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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background to the study

After the Vietnamese economic reform initiated in 1986 (Doi moi), tourism has gained a lot of attention and made significant achievements. In 1990, the launch of Vietnam Tourism Year, the number of international tourist arrivals was only 250 thousand, but by 2013, the number of international tourists coming to the country was 7.57 million, an increase of over 30 times. Over the past two decades, the number of international visitors to Vietnam generally grew at an annual average rate of over 12%, except in 2003 due to the SARS outbreak (-8%) and in 2009 because of the world economic recession (-11%). Domestic tourists also increased continuously during this period, from one million tourists in 1990 to 35 million in 20131.

While the economy of the country has still been in the process of overcoming the recession, tourism is the only economic sector to maintain a high growth rate. Growth in revenues from tourism rises faster than the increase in the number of tourists, at an average of 18.7% per year. According to calculations of the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) and the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), in 2012, Vietnam’s tourism industry contributed $13 billion to the economy, accounted for about 9.4% of GDP2 including direct contributions and indirect contribution3. Direct activities are to provide food, accommodation, transportation, sightseeing, entertainment, etc. for tourists. The indirect activities involve the supply chain services for tourists. In this respect, tourism has a ripple effect on all sectors of the economy and contributes to the society. Tourism has driven the development of tourism infrastructure and tourism facilities from the central to local levels. Tourism infrastructure has improved significantly. Air, water

---

2 Ibid.
3 Including government investment and spending for tourism, minus the import and tourism to foreign countries.
and land transport systems have been expanded and upgraded; energy, information and telecommunication infrastructure and other socio-economic fundamental innovation have also improved and effectively served for tourism growth.

The attraction of Vietnam’s tourism is the many natural and cultural resources, especially the increased number of UNESCO World Heritage (WH) sites in the country. Products like Ha Long Bay sightseeing, cultural heritage tours in Hue Citadel, Hoi An Ancient Town, My Son Sanctuary, adventure tour in Phong Nha – Ke Bang National Park attract attention from both international and domestic tourists. These products and the internationally recognized value of the destinations help Vietnam to position itself in the tourism market and are the focus in the strategy and master plan for tourism development. Table 1.1 presents the list of UNESCO WH sites in Vietnam to 2015.

**Table 1.1: List of UNESCO World Heritage sites in Vietnam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year of certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complex of Hue Monuments</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha Long Bay</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>1994 and 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoi An Ancient Town</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Son Sanctuary</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phong Nha – Ke Bang National Park</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Sector of the Imperial Citadel of Thang Long – Hanoi</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citadel of the Ho Dynasty</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trang An Landscape Complex</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UNESCO, compiled by author*

---

4 Strategy for Vietnam tourism development from 2011 to 2020, vision to 2030.
One of the UNESCO WH sites and a popular tourism destination for tourists is Hoi An Ancient Town, which is located in Hoi An City, Quang Nam Province. Besides being the home of Hoi An Ancient Town, Hoi An City also has the Cham Islands World Biosphere Reserve, recognized by UNESCO Man and Biosphere Program. The city is a part of the “Cultural Heritage Road”, the tourism route connecting three WH sites – Hue Citadel, My Son Sanctuary and Hoi An Ancient Town. Since being certified as a World Heritage and later a World Biosphere Reserve, the tourism industry in Hoi An has developed tremendously. The number of both international and domestic tourists to Hoi An now reaches more than one million per year\(^5\). The growing number of tourists to Hoi An City encourages a wide range of services such as accommodation, restaurants, souvenirs, tour guides, and transportation. The local people benefit from tourism, both directly and indirectly, and their lives are significantly improved (see Chapter 5). However, the quick growth of tourism and economic development raise potential risks to heritage sites and their recognized values, such as changing the integrity of the old town, environmental pollution and congestion. Some effects are related to socio-economic aspects, for example, rising prices, shrinking of agricultural land due to urbanization and tourism resort projects (UNESCO, 2008). To preserve the heritages along with tourism development, scholars have emphasized the importance of community participation in the planning and decision-making process. As “heritage sites belong to the people”, the local community who lives within and near the sites understands the situations and knows how plans are best carried out (Azni Mohd Dian & Nuraisyah Chua Abdullah, 2013). “Heritage conservation is unsustainable without local community participation” (ICOMOS, 1999) Community participation also helps to balance the negative impacts of tourism (Reid et al, 2004) and ensure proper distribution of benefits (Timothy & Tosun, 2003).

---

\(^5\) Hoi An Department of Commerce and Tourism.
UNESCO’s Office in Vietnam advocated a participatory process and cultural appropriate approach to better involve the stakeholders in the planning process in Hoi An City in 2009. The UNESCO World Heritage Center introduced the Public Use Planning (PUP) methodology in which the Office found many elements and models that could be applied to the sites in Hoi An. The PUP project took place in Hoi An City from 2009 to 2011, involving stakeholders and communities in the development of two visitor management plan for the two sites. This approach is different from the general planning approach that Vietnam follows, which is a top-down, centrally planned model as illustrated in Figure 1.1 below.

**Figure 1.1: The planning system of Vietnam**

![Planning System Diagram](attachment:image.png)

* CSED: Comprehensive Social & Economic Planning System

* **Sources:** "Report on the 2008 National Spatial Policy Seminar" (2009)
  
  National and Regional Planning Bureau, MLIT, Japan.

The two components of the centrally-planned Viet Nam Socio-economic Development Plan are the 10-year "Socio-economic Development Strategy" and the corresponding consecutive two "Five-year Socio-economic Development Plans". Both the strategy and plan fall under the control of the Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI). Under the Viet Nam Socio-economic Development Plan scheme, a bottom-up mechanism is employed whereby local governments (counties, districts, and provinces) issue proposals to the higher levels of government, which are then ultimately and eventually sent to the MPI, where they...
are incorporated into the country's overall spatial/land development policies (National and Regional Planning Bureau, 2009).

1.2 Problem statement

The PUP methodology utilizes the participatory approach, whereby participant sites formulate the tourism plan with community and other stakeholders. It was previously applied in many heritage sites around the world, such as Pico Bonito National Park in Honduras (1999), Komodo National Park in Indonesia (2002) and Coa Archeological Park in Portugal (2011)\(^6\). However, in general it was new and different from the practice in Vietnam. Even though Hoi An City has developed tourism for more than two decades, the communities only participate in contributing information and resources, implementing and sharing of benefits, rather than in decision making. Tourism planning in Vietnam, in sites like in Hoi An City is often done by outside consultants, not by the local organizations. The differences of PUP from the current planning system means that the governmental officials may not familiar with sharing power with the communities and the local people may not ready to participate in the planning process. Implementation of PUP methodology in other tourism destinations around the country, especially those which have less experience than Hoi An City in developing tourism, could also pose even more challenges.

1.3 Research objectives and Research questions

The objectives of the research are as follows:

1) To study the challenges of PUP methodology implementation to involve the community in tourism planning in Hoi An City.

2) To explore the potential of applying PUP methodology in Hoi An City and other tourism destinations in Vietnam in order to enhance community participation in tourism planning.

\(^6\) http://pupconsortium.net/sites/ accessed on June 5\(^{th}\) 2015.
The author set to answer the following research questions to achieve the above objectives.

1) What problems related to community participation did the PUP project encounter in Hoi An City?
2) What are the opportunities for PUP implementation in other destinations in Vietnam?

1.4 Methodology
This study is based on a case study of PUP implementation in Hoi An City, in the two sites Hoi An Ancient Town and Cham Islands Biosphere Reserve from 2009 to 2011. Primary data was collected by seven semi-structured interviews with tourism and PUP experts and local governmental officials who have experience with tourism and with the project in Hoi An. Secondary data such as project documents and materials, as well as legal documents relating to community participation and tourism in Hoi An were reviewed.

1.5 Definition of terms

Community: Taylor (2011) identifies three general ways in which community are used. They are 1) Descriptive: a group or network of people who share something in common or interact with each other; 2) Normative: a place where solidarity, participation and coherence are found; and 3) Instrumental: (a) an agent acting to maintain or change its circumstances; (b) the location or orientation of services and policy interventions. Community in Hoi An City in this research is defined as the residents living in the city, the owners and staffs of local businesses, academics and social organizations.

Community participation is defined as a method for incorporating the public’s ideas, values and interests into decisions, resulting in more responsive and democratic governance (Boyte & Kari, 1996).

Cultural heritage: the legacy of physical artefacts and tangible attributes of a group or society that are inherited from past generations, maintained in the present and
bestowed for the benefit of future generation\(^7\) (UNESCO, 2014). More specifically, the following is considered “cultural heritage”.

- Monuments: Architecture works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
- Groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
- Sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view.

(Source: UNESCO Convention, 1972)

Cultural heritage also include intangible heritage which “is embodied in those practices, expressions, knowledge, and skills, as well as in associated objects and cultural spaces, that communities and individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. Transmitted through generations and constantly recreated, it provides humanity with a sense of identity and continuity” (UNESCO Convention, 2003).

**Developing countries:** This research refers to developing countries as the countries/economies not listed as “High income”, with Gross National Income per capita of $12,746 or more in World Bank list of economies (2015)\(^8\).

\(^7\) [http://www.unesco.org/new/en/cairo/culture/tangible-cultural-heritage/ accessed on January 10\(^{th}\) 2015.]

\(^8\) [http://data.worldbank.org/about/country-and-lending-groups accessed on June 11\(^{th}\) 2015.]

**Natural heritage:** natural sites with cultural aspects such as cultural landscapes, physical, biological or geological formations. The following shall be considered as “natural heritage”.

- Natural features consisting of physical and biological formation or groups of such formation, which are of outstanding universal value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view;
- Geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation;
- Natural sites or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty.

(Source: UNESCO Convention, 1972)

**Public use program:** Public use includes all touristic, educational, interpretive, recreational and investigative uses by visitors who participate in activities that do not extract (except for sports and research) or introduce resources into a natural or cultural protected area. Public use does not include extractive activities for commerce or subsistence such as logging or mining. Public use program then would include all the products, programs, facilities, and services in the abovementioned areas. (PUP manual – Park planning for life, 2009).

**Stakeholder:** Stakeholders in this research include the lead agency in charge of the area, other government agencies, local government, private sector, non-profit, resident communities, academics, and others (Public Use Planning Manual, 2009).

**Tourism:** UNWTO defines tourism as a social, cultural and economic phenomenon which entails the movement of people to countries or places outside their usual environment for personal or business/professional purposes. Some people may

---

think of tourism only as a business, “provision of transportation, accommodation, recreation, food and related services for domestic and overseas travelers, involving travel for all purposes, including recreation and business” (Ansett Airline, 1977 based on Leiper, 1979). Looking from the business perspective leaves out the important human elements of tourism, as Weaver and Lawton (2006) put tourism as the sum of the process, activities, and outcomes arising from the interactions among tourists, tourism suppliers, host governments, host communities, origin governments, universities, community colleges and nongovernmental organizations, in the process of attracting, transporting, hosting and managing tourists and other visitors.

Tourism planning: “a course to determine an appropriate prospective action after a series of choices” (Gunn, 1994) to enhance visitor satisfactions, better business, sustainable resources use, and community integration (Gunn & Varr, 2002).

1.6 Organization of the study

The thesis is organized into six chapters. Chapter 1 gives the background of the study and lays out the problem statement, research objectives and research questions. Chapter 2 reviews existing literature on community participation in tourism planning, in heritage conservation and the PUP methodology. In Chapter 3, a more detailed explanation of the methodology applied in the study is provided. Overview information of Hoi An City and the two sites, Hoi An Ancient Town and Cham Islands Biosphere Reserve are presented in Chapter 4, focusing on how the resources and heritage values benefit tourism and the local communities. This chapter also provides the background information of the PUP project in Hoi An City. Chapter 5 describes the findings obtained from interview and documents analysis. These results are discussed in Chapter 6 and some recommendations are made on how to implement PUP in Hoi An City and other destinations in Vietnam.
Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1 Tourism and community participation in tourism

2.1.1 The connection between tourism and community

One important aspect of tourism is the interaction between tourists and the people they meet at their destination. The residents of destinations areas are considered a resource for tourism development, “the nucleus of the tourism product” (Simmons, 1994). Benefits of tourism to the host communities through economic and infrastructure development, as well as a medium for protecting the environment and culture (Andriotis, 2001), are already well documented. Tourism, however, is also associated with several social and environmental problems such as resources overexploitation, waste management problems, environmental degradation, traffic congestion, increasing crime rates and rising living cost (Andriotis, 2001; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2009). Indeed, destination communities face something of a “development dilemma” – tradeoff between the benefits they receive from tourism and the negative social and environmental consequences of its development (Sharpley, 2014). So tourism is also seen as a “double-edged sword” as while it may help the people and their communities earn their livelihood, majority of the benefits tend to flow out of them.

Development of tourism incurs varying degrees of impacts on destinations and, in particular, both positive and negative impacts affect apparently on the local people who act as hosts to tourists (Simmons, 1994; Wall & Mathleson, 2006). The study of Eshliki and Kaboudi (2012) shows that there is a relationship between the effects of tourism on community and the degree of participation in development programs. The negative effects of tourism on community cause a society inclination to participate in tourism development programs, and its positive affects results in increasing their support and reaching intended goals. Moreover, the tourism industry includes diversity of stakeholders having different perceptions and interest in tourism development, which at times are often conflicting. Development will trigger dissimilar effects on different groups depending on the
interests and the role they hold (Berno & Bricker, 2001) and each social group tends to interpret development in terms of how its interests can be served and how the distribution of benefits would affect it (Saxena, 2008). Successful development of tourism is therefore only achieved with harmonious relationships among the various stakeholders and community (Liu, 2003; Zhang, et al., 2006).

2.1.2 Community participation in tourism

Community participation as defined in Chapter 1 is a method for incorporating the public’s ideas, values and interests into decisions (Boyte & Kari, 1996). Community participation should ensure that community members understand the development process, potential opportunities to participate, and potential positive and negative impacts on their lives. Then, they will be better positioned to make appropriate decisions to reduce potential environmental or socio-cultural conflicts between tourists and local people (Aas et al., 2005; Tosun & Timothy, 2003). The growing concern over the need of public participation in decision-making has been attributed to several factors. Some of the identified factors include the gap of understanding between the public and officials, legalized provision of public participation, the complex and uncertain nature of the problems, uncertainty of risks associated with development, and the recognition that any kind of decision should consider the inherent social and political values rather than being purely scientific (Balint et al., 2006).

Community participation in tourism development will ensure benefit-sharing, transparency in development activities, and minimize probable negative impacts on the local community and environment. A participatory approach helps to create income-generating opportunities for local people and develop positive attitudes towards tourism development (Tosun, 2006). Participation also has been found to be crucial to the success of development as it helps to build the needed harmonious relationship among stakeholders. It increases efficiency and
commitment, builds trust, partnership and understanding at the local level, and creates transparency and accountability (Pretty, 1995; Kapoor, 2001).

