

Recommendations

Many of the benefits from tourism go primarily to the small percentage of villagers who are lodge and restaurant owners. Porter guides and support staff often share in them, whereas the large percentage of subsistence farmers, especially of the poor lower class, do not directly benefit from tourism income. Due to the lack of linkage between community and tourism development, benefits from tourism are confined primarily to lodge owners, a large segment of the mountain community being left out. In other words, although the potential to enlarge area six exists, this is not happening. A greater focus on income-generating activities is required in the area, and this can be achieved by bringing about a greater linkage between MCD and MTD. While cash incomes have increased to some extent as a result of tourism, the real income of most villagers has remained virtually stagnant, or even declined, due to inflation. This is especially true for poor food-deficit villagers.

Among the lodge owners as well, a large share of the income earned from tourism continues to leak out in the form of imports. While the available estimates indicate that as much as 50 per cent of the money spent by tourists has been retained in the ACAP areas since the introduction of ACAP (compared to 7 per cent before ACAP), it is not clear whether such a reduction in leakages has resulted from improved linkages of tourism with the local economy or from increased entry fees. In the present study's assessment, leakages continue to be large. The percentage of lodge owners' expenses for

import needs also to be taken into account and evaluated in order to understand the potential to better integrate community and tourism development.

Although some successes in conservation have been achieved (new infrastructure is benefitting communities, household behaviour is being modified, women are becoming involved in resource conservation and income generation etc), a large segment of the poor are being left behind. A wider diffusion of tourism benefits through stronger linkages between tourism and community development that is within the carrying capacity of the mountain environment stands out as the main issue which ACAP should focus on in its programmes. Stated differently, the dual economic structure, namely the subsistence sector and the tourism sector, needs to be linked in order to improve the carrying capacity of the area.

HER have significant economic value as well, which, if properly utilised, can provide a strong stimulus to mountain community development. The development of these resources needs to be conducted in a manner that does not in any way jeopardise the environment. One way to harness these resources is by maximising their non-consumptive uses through tourism promotion. ACAP should take the initiative to begin assessing the value of HER in the area. Although some initial efforts have already been made through the biodiversity study, additional work on developing safe minimum standards, limits of acceptable change, and other standards would be useful not only for this one area, but could set standards for other mountain areas of Nepal as well.

The assessment of HER could help in assessing the potential for other non-consumptive uses of HER. Note that only about 27 per cent of the visitors reported that trekking was their primary motive for visiting the area. There is scope to develop other products in the area to increase the range of products available to tourists and, at the same time, generate employment opportunities for local people.

Table 4.1: Ethnic Composition of Households

Area	Gurung	Magars	Occupational	Others	Total
Ghandruk	16 (64)	1 (4)	7 (28)	1 (4)	25 (100)
Ulleri	-	25 (100)	-	-	-
Total	16 (32)	26 (52)	7 (194)	1(2)	50 (100)

Figures in parentheses are percentages.

Table 4.2: Distribution of Population by Age and Sex

(given in percentages)

Age Group	Ghandruk			Ulleri			Total		
	Male	Fem	Total	Male	Fem	Total	Male	Fem	Total
Less than	17.2	15.9	16.5	27.6	27.1	27.3	22.1	21.6	21.8
10-65 yrs	81.3	79.7	80.5	65.5	70.0	68.0	73.8	74.8	74.3
65 + yrs	1.6	4.3	3.0	6.9	2.9	4.7	4.1	3.8	3.8
Total	64	69	133	58	70	128	122	139	261
Sex Ratio	92.75			82.8			87.76		

Table 4.3: Literacy and Level of Education of the Household Members Aged 10 Years and Above

(given in percentages)

	Ghandruk			Ulleri			Total		
	Male	Fem	Total	Male	Fem	Total	Male	Fem	Total
Illiterate	20.8	51.7	36.9	12.0	37.3	25.8	16.8	45.0	32.0
Read and write	17.0	10.3	13.5	26.0	23.5	24.7	21.1	16.5	18.6
Primary	17.0	8.6	12.6	12.0	9.8	10.8	14.7	9.2	11.8
Secondary	28.3	19.0	23.4	38.0	27.5	32.3	32.6	23.0	27.5
SLC or above	17.0	10.3	13.5	12.0	2.0	6.5	14.7	6.4	10.3
Total %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Cases	(53)	(58)	(111)	(42)	(51)	(93)	(95)	(109)	(204)