There are different forms of community participation and how much of their ideas, values and interests is reflected into decisions. Tosun (1999) developed a typology for community participation for tourism development. He classified three types of community participation designed specifically for tourism development and also compared them with two other models of Arnstein (1971) and Pretty (1995) as shown in Table 2.1. The highest and ideal model for community participation in Tosun’s typology is spontaneous participation, of which the community actively and directly participates in decision making and planning. It corresponds to the highest levels of Arnstein’s and Pretty’s typology. Induced participation, which is top-down, passive and indirect, is more prevalent in developing countries (Tosun, 2006). Community participate can voice their opinions and give feedbacks but only on the proposed options by administration. The lowest level of community participation in Arnstein’s model, non-participation and in Pretty’s model, passive participation and manipulate participation corresponds to the lowest of Tosun’s typology, coercive participation. This type of participation is also top-down, passive and manipulated, and tourism development is mainly for the interest of decision makers, tourism’s operators and tourists (Tosun, 2006).
Table 2.1: Normative typologies of community participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of Citizen Power</th>
<th>Spontaneous participation: Bottom-up; active participation; direct participation; participation in decision making; authentic participation; self-planning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Self-mobilization</td>
<td>8 Citizen control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interactive participation</td>
<td>7 Delegated power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Functional participation</td>
<td>5 Placation Degrees of Citizen Tokenism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participation for material incentives</td>
<td>4 Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participation by consultation</td>
<td>3 Informing Coercive participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Passive participation</td>
<td>2 Therapy Non-participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Manipulative participation</td>
<td>1 Manipulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty’s (1995) typology of community participation</td>
<td>Amstein’s (1971) typology of community participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tosun’s (1999) typology of community participation</td>
<td>Tosun’s (2006) typology of community participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reality effective public participation is still lacking, especially in developing countries, because of the barriers that usually originates from the existing traditional top down approaches (Briffet, 1999). Development in most developing nations often serves the interest of dominant social and economic groups. Public
participation processes are criticized as dissatisfying, time consuming, costly, and inefficient (Stewart & Sinclair, 2007). Community participation in tourism development, especially in developing countries, is confronted with operational, structural and cultural barriers (Tosun, 2000). According to Tosun (2000), operational barriers are centralization of public administration system, lack of coordination among private and public tourism organizations, and lack of information made available to local people. Structural obstacles include negative attitudes of tourism professionals, lack of expertise, elite domination, lack of appropriate legal system, lack of trained human resources and lack of finance resources. Cultural limitations refer to limited capacity of poor people, apathy and low level of awareness in the local community. The success of community participation in tourism development will depend upon many factors including relationships among interests groups and levels, types, scales, directions and stages of tourism development (Tosun, 2000).

2.2 Community participation in tourism planning

2.2.1 Tourism planning

Hall (2008 based on Gunn & Varr, 2002) state at the beginning of their tourism planning book that if tourism wants to achieve a greater economic impact, it must be planned well towards goals of enhanced visitor satisfaction, community integration and resource protection. Planning should be regarded as critical for the sustainable development of tourist destinations. However, planning is a difficult word to define. Hall (2008) argues that “planning is the process of preparing a set of decisions for action in the future, directed at achieving goals by preferable means”. Planning is a kind of decision making and policy making; however, it deals with a set of interdependent and systematically related decisions rather than individual decisions. Various activities in that process may be difficult to isolate as the planning process such as bargaining and negotiation, compromise, coercion, values, choice and politics (Hall, 2008). Planning as a process, must therefore be
distinguished from a “plan”, which is “a set of decisions for action in the future” (Dror, 1973).

Tourism destinations are often created through the imagination of an entrepreneur, private firms or national government, and any planning that occurs is usually from that perspective (Reid & Sindiga, 1999). Most decisions affecting tourism communities are driven by the industry in concert with national governments; in other words, local people and their communities have become “the objects of development but not the subjects of it” (Mitchell & Reid, 2001). Although as the ‘owner’ and usually directly impacted by tourism development, local communities rarely have actual control over the direction of tourism development (Scheyvens, 2003).

Tourism planning must be accountable and should facilitate participation of various stakeholders and their perceptions must be incorporated into planning (Hardy & Beeton, 2001). Brohman (1996) emphasized that tourism planning should respect the desires and needs of residents, as it is suggested that positive resident attitudes, supports and inputs are essential for a long-term sustainability of tourism industry. Integrated tourism planning as pointed out by Hall (1999) is an ‘interactive’ or ‘collaborative’ approach requiring participation and interaction between different government agencies having responsibilities for various tourism related activities; and between responsible organization and various stakeholders. Coordinating among different government agencies, the public, the private sectors and various stakeholders in tourism, however, is a very challenging task (Jamal & Getz, 1995).

2.2.2 The needs of community participation in tourism planning

Community involvement in tourism development has become an ideology of tourism planning. Many scholars have advocated community participation in the tourism development process as a tool to solve major problems of tourism in developing nations such as distribution of benefits and undemocratic decision
making. However, applying this approach to developing countries poses challenges as discussed above.

The argument that a community’s acquisition of tourism benefits can occur without involvement in decision making can be seen by a study of Li (2006) in Jiuzhaigou Biosphere Reserve, China. Local communities were found to benefit sufficiently from tourism without participation in the planning process. Li (2006) suggests that there are other ways for the community to acquire benefits from tourism. Institutional arrangements, stage of tourism development, geographical relationship between the community and the site, and landownership structure can influence how and to what extent local communities take part in tourism and acquire benefits. With the same idea, Ming and Wall (2014) study and discuss about community participation in tourism decision making and in the acquisition of benefits with a study in Mutianyu Great Wall, Beijing, China. They find that even with minimal participation in tourism decision making, the local community receives direct benefits facilitated by preferential policies and management mechanism of the local government and the management agency.

The cases of participatory tourism development examined in countries such as China or developing countries represents a manipulative participation or passive participation as per Pretty’s typology. These countries usually take a top-down, passive and indirect community participation approach in tourism development, where decisions are made for the communities, not by them, and participation occurs in implementation and sharing of benefits rather than in decision making about what will be done (Tosun, 2006). The need for greater community involvement in tourism planning has been emphasized throughout in the literature sources (e.g. Brohman, 1996; Timothy, 1999; Tosun, 2000; Saxena, 2008). Community participation in planning and decision making level for tourism development is vital as tourism relies on the cooperation and goodwill of local people so any development and planning must fit within local aspirations and capacity for successful implementation (Murphy, 1988). Effective tourism planning
is believed to maximize the economic benefits of tourism to the destination area, and mitigate the negative impacts on the local social, economic, and physical environments (Timothy, 1999). This also results in more positive attitudes to tourism development and local resources conservation (Brohman, 1996; Tosun, 2006).

The participatory approach also facilitates implementation of sustainable tourism development (Tosun, 2000). Choi and Sirakaya (2005) in their study on sustainability indicators noted that community participation in tourism planning is a necessary condition to achieve the goals of sustainable tourism development. Sustainable tourism development begins with tourism planning and an effective tourism planning must incorporate insights, attitudes and approaches and manage by community stakeholders (Balint et al, 2006).

2.2.3 Requirements and models for community participation in tourism planning

- **Requirements for community participation in tourism planning**

Adopting the community participation approach in tourism planning require considerable effort, financial resources and expertise (Tosun, 2000). In the context of developing nations, participation of stakeholders in decision-making has not been properly recognized in the planning documents or in practice (Tosun, 2001). Study of Timothy (1999) on tourism planning in developing countries suggested that, tourism planners should consider local constraints and conditions before imposing foreign ideologies into traditional societies. In some parts of the world, some communities have strong local cultural institutions and decision-making traditions that require grassroots participation in the decision-making level for local matters (Tosun, 2005). A study by Nunkoo and Ramkissoon (2011) to develop community support model for tourism finds that the residents’ level of trust in tourism institutions is a determinant of community satisfaction, and therefore also to their readiness to participate in decision making. And trust forms through
communication between parties and their reliable performance (Numkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011 based on Blau, 1964). According to Simmons (1994), defining the objectives of participation and identifying a suitable means for public inputs is stressed as important to secure the interest of public. And in the long term, participation that is “meaningful” has to be based on local people’s knowledge base and their perceptions of their power in shaping decisions (Simmons, 1994).

- **Models for community participation in tourism planning**

Many studies in the literature have developed more integrative approaches to planning. The situation of leaving the local communities and their people outside of the planning process, making them the “objects of development, not the subjects of it”, has motivated many practitioners and scholars (Mitchell, 1998; Pinel, 1998; Reid, Fuller, Haywood & Bryden, 1993) for a rethinking of a development model that would place communities at the center of planning and management, according to Mitchell (2001). While some have been adapted from business models and focus on product formation and issues of supply and demand (Butler, 1980), new research in the field suggests that approaches to tourism, particularly in rural areas, must be inclusive and emphasize meaningful public participation. For example, Potts and Harrill (1998) develop what they call a travel ecology approach based upon six principles: discovery, mutuality, locality, historicity, potentially, and enhancement. Or Mitchell (1998) had the framework of community integration in tourism planning, with three critical parameters: community awareness, community unity, and power or control relationships (both within and external to the community). Tourism integration from a community-based perspective takes into consideration all social, environmental and economic benefits and issues. The Public Use Program (PUP) described in the next section is also a model to involve community in tourism planning.
2.3 Public Use Planning Program (PUP)

PUP started in 1999, when Pico Bonito National Park in Honduras asked its partner, RARE Center for Tropical Conservation to find a consultant or methodology for their formulation of a public use planning for the park. RARE discovered from its research that there had not been any methodology that appeared successful\(^\text{10}\). RARE decided to design a new methodology with two conditions, 1) For Pico Bonito, they wrote their own plan; 2) For RARE, they researched barriers for plan implementation to prevent producing another plan that ended up only in the bookshelf\(^\text{11}\).

RARE’s experience with Pico Bonito was then transformed into the second stage of the Program’s development when it became integrated in the World Heritage Centre, the United Nations Environment Program, and the United Nations Foundation, under the project title “Linking sustainable tourism and biodiversity conservation in world heritage sites”. The PUP Program ended when the World Heritage Partnership terminated in 2004 and then was re-started in 2007, this time as a wholly UNESCO initiative\(^\text{12}\).

The PUP Program uses a process by which participant sites enter a capacity-building relationship with the program. The public use coordinators participate in four multi-day training segments, and in between segments, sites facilitate their actual plans. They learn to build a learning community and think strategically instead of depend on consultants and methodological recipes to formulate plans. The public use coordinator has an integral role to play which is to facilitate the process, set up the logistics, edit the document, lead the staff, and interface with PUP. The public use coordinators receive technical assistance from PUP staff, during and at least two years after the plan has been written. Table 2.2 shows the differences between conventional and PUP planning.

---

\(^{10}\) PUP Manual – Park Planning for life.  
\(^{11}\) Interview with the PUP Consortium.  
\(^{12}\) Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Conventional site planning</th>
<th>PUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worldview</td>
<td>PLUS: Predictable, linear, understandable, static, certainty embraced</td>
<td>DICE: Dynamic, impossible to completely, understand, complex, ever-changing, uncertainty embraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Publication of a document</td>
<td>Development of instructional capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning style</td>
<td>Rational, comprehensive, scientific, controlled, expert-driven, in search of the “answer”</td>
<td>Adaptive, imaginative, looking for order in chaos, balancing technical and political needs, inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning agent</td>
<td>High-paid, outside consultants facilitate and write plan</td>
<td>Trains staff to facilitate planning and implement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning period</td>
<td>Discrete beginning and end, usually 6 months to a year</td>
<td>After first plan, planning continuous, mixed with action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document adaptability</td>
<td>Finalized, polished, and completed for next 5 years (on average). Plan is essentially dead. Not updatable.</td>
<td>Minimal, improvable, and expandable with time. Plan in living. Must be highly updatable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document designed</td>
<td>Technical complex, long, hard to read for stakeholders</td>
<td>Simple, attractive, easier to read, understandable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practices</td>
<td>Often does not use or know best practices</td>
<td>Always researching new ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>Uses own, often intuitive, facilitation techniques</td>
<td>Uses proven facilitation methodology (TOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information needs</td>
<td>High, requires numerous studies, maps, databases</td>
<td>Assumes sufficient knowledge already exists to begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder participation</td>
<td>Symbolic or superficial representation of stakeholders who are not co-owners of process or product. Influence and</td>
<td>Stakeholders encouraged to participate early and continuously to promote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Money determine where power lies</td>
<td>Ownership of plan, power distributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning is not a priority, little evaluation performed. Adaptive management lauded but not used</td>
<td>Entire process designed to foment continuous learning, seen as key to navigating DICE world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional culture</td>
<td>Risk-averse, fearful of experimentation, centralized, top-down, rigid, hierarchical.</td>
<td>Willing to experiment, team-oriented, adaptive, flexible, cooperative, appreciates and shares learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management orientation</td>
<td>Administrator: execute routines, formulas, procedures, rules; follow others’ without much independent thought</td>
<td>Manager: learning, flexible, adaptive, uses routines but adapts and innovates them to fit context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Assumed, secondary to plan creation: implementation barriers usually not considered</td>
<td>Major concerns from outset, object of planning: great effort to identify and avoid implementation barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program technical assistance</td>
<td>Limited to no assistance for sites aside from consultants who do the work rather than help site to do it</td>
<td>Mentors site staff though entire process out to at least three years. No consultants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The PUP intervention has two immediate products: a trained public use coordinator (at least one who has gone through the course) and the public use plan for the site. PUP uses eleven modules which are designed with practices that each site can modify according to its particular reality and make up their own plan. Figure 2.1 shows the stages of PUP and table 2.2 summarizes the eleven modules and two rounds of result reviews in PUP. Program technical assistants then help sites implement their plans and also acquire new capacities for further publics use development. Public use coordinators also benefit from a growing network of others who have participated in the Program. After two or three years, PUP hopes that by way of the public use coordinator, site management will begin to
institutionalize into its own culture many of the skills and perspective of the holistic public use management as taught by PUP (PUP manual, 2009).

**Figure 2.1: Stages of PUP**

Source: PUP manual – Park Planning for life (2009), adapted by author
<p>| No | Module                  | Summary                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Format                                                                                                                       | Participants                                                                                                           | Deliverables                                                                                                                                 |
|----|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | PUP planning preparation | This module guides the Public Use coordinators through the most important preparation. It is based on the assumption that there is a close relationship between the amount of preparation for PUP planning and the quality of products that come out of the process | A: Semi-public meeting and interviews; B: individual research; C: individual research; D: private meeting; E: individual preparations | A: Principal stakeholders and leaders; D: principal players including site director, administrator, board members, project leaders, principal collaborators in public use development in the site | A: understanding and cooperation, stakeholder problems; B: brief self-analysis report of site; C: planning framework; D: terms of reference; E: recruited participants, brochure, metaphor, big site map |
| 2  | Interpretive framework   | Participants will recreate the site’s history. They will produce a full set of interrelated and hierarchical messages with supporting stories that can be used to educate visitors and motivate them to participate in the site’s conservation programs. | Public workshop                                                                                                               | Administrators and government officials; historians; people with experience in interpretation; people with literary experiences. Writers, artists, and historians especially, as well as | Site history in table or narrative form; lists of significance attributes; site massages; interpretive framework |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Directory of touristic attractions</td>
<td>Using a resource filtering process to arrive at the most promising touristic resources. After evaluating the barriers and solutions, the site writes a directory that will be used in a variety of steps in the PUP</td>
<td>Public workshop and field research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site personnel; people who know the site resources very well; tour operators who can distinguish attraction from general resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Directory of touristic attractions and their description; attraction ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Zones, sectors &amp; visitors</td>
<td>Every protected area can offer a range of visitor experiences, in other words, has a supply, determined by its physical, social and managerial nature. These experiences are managed based on corresponding zones. The site also identifies a set of sectors, areas with a common public use function.</td>
<td>Work sessions; open meeting; closed meeting; one-person research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical team; tour operators; community leaders and others who have interest in sector names and public use development strategy in site; mapmaker;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zone name descriptions with management factors defined; defined and prioritized sectors with site-wide public use strategy; zone/sector maps, inventory of zone types, narrative of zones and sectors; present and future visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public Use Product</td>
<td>Based on the Planning Framework, management</td>
<td>Public workshop; field trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site authorities, tour operators, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptions of products for high-priority sectors;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
zones, public use sectors, visitor profiles, and attraction barriers, participants define activities and services for the site`s attractions that promote its purpose and principal messages (Interpretive framework). Then participants determine the relations with the private sector needed to provide those products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Public consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The facilitator takes the results to date to strategic communities, to see what kinds of activities and services they would like to offer consistent with the strategic criteria. Similarly, the facilitator takes the results to two principal visitor profiles and sees if they can improve what has been offered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community workshops and focus groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community workshops and focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key planners, plus strategic community members, principal visitor profile representatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Modified or new Product Description Sheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First review of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The facilitator gathers a small group of critical people from inside and outside the process, to review the results to date and improve them. They try to achieve consistency, clear logic and strategic, specific results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7 | Monitoring | The monitoring plan will outline indicators of conditions of high-priority activities and services, how they will be measured, by whom, with what frequency, where, and what the possible control strategies are | Public meeting | Administration, field staff, at least one foreigner and tour operator to measure quality and represent private sector in monitoring obligations, someone with experience in monitoring social impacts |

| 8 | Regulations | The participants will look for the minimum number of | Public workshop | Site managers, private sector service |

|   |   |   | Body of regulations, logistics for |   |
regulations necessary to start the program. Regulations will work to protect the natural and cultural resource as well as the visitor experience. To make all these regulations operational, there will be a system for updating the regulations, as well as logistics to put them into place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regulations necessary to start the program. Regulations will work to protect the natural and cultural resource as well as the visitor experience. To make all these regulations operational, there will be a system for updating the regulations, as well as logistics to put them into place</th>
<th>Providers, local politicians, other stakeholders such as landholders or communities, directors from other sites with experience in regulations, relevant enforcement agencies implementing them, public use requirements</th>
<th>Implementing them, public use requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Calendar of activities</td>
<td>A strategic calendar will make implementation more effective by controlling the number and timing of activities taken on at any given moment. The implementing agency will also agree on a set of techniques to increase the chances of successfully implementing the plan</td>
<td>Private or public workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management staff, board of directors, advisors to the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Financial plan</td>
<td>A small financial team will determine program needs, fees and finances for all planned services in the upcoming three years. The data will also help in estimating visitation, investment, and where costs might be cut. To accomplish this requires some cost research and estimates based on similar enterprises in other sites.</td>
<td>Private work sessions with independent research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second review of results</strong></td>
<td>The facilitator gathers a small group of critically thinking people, as well as people from outside the process, to review the results to date among the operational modules and improve upon them. They will also write a “photographic” vision designed to capture the essence of where the site is headed. This vision statement</td>
<td>Private meeting</td>
<td>Same as the first review committee, plus a creative writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUP document preparation</td>
<td>This module help the Public use coordinator take the products from all previous modules and put them together into an actual document. This document needs to be written and designed. Then its contents need to be shared with stakeholders and approved by whatever process was identified in the Terms of Reference.</td>
<td>Public presentation is in a public forum; other steps carried out in an office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PUP manual – Park planning for life (2009), compiled by author
2.4 Chapter summary

Tourism is a phenomenon that involves multiple economic sectors and variety of stakeholder groups, and depends on a rich and diverse, natural or built environment. Tourism can provide considerable benefits to the destination through economic development, infrastructure development, and as a medium for protecting the environment and culture. On the other hand, it can cause social and environmental strains, and leakage of benefits (Andriotis, 2001). The complex nature of tourism creates many issues, concerns and challenges, especially for the local people who live inside and around the destination, who act as “hosts” to tourists (Wall, 2006). Many scholars have advocated the inclusive participation of local community in the decision-making process in tourism, to ensure the success of development, minimize probable negative impacts, increase efficiency, build trust, and create transparency and accountability (Pretty, 1995; Kapoor, 2001).

However, in reality effective public participation is still lacking, especially in developing nations, because of the bureaucratic barriers that usually originates from the existing traditional top down approaches (Briffet, 1999). Especially with tourism planning, tourism destinations are often created and planned from the perspective of an entrepreneur, private firms or national government (Reid & Sindiga, 1999). Although the local community is usually directly impacted by tourism development, they rarely have actual control over the direction of tourism development (Scheyvens, 2003). Community involvement in tourism development has become an ideology of tourism planning. Many scholars have considered community participation in the tourism development process as a tool to solve major problems of tourism in developing nations such as distribution of benefits and undemocratic decision making. Public Use Planning is a methodology which utilizes this integrative approach. The PUP uses a process by which participant sites enter a capacity-building relationship with the program. The Public use coordinators come from the site and learn to build a learning community and think strategically instead of depending on outside consultants. The PUCs, together with
the local community and stakeholders, follow the eleven modules of the PUP methodology to formulate the plans by themselves.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter describes the research methods that were used to obtain data to achieve the objectives set out and to answer the three research questions as mentioned in the Introduction. To study about community participation in tourism planning in Vietnam, a single case study was selected and analyzed in-depth by a qualitative approach. The application of Public Use Planning (PUP) methodology in Hoi An City from 2009 to 2011 was the chosen case study for this research. Both primary and secondary data were collected and analyzed. Semi-structured interviews and observation during field visit were used to obtain primary data. For the secondary data, the author reviewed legal and government documents, policy frameworks, academic papers and other articles, documents related to the research topic.

3.1 Research approach

This study adopted a qualitative research approach, which fit well with the proposed study for a variety of reasons. Qualitative research is an appropriate research method for researchers who are interested in insight, discovery, and interpretation rather than hypothesis (Noor, 2008). Moreover, qualitative research is suited to address certain research problems where the researcher often has little knowledge or understanding on the topic (Morse & Richards, 2002). In a qualitative study, the researcher can choose one or more strategies of inquiry as a guide and can use multiple interactive and participatory data collection procedures.

Qualitative research generally involves participatory methods of data collection, giving an emphasis on participant’s perceptions and experiences of a particular event (Creswell, 2009). Moreover, qualitative research is the most appropriate way to approach such subjects where the researcher needs to base the study on information that will be acquired from the local people and other stakeholders in the field, as is the case in this study.
3.2 Case study

A case refers to an event, an entity, an individual or a unit of analysis, and is highly applicable to understanding contemporary phenomenon in its real-life context using multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 1993). It is also defined as a bounded system that narrows down a given case to a particular place, time, or components that comprise it (Merrian, 2002). A case study inquiry will give an understanding of “how and why” things happen, thus allowing the researcher to focus on a particular issue or feature in depth. As Merrian (2002) suggests, much can be learned from a particular case and can be transferred to other similar situations as well.

The PUP methodology was introduced to Vietnam in a pilot project collaborated between UNESCO and Quang Nam Province. This project was the first instance PUP, or any method was used in Vietnam to integrate the community participation in tourism planning. It provided a good platform to examine the obstacles for applying a bottom-up approach in tourism planning. The project was run from 2009 to 2011 and took place in three heritage sites of Quang Nam Province – Hoi An Ancient Town, Cham Islands World Biosphere Reserve and My Son Sanctuary. Hoi An Ancient Town and Cham Islands World Biosphere Reserve are located in Hoi An City and were selected as the case studies of this research as they provide prime examples of the interaction between heritage and local residents. People are living inside the two sites and their actions directly affect the environment and the heritage. Especially, Hoi An Ancient Town is considered a “living museum”, with local people’s everyday lifestyle inside the old quarters making up an important part of the local culture. Moreover, Hoi An Ancient Town is a cultural heritage site and Cham Island Biosphere Reserve is a natural site, each site has its own characteristics and challenges in tourism planning and management. They can represent the other heritage sites in Vietnam, as the country has many cultural and natural sites.
3.3 Data collection methods

3.3.1 Primary data

The method chosen to collect primary data was semi-structured interviews. The interviews allowed for learning comprehensively about the informants’ experience and viewpoints of community participation in Hoi An tourism and the PUP methodology. From that, the author gained an understanding of tourism in Hoi An, the type of participation in Hoi An, as well as the obstacles for the application of participatory approach in tourism planning like the PUP in Hoi An in particular and in Vietnam in general. A framework was created for each interview, depending on the informant’s work background and experience in Hoi An. The interviews were semi-structured to allow additional questions rising from the information that was being provided. The interviews were recorded and transcribed to text.

The sampling strategy was snowballing. It started with the author’s own network and developed through each informant’s network to find people with experiences in Hoi An tourism, tourism planning and/or the PUP project. The key informants were tourism experts from the Institute for Tourism Development Research, a former JICA tourism expert, officials from UNESCO Hanoi Office, an expert from PUP Consortium, government officials from Hoi An Department of Commerce and Tourism, Hoi An Center for Culture and Sport, Management Board of Cham Islands Marine Protected Area. Table 3.1 below shows the roles of the key informants in the PUP project and tourism planning and management.
Table 3.1: List of informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization /Individual</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Code of the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Tourism Development Research (ITDR)</td>
<td>A governmental research institute functioned to conduct research, outline strategies, planning, mechanism, and policies relating to the management and development of tourism to help the State in its management over tourism industry.</td>
<td>26/1/2015</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO Hanoi Office</td>
<td>UNESCO has supported many projects in Hoi An and was the donor of the PUP project. The office followed the PUP process in Quang Nam Province since the beginning and continued to provide assistance to some follow up activities.</td>
<td>26/1/2015</td>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUP Consortium</td>
<td>Co-author of the PUP methodology and technical assistance for the PUP project in Quang Nam Province</td>
<td>17/2/2015</td>
<td>R3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoi An Department of Commerce and Tourism</td>
<td>One of the main local government organizations managing tourism in Hoi An City. Key facilitator in developing a visitor management plan for Hoi An City in the PUP project</td>
<td>28/1/2015 and 28/2/2015</td>
<td>R4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Six semi-structured interviews were completed from January to March, 2015 in Hanoi and Hoi An, Vietnam. Five interviews were conducted face-to-face and one was an online meeting. One interview with the Japanese tourism expert was organized in Tokyo on May, 2015. After the interviews, some further exchanges were made by phone calls and emails to follow up some information.

### 3.3.2 Secondary data

The research also used secondary data to support research findings. The reviewed documents were research papers, journal articles, legal and government documents and policy frameworks. Materials of the PUP project was also acquired, including a PUP manual, project reports, visitor management plans.

Most of the documents were obtained online through different sources. Academic papers and articles were searched on JSTOR and Google Scholar using key words such as “community participation in tourism” “heritage tourism” “heritage conservation”. Documents were also found from the reference list of relevant
materials. Policies and government reports were collected from the respondents and from the government agencies’ websites.

3.4 Data analysis

According to Creswell (2009) data analysis follows several steps which include: organizing and preparing data for analysis; obtaining a general sense of information; coding and identifying the main themes; representing the main themes in a qualitative narrative; and interpreting data in relation to the literature or theories. Following these guidelines, first the interviews and field notes were transcribed. The interviews were conducted in both English and the author’s native language, Vietnamese. The ideas from the transcripts and secondary data were organized into groups with general themes. The information in Vietnamese, which was deemed relevant to the study, was translated into English. The majority of the collected data was text which was input and analyzed manually.

3.5 Limitations of the study

The interviews were conducted with provincial government officials, UNESCO officials and tourism experts, who participated in the PUP project in Hoi An City. The stakeholders, e.g., private sector, tourists, etc. and communities in the two heritage sites were important parts of the project, however, their views were not presented. Due to the limitation of time and resources of the study, additional surveys for the participated stakeholders and local communities could not be carried out.
Chapter 4: Overview of the case study background

4.1 Overview of Hoi An City

Photo 4.1: Map of Modern Greater Hoi An

Source: UNESCO, 2008

4.1.1 Location and geographic features

Hoi An is a City of Quang Nam Province, located on the South Central Coast region of Vietnam with a total area of 61.71 km² and population of 88,933 people (2009)\(^{13}\). Hoi An is about 25km southeast from Da Nang City and 25 km northeast from Tam Ky City – the capital city of Quang Nam Province.

The city area covers land, sea and islands. The land area is 46.22 km², and accounts for 74.9% of the total area. In the center of the city are located three wards – Minh An, Son Phong and Cam Pho, most known for the Ancient Town, which was recognized as a UNESCO World Cultural Heritage in 1999. 18 km from the mainland are Cham Islands with the area of 15.49 km² (25.1% of the total area). Cham are island clusters that form a bow shape facing the East Sea and shielding the

\(^{13}\) Hoi An City website: hoian.gov.vn accessed on April 15\(^{th}\) 2015.
mainland. Cham Islands form a part of the Cham Islands World Biosphere Reserve recognized by UNESCO.

Hoi An City includes nine wards: Minh An, Son Phong, Cam Pho, Tan An, Thanh Ha, Cam Chau, Cam An, Cua Dai, Cam Nam and four communes: Cam Thanh, Cam Kim, Cam Ha, Tan Hiep (Cham Islands). Table 4.1 shows the population of the city in 2011, divided by wards and communes. The majority of the population is of the King ethnicity. Hoi An also has a Chinese community, linking to the history of formation and development of the area. Everyday there is a large number of people going to the city for visiting or doing business.