Table 4.4: Distribution of Economically Active Population (10 years and above) by Occupation

(given in percentages)

	Ghandruk	Ulleri	Total
Agriculture only	38.7	46.2	42.2
Agriculture +others	10.0	7.5	8.8
Service	3.6	11.8	7.4
Pension	4.5	4.3	4.4
Business	1.0	4.3	2.5
Tourism	11.7	4.3	8.3
Wage labour	1.0	-	0.5
Student	17.1	19.4	18.1
Others	12.6	2.2	7.8
Total	111 (100)	93 (100)	200 (100)

Table 4.5: Occupational Linkage of Households Members (10 years and above) with Tourism

(given in percentages)

	Ghandruk			Ulleri			Total			Total Cases
	High	Mode-rate	No Link	High	Mode-rate	No Link	High	Mode-rate	No Link	
Agriculture only	-	-	100	4.7	7.0	88.4	2.3	3.5	94.2	86
Agriculture +others	9.1	-	36.4	14.3	28.6	57.1	11.1	44.4	44.4	18
Service	-	54.5	75.0	18.2	-	81.8	13.3	6.7	80.0	15
Pension	-	25.0	100	-	25.0	75.0	-	11.1	88.9	9
Business	100	-	-	25.0	75.0	-	40.0	60.0	-	5
Tourism	92.3	7.7	-	100	-	-	94.7	6.0	-	1
Wage Labour	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	1
Students +Others	-	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	53

Table 4. 6 Distribution of Households by Farm Size

(given in percentages)

	Ghandruk	Ulleri	Total
Farm size			
Less than or equal to 0.5 ha	88	84	86
0.5 ha -1.0 ha	8	16	12
1.01 ha & above	1	-	2
Tenurial Status			
Owner-cultivator	60	80	70
Owner cum tenant	12	12	12
Pure tenant	8	-	4
Landlord only	16	4	10
Landless	4	4	4

Table 4. 7: Size of Operated Area by Type of Land

Type of operated land	Ghandruk	Ulleri	Overall
Khet (ha)	0.12 (0.19)	-	0.15 (0.06)
Pakho (ha)	0.57 (0.67)	0.51 (0.36)	0.54 (0.53)
Overall (ha)	0.70 (0.79)	0.51 (0.36)	0.60 (0.62)

Note: Figures in parentheses are standard deviations.

Table 4.8: Households Reporting Food Sufficiency and Disposal of Surplus

(shown in percentages)

Overall case study area	Sufficient for home consumption only	Not enough to meet family needs	Some sold to tourist market	Some sold to local market	Some sold in both markets
Paddy	46	46	8	-	-
Maize	75	14	9	2	-
Wheat	77	8	15	-	-
Millet	73	13	11	2	-
Potatoes	59	22	16	-	3
Vegetables	82	8	11	-	-

Table 4.9: Average Income of Households from Marketing Crops

	Ghandruk	Ulleri
Mean (Rs)	2910	2986
Std Dev	1898	3055

Table 4.10: Average Livestock Holding by Type of Animal (LSU)

	Cow	Ox	Buffalo	Goat	Sheep	Poultry	Total
Ghandruk	0.82	0.15	1.55	0.15	0.42	0.21	3.61
Ulleri	0.25	0.42	1.47	0.42	0.42	0.10	3.96
Average	0.53	0.29	1.51	0.29	0.42	0.15	3.78

Table 4.11: Disposal of Livestock Products by Households in Different Markets

(shown in percentages)

	Tourist Market	Local Market	Both	Others	Total
Ghandruk	12	10	5	73	100
Ulleri	20	5	5	70	100

Table 4.12: Average Annual Consumption of Fuelwood and Fodder Per Household

	Fuel-wood (Kg/HH)	Fodder (Kg/LSU)
Ghandruk	3,040	7,661
Ulleri	8,847	3,934
Total	6,003	5,797

Table 4.13: Percentage of Households Using Different Types of Energy

	Fuelwood	Kerosene	Electricity	Gas
Ghandruk	20(80)	15(60)	22(88)	4(16)
Ulleri	25(100)	25(100)	-	-
Overall	45 (90)	40 (80)	22 (44)	4 (8)

Note: figures in parentheses are percentages.