Table 4.1: Area and population of Hoi An City by wards and commune (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Population (people)</th>
<th>Population density (people/km²)</th>
<th>No of community units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61,712</td>
<td>90.891</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minh An Ward</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>6.509</td>
<td>10.157</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tan An Ward</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td>9.386</td>
<td>6.661</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cam Pho Ward</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>10.052</td>
<td>8.551</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thanh Ha Ward</td>
<td>6.406</td>
<td>11.419</td>
<td>1.757</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Son Phong Ward</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>4.495</td>
<td>6.188</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cam Chau Ward</td>
<td>5.704</td>
<td>10.644</td>
<td>1.848</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cua Dai Ward</td>
<td>3.156</td>
<td>5.559</td>
<td>1.747</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cam An Ward</td>
<td>3.148</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cam Nam Ward</td>
<td>4.549</td>
<td>6.282</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cam Ha Commune</td>
<td>6.132</td>
<td>7.089</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cam Kim Commune</td>
<td>4.204</td>
<td>4.017</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cam Thanh Commune</td>
<td>8.954</td>
<td>7.529</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tan Hiep Commune</td>
<td>15.491</td>
<td>2.413</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hoi An Department of Statistic

Hoi An has favorable conditions to attract a large number of domestic and international tourists. The nearest airports are Chu Lai Airport and Da Nang
International Airport. The city is part of the “Cultural Heritage Road”, the tourism route connecting three World Heritage sites of Vietnam – Hue Citadel, My Son Sanctuary and Hoi An Ancient Town. Beside the cultural heritage, Hoi An also has many natural landscapes. An Bang Beach and Cua Dai Beach, approximately 3 km from the center of Hoi An, together with Cham Islands are the advantages for Hoi An to develop marine tourism.

Hoi An City belongs to the 500 km central coast urban area, comprising of important economic centers of the Central region of Vietnam. To the north, there is the Chan May – Lang Co economic zone, the World Heritage site Hue Citadel and Da Nang – a rapidly urbanized city. To the south, there is Ky Ha port, Chu Lai Open Economic Zone, Dung Quat Economic Zone. These economic centers all have easy access to seaports, airports and convenient road system. All these conditions above facilitate Hoi An to develop trade and commercial activities, especially tourism.

4.1.2 Tourism resources

4.1.2.1 Landscape resources

a. Coast

Hoi An has an approximately 7 km long coastline with many beaches. The most well-known and developed are Cua Dai and An Bang Beach. Cua Dai beach is about 5 km northeast from the city center, and An Bang beach is located closer, about 2 km north of the city center. The coastline stretches from An Bang to Cua Dai fishing villages in which are located some beach resorts attracting tourists to the area.

b. The riverside

Thu Bon is a 2,598 m long river originated from Ngoc Linh Mountain and run southwest, combining with Tien River and Tranh River, to Hoi An Ancient Town and Cua Dai. The river passes by many attractions in Hoi An such as Dai Binh Village, Thanh Ha Pottery Village, Kim Bong Carpentry Village and Champa architectures. Thu Bon joins with the other rivers, De Vong, Truong Giang and
Dinh, before flowing into the East sea, creating the coastal mangrove scene in Cam Thanh, Cua Dai.

Dinh River, De Vong River and Co Co River flow through villages and to the sea. On tours along these rivers, tourists can see the features of both traditional villages and urban area.

c. Cham Islands

Cham Islands are located 15 km from the mainland, and 19 km from the center of the ancient town. Cham Islands consist of eight islands: Lao, Dai, Mo, Kho, Tai, La and Ong. There are small beaches on the islands, located among mountains such as Chong Beach, Ong Beach and Bac Beach. Cham Islands also have other natural landscape like Ba Cave and Yen Cave.

4.1.2.2 Ecological resources

Cu Lao Cham forest and marine ecological resources provide diverse aquatic species: corals, anemones, sea cucumbers, starfish, and fishes. Swiflets live and nest in this area. The forests cover over 70% of the islands with many valuable wood species. Cam Thanh water coconut grove with mangrove estuaries and coastal resources create a diverse coastal ecosystem.

4.1.2.3 Historical and cultural resources

a. Hoi An Ancient Town

Hoi An Ancient Town is preserved as relics of urban architectures, which were built from the 16th and 17th century. It has 1360 monuments, putting in categories of house, assembly hall, temple, family temple, well, bridge, port, market. These constructions, combined with the checkerboard road system, represent the popular urban design in that time period. The daily life of local residents with traditional cultural customs is being maintained and protected. The ancient town is a living museum of architecture and traditional urban lifestyle, marking the history of trade and culture exchange in this city.
b. Villages

The villages in Hoi An are small but distinctive in characteristics. Some of them have traditional crafts and products going back hundreds of years, such as Kim Bong Carpentry Village, Thanh Ha Pottery Village, Tra Que Vegetable Village, An Bang Fish Village. There are also new craft villages producing souvenirs for tourists like lanterns, clothing, footwear, and handbags.

c. Intangible culture

Folk festivals, spiritual beliefs

The culture in Hoi An is strongly influenced by Buddhism, mixed together with other Vietnamese traditional beliefs. Many families have a Buddhist statue placed in their houses. Each family also has an ancestral altar which is traditionally placed in a prominent position of the house. Apart from ancestor worship, people also worship the five deities of the house – Kitchen God, Well God, Gate God, Patron Saint of Life and the Goddess of Prosperity. Vietnamese-Chinese residents of Hoi An differ in two of the five house deities. Instead of worshipping the Patron Saint of Life and the Goddess of Prosperity, they worship the Door God and the Earth God (UNESCO, 2008).

Hoi An people practice a number of rituals and festivities according to the lunar calendar. There is at least one festival or ritual in one month. As ancient people in Hoi An depended a lot on farming and fisheries, the rituals and festivals are to wish for successful harvest and fishing, for example rituals for newly planted rice, and rituals at the beginning of the year for safe and good fishing. Some festivals are related to religions such as celebrations of the Buddha’s birthday or rites to protect oneself from the devil and evil spirits.

Entertainment and traditional games

Traditional games are not only enjoyed by children but also by adults in Hoi An, particularly games involving singing and gambling such as watch-tower singing (bai choi), pomelo throwing (nem buoi), cockfighting (choi ga) and card games (to tom).
The games are often played with many participants in front of a large audience in special occasions such as New Year or festivals. Hoi An City recreates some special events like the watch-tower singing game (bai choi) every Saturday evening, and the lantern festival every first and fifteenth day of lunar month in the centre of Hoi An Ancient town. Another restored performance is the dance “Ba Trao” which has its roots in Vietnamese-Chinese tradition and is performed during the Mid-Autumn Festival on the fifteenth day of the eighth lunar month to drive evil spirits away and to request happiness, good crops, health and prosperity. These performances and festivals are great attractions for tourists when they go to Hoi An. (R5)

4.2 Hoi An Ancient Town – UNESCO World Heritage site

4.2.1 History of Hoi An Ancient Town

History of Hoi An can be traced back to the Sa Huynh period (200 BC to 200 AD) by archaeological ruins found in Cam Ha, Thanh Ha, Cam Pho and Cam Thanh, including tomb jars, tools, stone jewelry and ceramics. Chinese coins and iron objects with Western Han Dynasty style prove that there were already trade activities between China and the South and Central region of Vietnam in the Sa Huynh period. Archaeological sites in Bai Ong also showed that Cham Islands were inhabited 3,000 years ago.

After the Sa Huynh period, Hoi An saw the presence of Cham people, Dai Viet (Vietnamese) people, as well as traders from China, Japan, Netherlands and other European countries. The Vietnamese ethnic group moved down from the north and settled down in Hoi An in the fifteenth century. Their main livelihood was agriculture (rice water) and fisheries. The villages in Hoi An area eventually developed specialized craft products, trade and commerce between the villages, and then with foreign countries. Many craft villages still exist to this day, such as Kim Bong Carpentry Village and Thanh Ha Pottery village.

Due to the convenient location and a deep water harbor, many Chinese and Japanese traders came to Hoi An in the sixteenth century, and by the seventeenth
century, they formed into Chinese and Japanese sections, divided by the Japanese bridge which still can be visited nowadays. European traders soon followed and brought Christianity to Hoi An.

After all the wars and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam was declared in 1975, Hoi An was a rural town whose the primary economic activities were agriculture, fisheries and craft production (R4). Beginning from the 1990s, with the renovation of Vietnam economy (Doi moi) and the openness for trade and commercial, many tourists started coming to Hoi An and the city transformed. Hoi An has experienced remarkable development in its economy, society and culture, with the highlight is the development of tourism based on the cultural heritage of the ancient town.

On December 4th 1999, Hoi An was recognized as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. This recognition is an important event to raise the awareness and action of the government and local people in heritage conservation and economic development. Ten years later, on May 26th 2009, Cham Islands - Hoi An was recognized as the World Biosphere Reserves. A city with two world heritage is an opportunity for local economic development through tourism, but also poses challenges in heritage conservation.

4.2.2 Heritage of Hoi An Ancient Town

Hoi An Ancient Town is one of the 64 national tourism destinations. It was certified as World Cultural Heritage by UNESCO in 1997. Under Criterion (ii), Hoi An is an outstanding material manifestation of the fusion of cultures over time in an international commercial port; and under Criterion (v) Hoi An is an exceptionally well preserved example of a traditional Asian trading port.

The boundaries of the ancient town and the surrounding districts were established under the Cultural Heritage law of Vietnam and the Hoi An People’s Committee’s Statute on Managing, Preserving and Utilizing the Hoi An Ancient Town (The Master Investment project for Conserving and Utilizing the World Heritage Site of Hoi An Ancient Town was proposed and ratified by the Prime Minister under
Decision No 240/TTg dated 14/4/1997). To promote sustainable reservation and development of Hoi An, the municipal government divided the area into two zones. Zone 1 or Intact Protection zone covers the heritage in the Ancient Town and the associated areas. The authenticity and integrity of the outstanding universal value must be protected with. Zone II or Ecological Environment and Landscape Protection zone is the area surrounding Zone I, where structures can be built that contribute to the promotion of the values provided that these structures do not affect the architecture, natural scenery and ecological environment of the Ancient Town. Zone II is further divided into Zone II-A and Zone II-B, each with its own set of detailed regulations pertaining to physical interventions of constructions and new developments.

The historic buildings in Hoi An are classified into five categories, according to their historical, cultural and scientific value by the Hoi An Center for Monuments Management and Preservation, as shown in Table 4.2.

### Table 4.2: Classification criteria of historic buildings in Hoi An

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Category and Category I</td>
<td>All original elements of these unique architectural and artistic structures have been maintained in an integrated manner. These elements have special historical, cultural and scientific value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>All original elements of the front building, façade and roof tiles have been maintained in an integrated manner. These elements have historical, cultural and scientific value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category III</td>
<td>The yin-yang tiled roofs and some original elements of the house have been maintained in situ. These elements have some historical, cultural and scientific value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category IV</td>
<td>These houses are built in modern style using modern materials like concrete. They do not contribute cultural significance to the complex of architectural monuments in Hoi An Ancient Town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: HACMMP (UNESCO, 2008)*
Table 4.3: Number of built structures in Hoi An by category (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Category III</th>
<th>Category IV</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communal houses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagodas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temples</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly halls</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family chapels</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches, oratories</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential houses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>1,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tombs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cultural works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>251</strong></td>
<td><strong>344</strong></td>
<td><strong>412</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,254</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: HACMMP (UNESCO, 2008)*
Photo 4.2: Japanese Bridge in Hoi An Ancient Town

Photo 4.3: Houses by the riverside in Hoi An Ancient Town

Photo 4.4: A shop selling lanterns in Hoi An Ancient Town
4.2.3 Heritage and tourism management structure

The Hoi An City’s People Committee has comprehensive management of the Ancient Town, with the assistance of the local authorities.

**Figure 4.1: Organizational chart – Tourism and Heritage management**

*Source: UNESCO (2008)*

**Hoi An City People’s Committees**: The Hoi An City People’s Committee is directly in charge of both running the World Heritage site and managing the town with a view to conserving heritage and developing its values. The People's Committee is responsible for and also works with related offices to manage and uphold regulations on tourism and services. The four main organizations helping the city in tourism management and heritage conservation are as follows:

**Hoi An Department of Commerce and Tourism**: This bureau communicates information about the laws and regulations for tourism management. It is also mandated to provide information to tourists about Hoi An, train tourism and service staff, inspect and evaluate tourism businesses and advise the People’s Committee regarding the development and implementation of tourism master plans.
Hoi An Department of Culture and Information: This bureau manages information, culture and sport within Hoi An. It advises the Hoi An Centre for Monuments Management and Preservation and enforces the implementation of the Cultural Heritage Law and regulations on relic management, preservation and use in Hoi An. It also supports coordination between related offices in monitoring and evaluating cultural and tourism activities.

The Hoi An Centre for Monument Management and Preservation: This center is responsible for informing the public about the “Regulations on Relics Management, Preservation and Use of Hoi An Ancient Town” and enforcing those regulations. It advises tourism businesses and residents about the importance of conserving heritage and provides guidelines on conserving that heritage. It also coordinates with the Hoi An Sport and Culture Center in providing up-to-date information about Hoi An’s people and culture.

Hoi An Center for Culture and Sport: This center directly operates the Tourism Information Offices and is responsible for managing ticket sales, providing information to tourists in the old quarter and in the handicraft villages, training tourism workers in order to create a good impression for tourists.

Beside the aforementioned organizations, the city also has a Cross-sectoral Inspection Team. This team composed of members of the Ward People’s Committee and HACMMP monitors all physical interventions within the old quarter and cooperates with the Sport and Culture Center to prevent “social evils” that may take place as a result of tourism activities.

4.3 Cham Islands - World Biosphere Reserve

The Cham Island Biosphere Reserve is divided into three functional areas. The core zone covers an area of 2,471 hectares - the entire Cham Islands Marine Protected Area (MPA). This area conserves the species diversity, landscape and ecosystems. The buffer zone covers an area of 8,455 ha. Economic, research, education and entertainment activities can be carried out in this area, with consideration to the
core zone. The transition zone is an area of 22,220 ha, including the Hoi An Ancient Town, Tra Que vegetable village, Kim Bong carpentry village, Thanh Ha pottery village. Each functional area of the Biosphere Reserve has different roles and different nature of interaction between nature and humans.

Photo 4.5: Map of Cham Islands

Cham Islands MPA consists of all seven islands – Lao, Dai, Mo, Kho, Tai, La and Ong, and the water around the islands, within 150° 52’ 30” to 160° 00’ 00” North latitude, 108° 24’ 00” to 108° 33’ 30” East longitude. The MPA includes (i) core area which is strictly protected to preserve the marine ecosystem and coral reefs; (ii) ecological restoration area, which are managed and organized to restore the ecosystems and natural aquatic resources in order to bring economic benefits to the community; and (iii) development area for community resident and economic, especially tourism development.

4.3.1 History of Cham Island World Biosphere Reserve

Cham Islands Marine Protected Area (MPA) was established under Decision No 88/2005/QD-UBND of Quang Nam Provincial People’s Committee on 20 December 2005. Objectives of the organization are to conserve marine biodiversity, protect
and exploit ecosystems sustainably, preserve natural resources and cultural heritages. The MPA operates near the islands on the mainland in Tan Hiep Commune, Hoi An, Quang Nam. Cham Islands MPA is an outcome of Cham Island MPA Project, which was established and operated under an agreement between the Government of Vietnam and Government of Denmark from 2003 to 2006 (R6). The long-term objectives of the project are strategies (i) to protect the natural resources and cultural and historical values of Cham Islands archipelago, and (ii) to use sustainable natural resources and cultural and historical values of Cham Islands to stimulate socio-economic development (Trinh, 2014).

In 2009, Hoi An – Cham Islands was recognized by UNESCO as a World Biosphere Reserve. The people of Hoi An have had a long history living in reliance on the natural resources, on local mangroves, sea grass, and coral reef habitats. The proposed biosphere reserve is coordinated by the People Committee of Hoi An City as a modality of sustainable development with environmental services to help local people practice a sustainable livelihood. The suggested services are (i) conservation of biodiversity, cultural diversity and natural resources through active human intervention with cultural values; (ii) conservation of anthropogenic ecosystems in harmonious landscapes resulting from traditional patterns of land use; adapted land use/ sea use in order to foster biodiversity; fostering land stewardship enhancing the natural environment; and (iii) restoration/rehabilitation areas assisting the natural recovery of an ecosystem that has been degraded, damaged or destroyed serving as a corridor, part of ecological networks, stepping stone patches or stand-alone polygons.

4.3.2 Natural and cultural resources of Cham Islands Biosphere Reserve

Natural resources

The core zone of Cham Islands Biosphere Reserve - the entire Cham Islands MPA, has forest and marine ecosystems such as coral reefs, sea grass beds, etc. The buffer zone has coconut water forest ecosystems and riparian ecosystems. The
ecology of coral, sea grass, seaweed, sand, rocky shore are important habitat for many aquatic species which is a great supply and is valuable for the residents’ livelihood.

Cham Island’s primeval forest, with abundant flora and fauna, not only offers a variety of products, but also a place to store and supply fresh water to feed thousands of people on the island. The vegetation cover on the island has more than 500 species, of which about 228 species of plants are medicinal. Cu Lao Cham is one of the few islands in Vietnam which has the swiftlet nests resources, which have special nutritional value and high price. With these values, Cham Islands’ forest was classified as Special Use Forest, with the conservation of rare and extremely important genetic resources for human life and potential for ecotourism development.

**Photo 4.6: Cham Island**

*Cultural resources*

Besides the beautiful scenery, Cham Islands has an abundance of local knowledge sources and archaeological heritage. Residents have long lived and formed historical and cultural characteristics of the coastal islands. The two archeological sites in Bai Lang and Bai Ong, and excavations of ancient ships sunk near Cham
Islands show the cultural history from Sa Huynh period, Champa Kingdom to Dai Viet period. The artifacts and the architectural monuments illustrate the history of international trading of the area.

Photo 4.7: Ngoc Huong Monastic in Cham Islands

4.3.3 Management structure

In Vietnam, biosphere reserves are overseen by the Man and the Biosphere (MAB) National Programme, which is in turn supervised by the National Commission for UNESCO. Management of biosphere reserves in Viet Nam is recommended to focus on the coordination of stakeholders to harmonize their benefits and responsibilities for fulfilling designated functions of the biosphere reserve. Local authorities, conservation agencies, civil society, the business sector, and local communities all collaborate in the management of biosphere reserves.14

Cham Islands Biosphere Reserve Management Committee was formed with nine members, representing the concerned departments in Hoi An City. In addition, the Management Committee is supported by the Secretariat, the Advisory Committee and the Technical Group.

Local communities and business sector also have been mobilized to protect and promote the Biosphere Reserve. This can be seen through the model of co-management and marine co-protection in Bai Huong communities; Stone Crab protection group in Cham Islands; protection and restoration of water coconut forest in Cam Thanh. However, the mechanism to increase involvement of the private economic sector in the management of Cham Islands Biosphere Reserve is still needed.\(^{15}\)

The core zone of the Biosphere Reserve is Cham Islands MPA, which is managed by a Management Board. Cham Islands MPA Management Board was an organization under Quang Nam Province People’s Committee when the MPA was first established in 2005. When a Biosphere Reserve is created in Vietnam, normally the vice chairman of the district People’s Committee is appointed the director of the management board, which in the case of Cham Island Biosphere Reserve, it is the vice chairman of Hoi An City People’s Committee. So in 2013, Cham Islands MPA Management Board was moved to be under the administration of Hoi An City in Decision No 1035/QD-UBND dated 02/04/2013 by Quang Nam Province People’s Committee. This transfer allows Hoi An City to manage Cham Islands MPA and the Biosphere Reserve comprehensively.

### 4.4 Hoi An tourism development

Tourism activities in Hoi An mainly concentrate in the Ancient Town and surrounding area of Cua Dai Beach, Cham Islands and traditional craft villages.

*Tourism accommodations*

By the end of 2009, the city has 81 accommodation establishments with 3,138 rooms.

---

\(^{15}\)Report on the status of the management, protection and promotion of the World Heritage Site of Hoi An, Hoi An City People's Committee (2013).
Table 4.4: Tourism accommodation establishments in Hoi An

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of accommodation establishments</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>119.01%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>102.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of rooms</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>125.82%</td>
<td>2,856</td>
<td>3,168</td>
<td>102.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HADCT

Beside the registered and classified tourism accommodation establishments above, there are 61 houses and 164 rooms which are considered as homestay in Hoi An City, accounting for 45.52% of all the accommodation establishments but only 4.23% of the total number of rooms. The number of homestay on land is 21 houses with 67 rooms; the number of establishment on the islands is 40 houses with 97 rooms. This kind of accommodation has developed a lot in the past decade, however, they are mainly underexploited due to the lack of overall strategy, promotion and collaboration to attract customers. The city government is also in the process of developing a legal framework and mechanisms to administer and monitor this business. The number of new registered homestay establishment each year is limited by the city.

Tourist arrivals

After being recognized as a World Cultural Heritage site, Hoi An became a popular destination for tourists coming to Vietnam. In the period from 2001 to 2005, because of the restoration and promotion of tradition festivals in Hoi An, the number of tourists increased tremendously every year (R5). The average growth rate

---

16 Scheme for development of homestay model in Hoi An to 2015 (2012).
17 Ibid.
rate of this period reached 17.37% per year, of which 16.6% for international tourists and 21.79% for domestic tourists.

The period from 2006 to 2009 was a difficult time with many challenges for the tourism industry of the country in general and tourism in Hoi An in particular. The local economy suffered the negative effects of the economic crisis and recession, epidemics and natural disasters. These conditions also affected tourism badly as the number of tourists coming to Hoi An decreased. At the end of the period, with the recovery of the economy, Hoi An tourism recovered and showed positive growth. Table 4.6 and 4.7 show the number of one-day visitors and staying-overnight tourists in Hoi An in the two periods, from 2001 to 2005, and from 2006 to 2009.

**Table 4.5: Number of tourists staying overnight in Hoi An**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>155,729</td>
<td>346,902</td>
<td>117.37%</td>
<td>394,574</td>
<td>515,166</td>
<td>106.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>134,154</td>
<td>289,082</td>
<td></td>
<td>116.60%</td>
<td>323,760</td>
<td>393,414</td>
<td>104.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>21,575</td>
<td>57,820</td>
<td></td>
<td>121.79%</td>
<td>70,814</td>
<td>121,752</td>
<td>114.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: HADCT*
Table 4.6: Number of one-day visitors in Hoi An

Unit: person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245,647</td>
<td>296,812</td>
<td>103.86%</td>
<td>326,318</td>
<td>445,836</td>
<td>106.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>131,581</td>
<td>173,051</td>
<td>105.63%</td>
<td>193,796</td>
<td>261,442</td>
<td>106.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>114,066</td>
<td>123,761</td>
<td>101.64%</td>
<td>132,522</td>
<td>184,394</td>
<td>106.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HADCT

As mentioned above, the number of homestay establishments has been increased but they have been underexploited. In the beginning, from 2000 to 2005, the number of tourists using this service was small and unfortunately uncounted. From 2006 to 2010, around 7,500 tourists stayed in homestay, accounting for 0.18% of the total tourists staying overnight, and with an average growth rate of 14.6%. The average length of stay was 2.5 days, of which international tourists stayed 2.55 days in average, and the number for domestic tourists was 2.49 days.\(^\text{18}\)

Tourism markets

Up to 80% of international visitors to Hoi An stay overnight, with the average of 3 days. 20% of international visitors are day visitors from Hue, Da Nang or a hub on the north-south road tour. Foreign tourists mainly visit cultural and historical monuments, the riverside landscape and villages. They use a variety of local transportation services, cuisine and shopping. Majority of the tourists are in the age group 16-30. In recent years, international tourists to Hoi An are mainly from European countries, Australia, Japan and the USA. The average length of stay in Hoi An in 2009 was 3.6 days.

\(^\text{18}\) Scheme for development of homestay model in Hoi An to 2015 (2012).
Majority of domestic tourists travel in groups. They mainly are from the cities and the highest proportion of visitors are from Ho Chi Minh City and Hanoi. Their principals activities are to visit the old town for dining and shopping, village tours and stay at sea resorts. They often use local accommodation and cuisine.

More information on tourism in Hoi An City and Quang Nam Province is provided in Appendix 3 – Quang Nam and Hoi An tourism industry factsheet.

Tourism labor

By the end of 2009, the number of employees in tourism business was 3,676; of which 1,966 people were trained professionally, accounting for 53.48%; 339 employees have university or college degree, accounting for 9.22%. Overall quality of labor in tourism is still weak and largely untrained.

4.5 Introduction of the PUP project in Hoi An City

4.5.1 Preparation of the PUP project in Hoi An City

Overload of activities in heritage sites in Quang Nam Province, especially in Hoi An Ancient Town and Cham Islands Biosphere Reserve, can impact negatively on the nature, culture and society of the province. Since being certified as the World Heritage and World Biosphere Reserve, the tourism industry in Hoi An and Cham Islands have developed tremendously. The number of both international and domestic tourists to Hoi An now reaches more than one million per year. The number of tourists to Cham Islands has increased after it was recognized as World Biosphere Reserve, from 35,000 in 2009 to 50,000 in 2010 (R6). The growing number of tourists to Hoi An City encourages a wide range of services such as accommodations, restaurants, souvenirs, tour guides and transportation. The city currently has over 3000 rooms with different standards and over 800 business stores. The local people benefit from tourism, both directly and indirectly, and their lives are significantly improved. However, the quick growth of tourism and economic development raise potential risks on heritage sites and their recognized values. Some negative effects which are observed in Hoi An Ancient town are
changing integrity of the old town, environmental pollution such as water, noise, waste, congestion. Some effects are related to socio-economic aspects, for example, rising prices, and the shrinking of agricultural land due to urbanization and tourism resort projects (UNESCO, 2008). For Cham Islands, tourism contributes to raise awareness of biodiversity protection and brings new livelihood opportunities for the communities. However the capacity of communities, services and infrastructure in Cham Islands cannot meet the dramatic demand from visitors on the island. Moreover, Cham Islands frequently have natural disasters, and have to endure the pollution from the mainland, affecting the environment and biodiversity.  

To mitigate the negative effects, UNESCO Hanoi provided technical and financial support to Quang Nam Province to implement the project “Integrated Culture and Tourism Strategy for Sustainable Development” in 2009. The aim is to apply an integrated approach to the planning and management of heritage as the preservation of cultural and natural heritage in Hoi An that cannot be done without considering other stakeholders. UNESCO supported the province to develop a strategy which aims to balance heritage preservation and development of the province. UNESCO advocated a participatory process and cultural appropriate approach to better involve the stakeholders in the planning process (R2). The Integrated Culture and Tourism Strategy for Sustainable Development in Quang Nam Province emphasized the need of coordination among stakeholders. In parallel with the development of the strategy, UNESCO looked for initiatives to support the three sites in the province, Hoi An Ancient Town, Cham Islands Biosphere Reserve and My Son Sanctuary, the driving force for development in the province. The UNESCO World Heritage Center introduced the PUP methodology in which the UNESCO Office found many elements and models that could be applied to the sites in Quang Nam. UNESCO, together with the Netherland Development
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Organization (SNV) - consultant of the project, trained a core team of site managers to plan and facilitate the community meeting and consultation process at site level to develop a visitor management plan.

With the support of the UNESCO office in Vietnam, Hoi An City government and related agencies, Hoi An Department of Commerce and Tourism and Cham Islands MPA Management Board supervised the creation of the two visitor management plans of Hoi An City and Cham Islands World Biosphere Reserve. The overall goal was to develop the strategies and action plans in tourism management and sustainable development to contribute to heritage conservation and local economic development.

The first step of PUP was training of the trainers (TOT). There were thirteen participants taking part in the training program for PUP methodology. They were from the three sites and the Quang Nam Province Department of Culture, Sport and Tourism (DCST), of which, four were from Hoi An Department of Commerce and Tourism and three were from Cham Islands MPA Management Board, who would be the Public use coordinators of the project (hereafter PUC). The first introduction workshop of PUP was held in February 2010 to introduce the PUP objectives and process.

4.5.2 PUP implementation

After the introductory workshop, the training was continued and divided into three parts; each one was separated by several months. The philosophy was that the Public use coordinators were trained in some modules of the methodology that they implemented it in their sites and then they came back to share their experiences and continued training (R3). The coordinator teams had the capacity to facilitate their own plans and implement that planning. During the time the PUCs were actually doing PUP, the expert team from UNESCO and SNV went out and visited the sites to provide needed support in using PUP tools.
After each training workshop, with the support of UNESCO and technical experts, the PUCs planned the next steps in the planning process. The result of each module in PUP is a community-based product with comments and input from multiple stakeholders. The project was also divided into two phrases of implementation. After each phrase, the PUCs held a seminar on the achieved results to Quang Nam DCST, UNESCO Hanoi and SNV to have additional comments and adjustment.

The PUCs of Hoi An and Cham Islands implemented each module of PUP methodology with active participation of stakeholders by means of workshops, meetings and public hearing. After reviewing and compiling the comments from the workshops, they sent the result back to the stakeholders for comment one more time before completing the content report. In addition to workshops, the two PUCs teams did group interviews directly and indirectly via surveys to get feedback from visitors and tourists. The purpose of this activity is to record their responses on tourism activities, products and services to improve the existing ones and build orientation for new activities and products. These results also would help tourism managers to identify potential market segments, to better promote and market Hoi An tourism products.

One important aspect in the project implementation was to make sure the activities stay on schedule and everyone involved was kept informed of the process. The teams both followed a general timeframe, as presented in Table 4.7 which shows the schedule of team Hoi An. The project helped strengthen the collaboration among different local government organizations. They made their own arrangement to connect and coordinate the activities, for example, the Hoi An team created a group email for the members so they were kept up to date and could comment on completed parts (R4).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Module 1</td>
<td>Preparation for the project</td>
<td>3/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Module 2</td>
<td>Consultation workshop with stakeholders to create the site interpretation</td>
<td>5/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Module 3</td>
<td>Consultation workshop with stakeholders to create the list of attractions</td>
<td>5/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Module 4</td>
<td>Consultation workshop with stakeholders on zones and sectors for tourism</td>
<td>8/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Module 5</td>
<td>Consultation workshop with stakeholders to develop the list of tourism products</td>
<td>8/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Module 6</td>
<td>Public consultation, tourist interviews and surveys</td>
<td>8/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Module 7</td>
<td>Consultation workshop with stakeholders on tourism impacts on environment, culture and society, and monitoring these impacts</td>
<td>10/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Module 8</td>
<td>Consultation workshop with stakeholders on regulations</td>
<td>10/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Module 9, 10</td>
<td>Creating calendar of events to 2015, financial plan</td>
<td>12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Module 11</td>
<td>Draft the visitor management plan, reviewing, editing and submitting for approval</td>
<td>12/2010 – 2/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Hoi An City Visitor management plan (2011)*
The visitor management plans for Hoi An City and Cham Islands World Biosphere Reserve combined all the results of each step in the planning process. The plans were submitted to Quang Nam Province People’s Committee, Hoi An City People’s Committee, Quang Nam DCST, UNESCO and SNV to get suggestions for improvement, project approval and support for plan implementation.

4.6 Chapter summary

This chapter presents the results from secondary data on the background of Hoi An City and the PUP project in Hoi An from 2009 to 2011. Hoi An is a city of Quang Nam Province, and is a part of the “Cultural Heritage Road”, the tourism route connecting three World Heritage sites of Vietnam – Hue Citadel, My Son Sanctuary and Hoi An Ancient Town. The city has a lot of potential for tourism development, with its long history, rich cultural and natural resources. The highlight for the city tourism is the Hoi An Ancient Town and Cham Islands Biosphere Reserve is becoming an increasingly popular destination in the area. Since the ancient town was recognized as UNESCO World Heritage in 1999, the number of tourists arrivals has increased, except for during the economic crisis and from which it has since recovered. The management of tourism in the Ancient Town has well been established since the certification, with the Hoi An City’s People Committee has comprehensive administration and assistance of the local tourism and heritage governmental organizations. The management in Cham Islands has been reconstructed, transferred from Quang Nam Province to Hoi An City after Cham Islands was recognized by UNESCO as a World Biosphere Reserve in 2009. UNESCO provided technical and financial support to Quang Nam Province to implement the project “Integrated Culture and Tourism Strategy for Sustainable Development” in 2009, of which one of the activities is a two visitor management plan in Hoi An and Cham Islands by facilitating the community meeting and consultation process at site level. The overall goal was to develop the strategies and action plans in tourism
management and sustainable development to contribute to heritage conservation and local economic development.
Chapter 5: Research findings

Findings from the interviews and documents are organized based on the stages of PUP: before, during and after PUP implementation (see Figure 2.1). Before going into analyzing and discussing about the activities of the PUP project in Hoi An City, we need to understand the overview of community participation in Hoi An and Cham Islands.

5.1 The situation of community participation in Hoi An and Cham Islands

5.1.1 Community participation in Hoi An

Before the Ancient Town was recognized as a UNESCO World Heritage site in 1999, local residents in Hoi An used to rely on agriculture, fishing, trade and other economic activities such as craft producing, tailoring and traditional medicine for livelihoods (R4). Tourism is now the biggest economic sector of the city. Tourism and related commercial services accounted for 64% of the total revenue in 2007, as illustrated in Figure 5.1. It is said that almost all residents of Hoi An feel that tourism contributes significantly to the local economy, their income grow as a result and they benefit from tourism (UNESCO, 2008). Hoi An has a low percentage of households that are considered poorer than the national standard ($16,25 per person per month). In 2007, this number was 6.5% while the national average rate was 14.7% (UNESCO, 2008)

Figure 5.1: Major economic sectors in Hoi An (2007)

Source: Hoi An Department of Statistic
Management plan for Hoi An tourism has always been reviewed and updated since Hoi An Ancient Town was recognized as a World Heritage site to ensure that tourism benefits the residents of Hoi An and leaves minimized negative impacts on the heritage and environment such as such as water pollution, noise, waste, congestion, etc. The participation of local people is important for this process, however there are different levels or types of community participation in planning and decision making, as presented in Chapter 2. In Hoi An, the participation of community in tourism planning is said to have been mainly passive, as contributors of information and resources or implementers (UNESCO, 2008).

“The involvement of community is in the form of consultation of representatives of stakeholders. One method is that the People’s Committee sends documents hierarchically down to the community units to collect comments and opinions of community residents. The community units make announcement or notice and then collect comments and report back up to the People’s Committee. Another method is People’s Committee Council meetings, representatives of community groups and local authorities share their opinions and vote to approve the new plan” (R4).

An example is when the Five Year Action plan 2002-2007 for sustainable development of Hoi An to safeguard the outstanding universal values was created, the Home Owners Association, Women’s Union and Youth Union provided the civil society participation in drafting the Action Plan (Galla, 2012). However, this form of participation cannot reach out to everyone and people have limited control over the vision for future development and the outcome of the plans.

The city government have set up a mechanism to encourage people in Hoi An to participate in the preservation and protection of the cultural heritage of the city. The People’s Committee issued Decision No 798/QD-UBND on 08/06/2011 to build a network of collaborators for heritage management and conservation in the three wards – Minh An, Son Phong and Cam Pho. This network supports the implementation of heritage protection guidelines in Hoi An Ancient Town. They
participate in monitoring activities; detecting cases of violation in repair and construction of building; communicating and mobilizing people to raise their awareness in heritage conservation. Currently, the network has thirty three members who are community unit leaders and hold a meeting at least twice a year. The activities of the network are funded from the annual budget of the Center for Monument Management and Preservation.

Community-based tourism is also one of the drivers of tourism development in Hoi An. The pilot for home-stay in ancient houses was implemented in three houses with nine rooms in 2001. And since 2006, the model of homestay with Hoi An people has been developed and has achieved positive results. In 2011, the city has 61 homestay establishments with 164 rooms. Besides accommodations, the local people also organize additional activities for the tourists to experience the local lifestyle, such as cooking, farming and fishing. These activities bring extra income for local farmers and fishermen.

5.1.2 Community participation in Cham Islands

There are about 2,500 people living in the Cham Islands, mainly on the Lao island. The majority of them are fishermen, relying heavily on the marine resources (R6). Fisheries are the most important income generating activities and tourism is considered a sector with the potential to increase income in Cham Islands. Some households depend fully on the forest; they typically are families with no other income generating alternatives, such as single women, the elderly and non-fishermen households.

During the project to set up Cham Islands MPA from October 2003 to September 2006, which was supported by the Government of Denmark, regulations to protect the environment and natural resources were discussed and proposed by the local community, and were then reviewed and approved by state agencies. The MPA
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management plan was developed using the co-management model, which promotes the participation of the state agencies, donors, stakeholders and all of the local community. Management regulations of the MPA demonstrate the commitment of local people to exploit the resources in a sustainable way and preserve them for future generations. Not only did the local people make the proposal, they also were responsible for selecting a patrolling group, to participate in monitoring and maintaining the enforcement of these regulations (Trinh, 2014). The co-management model has promoted positive community engagement and improved state agencies’ responsibility. The most important benefit is that it makes local communities appreciate the value of natural resources and make them understand their responsibilities. Table 5.1 shows the timeline of projects in Cham Islands MPA which involve the community.

Table 5.1: Timeline of projects in Cham Island MPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 – 2006</td>
<td>MPA project supported by Denmark Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Recognized as World Biosphere Reserve by UNESCO Man and Biosphere Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 – 2011</td>
<td>PUP project supported by UNESCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hoi An City issued a tourism development program in Cham Islands from 2013 to 2015, with a vision to 2020, in which community-based tourism and ecotourism were the orientation for development. The pilot for community-based tourism was implemented in Bai Huong village in 2009, focusing on homestay, tour guide by local people and local tourism services. Cham Islands MPA Management Board collaborated with other organizations to support the community in product building, interpretation skills, cooking skills, etc. The model was said to have been effective and was extended to the remaining three villages in Cham Islands. The community-based tourism program is suitable for Cham Islands MPA because it
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provides opportunities for local people to generate income, and the benefits from tourism can go directly to the communities.

Another example of community participation in Cham Islands is the recovery and sustainable exploitation of the land crab, one of the most important marine animal resources in this area. Land crab has become a popular tourist product, and as a result it faces a high risk of becoming overexploited. A land crab group was formed consisting of local people to issue and approve regulations governing the use of this resource, for example land crabs are not allowed to be collected during their breeding season; land crabs collected must be larger than seven centimeters and not be carrying eggs; and the number of land crabs an individual is permitted to catch is decided by the commune and local participants, and is based on the co-management agreement. This has promoted the conservation principle among the local people, and in reality increased the price of land crabs and their income (Trinh, 2014).

5.2 Stages of the PUP project in Hoi An City

5.2.1 Preparation stage

The preparation stage includes site selection and training. The project sites were chosen by Quang Nam Province and UNESCO (R6). Ten managers and staffs from the three sites, together with three officials of Quang Nam Department of Culture, Sport and Tourism then participated in training.

“We used three steps of training methodology. I trained the local facilitators - four people, to run the training to train the trainers. Then the training the trainers was divided into 3 trainings; each one was separated by several months. The philosophy is you train them a little bit and they actually go to use it; they come back and share their experiences. They can make a social network, references among each other. And they come back the second time and we train the next part” (R4).
The big problem in the first stage of PUP is that there was no direct community participation. The participant sites were decided top-down by Quang Nam Province and UNESCO, and training was conducted for the PUCs, the site managers and officials. The first introduction workshop of PUP was held in February 2010 to introduce the PUP objectives and process with only officials from the local government and the sites. This process demonstrates the predominantly top-down approach in Vietnam, since the decision to implement PUP was decided by Quang Nam Province government and UNESCO, and passed down to the sites for participation.

The first training, the introduction workshop of PUP was held in February 2010 to introduce the PUP objectives and process. Even though Quang Nam DCST had sent documents to the sites to invite participations for the training (R4). The workshop was the first time the sites began to understand what was going to happen and “that was not what they expected” (R3). The participants were not well-prepared and some were even confused because they did not understand the approach. “Before the process started, participants did not fully understand the project objectives and their tasks. They simply understood that PUP was a tourism planning method that helps to build a tourism management plan for sites with multi-stakeholder participation” (SNV, 2011).

Both the Hoi An DCT and Cham Islands MPA Management Board evaluated highly the information and methods during the training period. “The atmosphere was very relaxed, and the class members were sociable and willing to help each other” (R4). However, the information and examples gave out were different from the situation of the two sites. “The information which was shared in the training was very good in theory, however, the examples were not closed or similar with local practices” (R4). “The PUP started from a national park in South America, the conditions are too much different from the conditions of Vietnam (economic and society)” (R6, parentheses added by author). It also must be noted that the participants were full-time government officials who had other responsibilities.
even during the training process. “All participants had to focus with high intensity. It was difficult as the participants also had work commitments” (R4). A large amount of information in a short training time required full commitment from the participants.

An evaluation survey was done by SNV after the PUP project finished, with thirteen participants who took part in the training program, of which ten were from the three sites and three from the Quang Nam Province DCST. A total of ten participants (78%) responded to the survey. The participants responded in a questionnaire indicating that the training “mostly met their expectation”; no participant chose “fully met their expectation”. The evaluation pointed out three issues, which were (i) compatibility of the PUP process with current tourism planning practice in Vietnam; (ii) lack of a cultural heritage focus in the PUP manual; and (iii) the complexity of training manuals with incomplete translation (SNV, 2011).

5.2.2 PUP implementation stage

During the project, the two teams encountered some problems. This was the first time PUP methodology was applied in Vietnam so the approach and technical aspects of the projects were new to all the participants. The involvement of different stakeholders in the planning process like in this project was also not familiar in Vietnam. The traditional planning method in Vietnam is that the government or outside experts, in a top–down approach, developed a draft plan and brought into a workshop for consultation. The participation of community in the PUP was at a higher level. It was interactive participation compared to the passive participation - contributors of information and resources or implementers as identified by UNESCO (2008). Hoi An City has a record of community involvement as presented in 5.1, and the government officials in Hoi An City showed that they were very interested in working with local people “Hoi An is very much different from other provinces in that the government officers seem to be
very committed and you can feel that when you meet with people there” (R2). However, they did not know how and where to start, “the local government officials in related agencies confessed that they were not familiar with working with the community” (R2). UNESCO regarded this as one of the constraints, “we had the advantage that they were ambitious to learn a new tool, but it was not an ideal application when we come to the implementation”. The Hoi An DCT “found it difficult to choose the right stakeholders to join the planning process” due to the lack of experience.

The other side of the problem discussed above was that communities and stakeholders were not used to participating in tourism planning. The farmers in Cham Islands, for example, had never been invited to workshops held by the local government to raise their voice and they did not say anything in a meeting (R2). Also in Cham Islands, before the project, UNESCO conducted a baseline survey with the communities. The comments they gathered from the survey showed that the local people were more interested in what benefits they could get from participating in the process. UNESCO and the facilitators had to apply different methods to overcome this problem. Instead of organizing all the meetings in government offices, some meetings were conducted in the villages, in smaller groups with limited participation of government officials (R2). After that, the local people were more open to voice their comments and they contributed many ideas for the visitor management plan (R6).

The representatives from Hoi An and Cham Islands commented on some limitations of the community participation in their opinions, “PUP had a small number of activities related to the community, and the rest was to consult with representative of stakeholder groups” (R4). The respondent from Cham Islands MPA Management Board found “the information collected from the community and visitor survey was not enough to apply in the PUP plan” (R6). When asked about the problems the organization encountered during the PUP project, the respondent from Hoi An DCT answered that “except for the staffs who participated
in UNESCO training, the other people did not understand the concept or the methodology of PUP” and “Another problem is the time limit. I had to juggle my normal workload with UNESCO training, PUP implementation and the visitor management plan” (R4). Nevertheless, “people were generally willing to participate in the meetings and gave opinions based on the activity” (R4).

The respondents also had some difficulties with the methodology, more specifically, the appropriateness of the modules. “The zoning approach was difficult to apply in Cham Islands. The financial plan was built based on the estimated number of tourists. Not enough information was collected from the community and visitor survey to apply in the PUP plan” (R6). The evaluation done by SNV found the participants struggled with the concepts of developing key messages, zones and sectors, and financial planning. The reasons for their struggle included the complexity of the material, how it is explained in the manual, the quality of the translation, the delivery of the training and the Vietnam context (SNV, 2011). Zones and sectors were considered difficult to grasp because of different terminology, “heritage sites in Vietnam are small in size compared with park/sites in US and Latin America countries” (SNV, 2011). The financial module also presented challenges because in Vietnam, the site has limited control over budgets.

“Hoi An is a city and a cultural heritage, much like half of heritages in the world that are cultural cities. City presents a lot of challenges that other kinds of sites do not present. For example, one challenge of the city is you do not have one administrative agency. You often times have many different agencies, by private owners, by central and local government, by churches, by non-profit, so you cannot finance a plan the way we used to do it. Zoning also does not work the same way in city. And the zoning methodology we had was totally not appropriate for Hoi An” (R3).

The methodology still succeeded in involving the community more than the traditional practice in Vietnam, “with this methodology we were able to invite
different stakeholder, and the community and stakeholders who engage in each step were not always the same” (R1). “PUP was verified by the people who did not join the planning process. We cannot invite the whole community so we invited some people to discuss and make the plan. We then went to the community to discuss and check the results again” (R6). “During our process, we needed to keep changing and update the plan with the stakeholders, because people need to agree before we could move to the next step. We discussed throughout the process” (R4).

The participants from Hoi An DCT and Cham Islands MPA Management Board assessed the methodology favorably as it had been utilized in many destinations around the world and the plan was built, verified and implemented by local government, stakeholders and communities. The Cham Islands MPA Management Board believed that “PUP will make visitors have a better experience. We did not look from the perspective of administration and management, we looked from the perspective of how to make the experiences of visitors better” (R6). The representative from Cham Islands MPA Management Board shared some strong points of PUP.

“It was built and implemented by teams, by stakeholders, that mean you collect many different ideas, not just you. PUP collected whole aspiration of biosphere reserve stakeholders. They can share their aspiration in the plan. The PUP is an open-ended plan that means you can change the content of the plan due to the change of circumstance” (R6).

The respondent from the PUP Consortium commented that “I think the people in Hoi An were better at taking advantage of that than the other ones because they were controlled by the city government, rather than by the national government, by the Ministry. So they have much more flexibility, bureaucratically, operationally to do a lot of these things than the people in My Son or Cham Islands” (R3).
5.2.3 Post PUP implementation in Hoi An City

After the PUP project in Hoi An City finished in 2011, UNESCO continued to promote and tried to keep up the momentum of the project. UNESCO encouraged the site managers to combine what was developed in the visitor management plan with their work and duties, as they had to submit their plan to the government every year and got the government funding.

“This question is still raised by the site managers; they keep asking if this kind of plan is a legal document? In Vietnam, if anything is not a legal document, it is very hard to be implemented. In fact, the visitor management plan is not a legal document, so we try to explain to them that you develop a plan, a vision for the site and come up with a list of priorities and what you want to do for the site. So they have to harmonize and combine what they develop within this plan with their daily work. So with the daily work, they have to submit to the local government every year the plan and get the government funding” (R1).

The two visitor management plans, the results of the project, were not legal documents, which made the implementation of these plans difficult because of the system. The sites and related organizations did not have any obligation to implement them after the PUP project finished, and in fact the implementation of the two plans was limited. The Cham Islands MPA Management Board commented that “The PUP plan was published but it did not specify the details for each department, division and communes of city. Departments and divisions do not integrate PUP in their yearly plan. Before making the plan, the provincial government talked to the departments and said that they needed to integrate this plan in your yearly planning but I have not seen it” (R6). The tourism planning practice in Hoi An City after the PUP project also has not been changed. The development plan for Hoi An tourism from 2011 to 2015 and the updated version from 2015 to 2020, has followed the same traditional planning method (R4).
However, both of the teams when interviewed said that they did incorporate result of PUP project in the city and the site tourism development planning. “Hoi An City government agreed and passed on the implementation plan, the annual programs for tourism development which were proposed by the Hoi An DCT” (R4). The team from Cham Islands is said to have done a good job in integrating some proposals within the visitor management plan in their annual planning (R2). They organized some training courses for heritage guide and for heritage management, for the community and stakeholders on how to protect and manage the biosphere reserve, etc. They also organized trips to get feedbacks from tourists. In 2012, Cham Islands MPA Management Board organized a workshop to introduce the PUP visitor management plan and to attract investment (R2).

The purpose of PUP methodology is to increase the participation of different stakeholders in tourism planning so that they can become more aware and the plan is implemented, not put in a bookshelf\textsuperscript{23}. The representative from Cham Islands MPA Management Board wondered about the visitor management plan for Cham Islands, “I think it is staying in our bookshelf and computer only”. Moreover, the residents and tour companies participated in PUP process, however, they do not convey what has been decided in the plan to visitors and tourists. Enterprises develop strategies and tourism products independently, with little consideration to the visitor profiles in the visitor management plan. “I think we need a lot more time to continually talk and discuss with the residents so they can understand first and then they can slowly change their thinking, their behavior” (R6). The discussion for lack of implementation also mentioned lack of funding (R4) and lack of commitment from the local government (R6).

The respondent from Cham Islands MPA Management Board, however, noted an absence of interest from the stakeholders and community in the visitor management plan after the PUP project finished. “When we talked and explained

\textsuperscript{23} Manual for PUP – Park planning for life (2009).
it to the local people, they understood, but they did not apply the ideas to their jobs. The residents went to the workshops, they remembered many things, but when they talked to the visitors, they forgot” and “Enterprises did not follow up the content of the PUP. They develop the strategies and products independently. They have not transferred the five messages creating in the PUP plan to the visitors. So different tour guides had different stories about the island” (R6).

For Hoi An City, the tourism development plan from 2011 to 2015, and the latest plan from 2015 to 2020 were said to be based partly on the visitor management plan developed with PUP methodology. These development plans were still made with the traditional planning method in Vietnam (R4). “In the tourism development plan of Hoi An from 2011 to 2015, many programs are given but are not implemented fully. The first reason is that there are some changes in terms of planning. The second is financial. So to continue, Hoi An has to make adjustments. The current plan is to 2020. The plan was approved, and based partly from the PUP plan” (R4). In 2012, Hoi An DCT collaborated with Cam Thanh Commune and the Center for Urban Development to introduce PUP methodology to Cam Thanh officials and stakeholders. “It was done by the Department, in collaboration with Cam Thanh Commune and the Center for Urban Development in 2012. PUP methodology was introduced to Cam Thanh officials and stakeholders. Depending on the purpose, there were different participants, officials and experts from relevant agencies, businesses and representatives of community groups” (R4).

UNESCO also selected from the two plans some proposals which were appropriate for the organization’s mandate in Hoi An. In the Ancient Town for example, the first of which was a craft development training program. In this activity, artisans were selected from craft villages and trained to develop new product ranges, product lines and product collections with themes inspired from their local culture. This training aimed to promote craft product development and diversification so that the artisans can better benefit from the tourism growth in their province. The second activity was Cultural Heritage Specialist Guide Program. The program aims
to reinforce sustainable tourism development by training guides to educate visitors about the authentic values of sites and codes for responsible conduct (R1).

5.3 Overview of PUP at other tourism destinations in Vietnam

In March 2012, UNESCO collaborated with Vietnam National Administration of Tourism (VNAT), an government administration organization, to organize a workshop and introduce the PUP and the experiences of the three teams in Quang Nam. The attendants of this workshop were representatives from provinces and heritage sites around the country. After this workshop, the Management Board of Dong Van Geo-park showed interest in the methodology. Training workshops to introduce PUP methodology in Dong Van Geo-park were organized from September 2012 to August 2013.

UNESCO continued to integrate PUP in another project in Vietnam, the responsible and sustainable tourism project in the country central region. They supported community-based tourism in satellite destinations of the World Heritage sites. The two chosen villages were Thanh Toan Village, 7km from Hue Citadel, and Chiem Tay village, a rural village in Quang Nam Province. These villages wanted to develop tourism but they did not have the know-how, and there was also a need to develop a tourism management plan. To help the local residents, UNESCO introduced some selected modules of the PUP to identify resources, tourism potential, products and services. The other modules were found to be beyond the capacity of the local residents and hard to implement.

The PUP Consortium also continued to promote PUP in other destinations in Vietnam, the most notable being Phong Nha Ke Bang National Park, which is also UNESCO Heritage site located in Quang Binh Province, central of Vietnam. After the experience of PUP in Quang Nam Province and other destinations around the world, there were some changes in the way the PUP project was set up in Phong Nha Ke Bang.

---

Nha Ke Bang. One of the changes is the Exploratory trip which was applied at the very beginning. The Exploratory trip focuses on holding dialogues, both with primary actors, those people who are the most responsible in decision making, and with a public presentation for the secondary actors, with questions and answers. The idea is a situation of co-financing, the Consortium and the site, each contribute to the financing of the trip. So both sides make some sacrifice, and both sides have equal power, “the right to be both buyer and seller”.

“If we decide to work together, we go to the next stage – fundraising. It is a partnership, not a consultant – hirer relationship. We will find the money together, if it does not already exist. We acquire at least two years of funding so there is money for the planning and money for the implementation, at least at the beginning of implementation. And we would hope to stay with that site for three years, even if there is no funding for the third year because it is about relationships. And then after the PUP, we have the implementation, and then the last stage – if they actually want to join the PUP consortium” (R3).

5.4 Obstacles for PUP implementation in other tourism destinations of Vietnam

The examples above show that there are opportunities and obstacles for PUP to be applied in other destinations in Vietnam. The challenges that the teams in Hoi An City encountered during and after the project are not unique to only the situations in Hoi An. The other destinations which plan to apply PUP must also prepare for the obstacles of the current system, the unfamiliarity of the concepts, and the difficulties in working with local people. There are also other obstacles as presented below.

5.4.1 Level of knowledge and awareness from both the site managers and the local people

PUP requires a certain level of knowledge and awareness from both the site managers and the local people. When PUP was introduced to the other
destinations, UNESCO found the methodology “very challenging for them” (R2). UNESCO only could apply some selected modules in their project in Thanh Toan Village and Chiem Tay Village because some modules were deemed beyond the local’s capacity. This problem was also noted in all three interviews with UNESCO, Hoi An DCT and Cham Islands MPA Management Board, that the PUP manual was complicated with many modules and examples.

After the PUP project in Quang Nam Province, the PUP manual version in Vietnamese, which was used for the training of the project teams, was revised by the Institute for Tourism Development Research in 2011. The manual still has to be changed continuously.

“It is one of the big contributions of our pilot project in Vietnam, to review the methodology. We realized that the methodology should be more practical for the site managers to understand. After the implementation in Vietnam, the manual was completely changed. All those chapters are put in the background documents. We focus more on the models and guidelines” (R2).

5.4.2 Readiness of the sites to participate in PUP

According to the PUP Consortium, “often times a project begins with the three great forces of colonialism, which are money, politics and expertise. Money is we have money so you have to participate or the government wants it to happen so it has to happen, and the last one is an expert says you need a plan so you have to create a plan. So the result is you have an unbalance relationship; you have a lot of power on one site, and not much power on the other site” (R3). To minimize this obstacle, the PUP Consortium recently started to apply an Exploratory Trip before deciding on a site for PUP application. They want to create a situation in which the site can decide to participate in PUP for themselves, instead of the donor, government or expert. The site may not be ready to apply to the whole PUP like the case in Thanh Toan and Chiem Tay Village, or it only needs to improve the
communication, create a dialogue system with stakeholders. “In order for implementation to likely happen, there has to be a certain level of trust” (R3). The local government, site managers and communities need to communicate to understand each other’s perspectives and agenda.

5.4.3 Funding for PUP project

This kind of project normally has to find the funding from outside organizations for up to two years as the PUP Consortium suggested. Without donors and fund, PUP cannot happen as can be seen in the case of Phong Nha – Ke Bang National Park. The Exploratory trip in Phong Nha – Ke Bang came from the aid of KFW – a German government-owned development bank. After the trip, the site manager and the PUP Consortium decided to conduct PUP in the park and KFW was going to support the project. However, there was also an on-going proposal for a cable car system which ran through the national park to a cave inside the park, Son Doong Cave. This proposal faced much opposition from critics. KWF decided to postpone the PUP project in Phong Nha – Ke Bang, “which is ironic because PUP for what it does is it tries to set up public decision making process so the very problem that they have in Phong Nha Ke Bang does not happen again” (R3).

5.5 Chapter summary

Management staffs of Hoi An tourism and Cham Islands MPA Management Board participated in PUP training and conducted the project in the two destinations in Hoi An City from 2009 to 2011. The participated sites were chosen by Quang Nam Province government and UNESCO. The officials and managers from the sites were initially confused because they did not understand the approach. However, after the initial confusion, the participants evaluated highly the information and methods during the training period. During the project implementation in Hoi An City, the two sites encountered difficulties due to the complexity of the manual.

---

with new concepts and the new participatory approach. The involvement of different stakeholders in the planning process was not familiar in Vietnam, where planning is often delegated to external experts. And communities and stakeholders were not used to participate in this kind of workshops and activities. The respondents also had some difficulties with the methodology. Their struggle was due to the differences in Vietnamese context in modules such as zones and sectors, and finance. The methodology still succeeded in involving the community more than the traditional practice in Vietnam. And it was assessed favorably by the respondents because the plans were built, verified and implemented by local government, stakeholders and communities.

After the project finished, UNESCO continued to support some proposed initiatives and Hoi An City and Cham Islands MPA integrated parts of the two plans in their usual work and planning. However, the visitor management plans were not executed in general because of a number of reasons. The PUP methodology has continued to be introduced in other destinations of Vietnam. The challenges that Hoi An City faced during the project may also apply to the PUP implementation in other destinations in Vietnam, however some additional obstacles must be noted. Sites needs to be prepared and be able to make the participation decision themselves. If the site only applies PUP because of the influence and pressure from national and local government, outsider experts and donors, implementation of the result plan will not happen. Especially since implementing PUP and the result planning requires commitment in time and budget for at least two years. Funding for not only PUP but also the plan implementation is also important. The capacity of the site managers and stakeholders should also be considered due to the complexity of the methodology. Sites can choose to apply selective tools and modules of the PUP to their regular works.
Chapter 6: Discussion, Recommendations and Conclusion

6.1 Discussion

The PUP was implemented by a range of different stakeholders at the two sites in Hoi An City, the Ancient Town and Cham Islands Biosphere Reserve. Figure 6.1 shows the stakeholders that were involved in the PUP project in Hoi An City. Their roles and views during the different stages of the PUP project will be the focus of the discussion. As presented in chapter 2, the involvement of community and stakeholders in tourism planning is very important as it helps to build the needed harmonious relationship, increases efficiency and commitment, builds trust, partnership and understanding at the local level (Pretty, 1995; Kapoor, 2001). The strong point of the PUP methodology is the involvement of a cross-section of different stakeholders in the tourism planning process, including an enhanced role for local communities. However, the diversity of stakeholders results in different perceptions as will now be discussed.

Figure 6.1: The stakeholders who participated in the PUP project

Source: Compiled by author
Communities in Hoi An City

The success of the PUP project in Hoi An City could not happen without the support and cooperation from the local community for heritage conservation and tourism development. This is the reason local people are considered a valuable resource for tourism development (Simmons, 1994). And tourism relies on their cooperation and goodwill so the support of the local people is very important (Murphy, 1988).

The findings showed Hoi An to be a special case in community participation in Vietnam. The local people have gained a lot from tourism development. And they generally have been supportive of heritage conservation activities (R7), “it is just in their character” to participate, to accept the regulations to preserve the heritage (R1). This cooperation cannot be said for all the other destinations around the country (discussed more below). The communities of Hoi An City also have had previous experience in participation, such as the recreation of traditional festivals and the preservation of local crafts and local products as presented in Chapter 4 and 5. After the initial unfamiliarity with the workshop format of the PUP project, the local people could openly voice their comments and contributed many ideas to the visitor management plan (R6). The participation of the community in PUP was the interactive participation in Pretty’s typology or spontaneous participation in Tosun’s typology which is bottom-up, direct and participation in decision-making.

Negative effects of tourism on community cause a society inclination to participate (Eshliki & Kaboudi, 2012) and to gain the support of the community is not an easy task. This can be seen in the case of other heritage sites in Vietnam, such as when local people in Duong Lam Ancient Village signed a petition in 2013, asking the government to take back its heritage title since it intrudes too much in their lives26, or the unsuccessful plan to relocate residents from the old buildings in Hanoi

Ancient Quarter to preserve the area and develop tourism. This supports the idea of Brohman (1996) and Tosun (2006) that positive tourism growth results in more positive attitudes to tourism development and local resource conservation. In general, the residents of Hoi An City has been supportive of conservation activities, however, it is not without conflicts, as noted by R2:

“I recognize one of the biggest issues, and it still exists now, is the local residents who are actually living in the Ancient Town. They have been very happy for the last, like fifteen years, but then recently they realized that they have lost some of the benefits because they have to follow too many regulations to preserve the heritages, like the construction regulations. Because the regulations are very strict in the old quarter, while other areas are free to develop so tourism service has developed rapidly in the surrounding area. Eventually the people living in the Ancient Town feel that they keep and preserve the cultural capital for someone else” (R2).

In the baseline survey conducted with a number of community members in Cham Islands by UNESCO before the PUP project, their comments showed that the local people were more interested in what personal benefits they could get from participating in the process (R2). This supports the idea of Wall (1996) that local communities support tourism development mainly because they want positive changes, such as higher incomes and job opportunities. That is one of the reasons community participation should occur from the early stages of tourism planning to provide the residents with realistic expectation (McIntyre, 1993 based on Mitchell, 2001). The methods in PUP provided additional opportunities for the community and officials to communicate and understand each other’s perspectives.

Local government agencies

Hoi An City has four organizations to manage tourism and heritage under the city People’s Committee (see Figure 4.1). The city officials who participated in the PUP project and are the focus of this research are the officials of Hoi An Department of Commerce and Tourism and Cham Islands MPA Management Board. The model of Hoi An City, having a specialized tourism department, is different from other provinces and cities, which often have a combined Department of Culture, Sport and Tourism28. Overall the four organizations have collaborated strongly with each other in their activities (R2 and R7).

The city officials have done a good job in creating connection with the communities and establishing a support system to encourage the local people to preserve the heritage even before the PUP project. This shows in another difference of Hoi An City compared to other destinations, the Ancient Town entrance ticket system. Since 1999, the city has set-up different check points around the Ancient Town to sell the entrance tickets to some selected buildings and monuments (R2 and R5). This is a great source of revenue and finance for heritage conservation. From 1999 to 2008, the city restored 43 heritage buildings from the revenue of the tickets (UNESCO, 2008). In addition, “for some very poor families who want to sell their properties to outsiders instead of doing renovation, the government were either support part of the cost or buy the property and conduct restoration, then rent it to the same residents” (R2). Hoi An City does not have the obstacle of negative attitudes of officials in community participation as Tosun (2000) suggests. However, it still lacks a legal system to support participatory approach like the PUP, as the visitor management plans were not recognized as official documents under the system. The officials and managers were not required to follow up the plans, which consequently have not been implemented.

28 After a merger created the Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism in 2007.
Conflicts between the local government and local community can occur, especially in the above examples of relocation programs. To resolve these conflicts efficiently, the government should involve the community in the process, to consult and seek their agreement. As discussed in Chapter 5, for community participation to happen, there has to be a level of trust between the local community and local government. This, in turn, can only happen with constant dialogues and other forms of communication in a participatory approach like the PUP.

*Private sector*

The strong point of the PUP methodology is the involvement of a cross-section of different stakeholders in the tourism planning process, including the private sector. Tourism enterprises participated in six out of eleven modules of PUP, including identifying touristic attractions; zones, sectors and tourist profiles; public use products; monitoring; regulations; and financial plans. It helps to overcome one of the operational barriers to community participation, which is lack of coordination among private and public tourism organizations (Tosun, 2000).

The local government of Hoi An City has long entrusted the help of private sector in tourism problems. For example many tourists and businesses complained of buying entrance ticket in Hoi An Ancient Town, Hoi An authorities gave a thorough explanation to tourism enterprises, they agreed and committed to inform their tourists to buy the tickets (R4). The representatives of tourism sectors, who participated in the PUP project, had many good inputs and ideas for the two visitor management plans (R4 and R6), however, their commitment after the project finished was not high (R6). This shows that Hoi An City already has and should continue to maintain the relationship with the private sector to resolve development issues.
UNESCO

UNESCO was the donor of the PUP project in Hoi An City and also the one who introduced the PUP methodology to Vietnam. After the project finished, UNESCO also selected and funded some initiatives proposed in the visitor management plans. The organization has continued to support and promote PUP at other destinations across Vietnam by organizing workshops and incorporating suitable PUP modules in their projects and activities. Although UNESCO’s avocation for a participatory approach at Hoi An was well intentioned, they imposed PUP on Hoi An City when they “applied the three big forces of colonialism, money, politics and expertise” (R3). For example, the officials from Hoi An City were not well informed about the methodology and the project and the community also was not surveyed. A study by Timothy (1999) on tourism planning in developing countries suggested that, tourism planners should consider local constraints and conditions before imposing foreign ideologies into traditional societies. Hoi An City was a successful case because the communities already have strong local cultural institutions. For other destinations in Vietnam without this established culture of participation, implementing PUP would be more difficult.

Consultant

The PUP Consortium is also an important organization for PUP implementation in Vietnam. It was created by the co-author of the PUP methodology and the technical assistance for the PUP project in Hoi An City. The consultant had an important role during the project, assisting the technical aspects of the PUP. The experience of Hoi An City is said to help further developed the methodology (R3). The PUP project has set the framework and connection for the PUP Consortium to have more collaboration in Vietnam in the future. Opportunities for the implementation of PUP are available, such as in Phong Nha Ke Bang National Park (R3). So the PUP Consortium can play a big role in bringing the PUP methodology to other destinations in Vietnam.
National government agencies

The Institute for Tourism Development Research (ITDR) and the Vietnam National Administration of Tourism (VNAT) did not directly participate in the PUP project. However, UNESCO had a contract with ITDR to revise the Vietnamese version of the PUP manual. Also UNESCO collaborated with VNAT to organize the workshop in March 2012 to introduce PUP to other heritage sites around the country. These two organizations are under the national government and are in charge of proposing strategies, planning, mechanism and policies relating to tourism management and development to the State. They could be one of the structural obstacles to community participation to tourism planning, according to Tosun (2000), if their attitudes toward community participation are negative. Or they could contribute greatly to the promotion and implementation of PUP and community participation in tourism planning by proposing guidelines and policies.

A preliminary survey investigated the two organizations’ perceptions of community participation in tourism development in Vietnam. Results showed that the officials felt community participation to be “very necessary” (55%) or “necessary” (38%) for tourism development. No one chose “not necessary”. This result indicated that the national government agencies understand the important role of community in tourism. 17 officials, more than half of the respondents (59%) had seen an increase in community participation since 2011. Only 5 officials (17%) responded that it had decreased, and 7 officials (24%) reported the trend had stayed the same. 18 officials (62%) had experience working with the community since 2011, of which 15 were from ITDR and only 3 from VNAT. The reason is that the duties of VNAT are focused more on administration of travel, hotel and tourism promotion.

29 The survey was conducted at the two organizations in August 2014. 29 questionnaires were collected altogether, 17 from ITDR and 12 from VNAT.
30 Since the beginning of the current Strategy for Vietnam tourism development until 2020, with a vision to 2030.
6.2 Recommendations

The following are some recommendations for Hoi An City and UNESCO to utilize the results of the PUP project in Hoi An City, and recommendations for other tourism destinations in Vietnam seeking to overcome similar obstacles to implement PUP. In addition, recommendations for further research are also listed.

- Recommendations for Hoi An City:
  - Integrating more participatory process and suitable PUP modules, such as public consultation, monitoring and regulations in the current planning practices of the city.
  - Implementing the PUP methodology at other tourism sites and organizing capacity training for the city officials
  - Holding frequent dialogues with local community and stakeholders to exchange their perspectives and resolve conflicts through public workshops.

- Recommendations for UNESCO:
  - Continuing to revise the PUP manual in Vietnamese, clarifying technical terms, and updating with examples from the PUP project in Quang Nam Province.
  - Making a platform for current and potential Public use coordinators to share their knowledge and experiences in PUP, for example: social network website, group email, newsletter, etc.
  - Continuing to support capacity building for site management organization in Vietnam in skills and tools for community participation.

- Recommendations for PUP implementation at other tourism destinations in Vietnam:
  - Doing survey and holding discussion with the local community and stakeholders before deciding to implement PUP.
  - Choosing appropriate Public use coordinators, taking into account their skills, knowledge of site and their duties.
- Allocating budget to implement not only PUP but also the result of PUP – the management plan.
- Continuously building capacity for site managers, officials and stakeholders to implement PUP and the management plan.
- Integrating the management plan into the site’s traditional annual and five year action plans and budget allocation.

**Recommendations for further research:**
- Research about PUP in other destinations which also apply this methodology. The perspectives of different tourism stakeholders, not only government officials, can be reflected and analyzed.
- Comparative research about different cases of PUP in one country or in different countries.
- Comparative research about PUP implementation in natural heritage sites versus cultural heritage sites.
- Research about the possibilities of another model suitable for Vietnam or about the conditions to evolve from the conventional planning method to the participatory method. The aim of this research was to study about the participatory approach in tourism planning in Vietnam through the PUP, which is only one model of this approach.

**6.3 Limitations of the study**

This research investigated the PUP model applied in Hoi An City to involve different stakeholders in tourism planning and its implementation after the project. Interviews with tourism experts, PUP experts and local government officials who have experience of the project and Hoi An tourism were conducted and their views and opinions were reflected in the study. Due to the time and resource limitations of the author, no interview or survey was conducted directly with the local residents and tourism operators who participated in the project and may have provided a diversified view of the project and the PUP methodology.
Another limitation of the study is that Hoi An Ancient Town and Cham Islands MPA were chosen and funded by UNESCO to apply PUP. These two sites, as a World Heritage site and a World Biosphere Reserve respectively, also have been supported heavily by the local and national governments and many other international organizations like UNESCO to preserve and protect their heritages. That places the two sites in a more favorable condition than many other tourism destinations around the country. Even though the research touched on some obstacles for PUP implementation in other destinations in Vietnam, PUP in these locations will be greatly different from the implementation in Hoi An City.

6.4 Conclusion

Community participation in tourism planning is an approach that incorporates the insights and perspectives of the stakeholders to ensure transparency in tourism development activities, and minimize negative impacts on the local community and environment. The PUP is a model of participatory tourism planning that UNESCO found suitable and applied in Hoi An City. This study reflected on the project implementation process, as well as the legacy after the project had finished, and identified the pros and cons for PUP in Hoi An City and in other tourism destinations in Vietnam. Through interviews and review of the project and legal documents, the author discovers some problems of PUP implementation in Hoi An City and in Vietnam as follows.

During the preparation stage of PUP, the problem was a lack of direct community participation. The participating sites were pre-selected by Quang Nam Province and UNESCO. The officials and managers from the sites were not well-prepared for the first training workshop and some were even confused because they did not understand the approach. The training also provided a large amount of information in a short training time, making it difficult for the participants who also had other job commitments. However, after the initial confusion, the participants evaluated highly the information and methods during the training period.
During the project implementation in Hoi An City, the two sites encountered difficulties due to the complexity of the manual with new concepts and the new participatory approach. The involvement of different stakeholders in the planning process was not familiar in Vietnam, where planning is often delegated to external experts. Communities and stakeholders were not used to participate in this kind of workshops and activities so they initially were not open. The respondents also had some difficulties with the methodology. Their struggle, in modules related to zoning and finance for example, was due to the complexity of the manual and the differences in the Vietnamese context since PUP was first developed for large-scale natural heritage sites. The methodology still succeeded in involving the community more than the common practice in Vietnam. And it was assessed favorably by the respondents because the plans were built, verified and implemented by local government, stakeholders and communities.

The two teams in Hoi An and Cham Islands completed the visitor management plans and finished the projects. However the visitor management plans were not recognized as official documents under the system. The officials and managers were not required to follow up the plans, which consequently have not been implemented. Both of the teams when interviewed said that they did incorporate the visitor management plan, the outcome of PUP project, in the city and the site tourism development planning. However, actual implementation is limited. Some activities proposed in the visitor management plans then relied heavily on UNESCO for implementation.

After the project in Hoi An City, UNESCO and the PUP Consortium continues to promote PUP in Vietnam. The challenges that Hoi An City faced during the project may also apply to the PUP implementation in other destinations in Vietnam, where some additional obstacles must also be noted. This research suggests that in order to successfully put PUP into practice, the PUP manual and the way the methodology is applied need to continue to be revised. Sites needs to be prepared and be able to make the participation decision themselves. If the site only applies
PUP because of the influence and pressure from national and local government, outsider experts and donors, implementation of the resulting plan will not happen, especially since this requires a commitment in time and budget for at least two years. Hence, funding for not only the PUP but also the plan implementation is also important. The capacity of the site managers and stakeholders should also be considered due to the complexity of the methodology. Sites can choose to apply selective tools and modules of the PUP to their regular works. A gradual change to the practice of top-down planning, to involve a range of different stakeholders in the planning process is also necessary. One encouraging trend is that national government agencies such as ITDR and VNAT are already recognizing the importance of and the growing trend toward community participation.

In conclusion, this study has reviewed all the stages of the PUP project in Hoi An City by using both primary and secondary data. The problems during different stages of the project and the opportunities to apply PUP in other destinations in Vietnam were identified. The findings of this research are suggestions for the other destinations to overcome the obstacles and further involve the community in tourism planning.
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