Table 4.14: Share of Fuelwood and Fodder from Private and Public Sources

	Fuelwood		Fodder	
	Private source (%)	Public source (%)	Private source (%)	Public source (%)
Ghandruk	22.61	77.4	46.6	53.4
Ulleri	10.8	89.2	61.5	38.6
Total	16.4	83.5	53.7	46.3

Table 4.15: Perceived Impact of Tourism on Scarcity of Firewood and Fodder

Attributed to	Ghandruk (%)		Ulleri (%)		Total (%)	
	Fuelwood	Fodder	Fuelwood	Fodder	Fuelwood	Fodder
Tourism	4	-	75	22	40	11
Partly tourism	9	-	4	6	6	3
No tourism impact	83	89	4	61	43	75
Population growth	-	-	17	11	9	6
No desire to protect forests	4	11	-	-	2	6

Table 4.16: Reasons for Changing Pattern in Energy Consumption

	Ghandruk (%)				Ulleri (%)			
	Tourism	Fuel-wood shortage	Others	Total	Tourism	Fuel-wood shortage	Others	Total
Fuelwood	-	53	47	75	-	86	14	82
Kerosene	-	50	50	20	67	-	33	18
Electricity	-	-	100	5	-	-	-	-
Total	-	50	50	100	12	71	18	100

Table 4.17: Lodge Owners' Place of Origin, Type of Lodge and Lodge Status

	Ghorepani (%)	Ghandruk (%)	Total (%)
Lodge Owners' Place of Origin			
Same village	94	95	95
Migrated	6	5	5
Type of Lodge			
Permanent	55	45	78
Temporary	11	88	22
Owner- Operated or Operated by Others			
Owner-operated	46	54	87
Operated by others	40	69	13
Total	45	55	100

Table 4.18: Mean Number of Rooms and Beds Per Lodge

	Mean	Std Dev	Cumulative Sum
Rooms			
Ghorepani	8.72	2.60	157
Ghandruk	7.27	3.29	160
Total	7.92	3.05	317
Beds			
Ghorepani	17.94	5.20	323
Ghandruk	15.27	7.27	336
Total	16.47	6.42	659

Table 4.19: Employment per Lodge during Peak and Slack Seasons by Sex

	Peak Season			Slack Season			Total in %	
	Male	Fem.	Hired	Male	Fem.	Hired	Male	Fem.
Ghorepani	1.22	1.78	1.00	1.22	1.78	-	43	56
Ghandruk	1.00	1.59	1.00	1.00	1.59	-	45	55
Total	1.10	1.67	0.50	1.10	1.67	-	44	56

Note: 'Male' and 'female' refer to family members.

Table 4.20: Mean and Total Number of Visitors Entertained per Lodge during Peak and Slack Seasons

	Peak Season		Slack Season	
	Mean	Total	Mean	Total
Ghorepani	1133	7930	276	2209
Ghandruk	565	6791	283	3392
Total	775	14721	280	5601

Table 4.21: Average Rates Charged per Tourist for Various Food Items and Services

Items	This Season	Last Season	Range
	Rs	Rs	Rs
Room	75.00	70.50	40-350
Bed	37.86	37.75	20-250
Breakfast	85.71	80.25	35-150
Lunch	90.00	88.75	30-150
Dinner	142.86	141.50	60-300

Table 4.22: Average Annual Energy Consumption(AAEC) by Lodges

Energy Sources	Ghorepani		Ghandruk	
	AAEC	Price/Unit	AAEC	Price/Unit
Firewood	17753.20kg	1.09/kg	2689.20kg	1.26/kg
Kerosene	319.63 Lit.	21.91/Lit.	618.38 lit.	15.00/lit.
Gas	-	-	21 cylinder	485.00/cyl.
Electricity	-	-	12.5 kW. hr	00.75/Watt
Solar heater	-	-	2.2 panel	10750.00/panel

Table 4.23: Use of Energy Devices as an Alternative of Fuelwood

(shown in percentages)

Energy devices	Ghorepani	Ghandruk
Improved Stove	16.7	18.2
Back-boiler heater	61.1 ¹	27.3
Solar heater	00.0	45.5
Space heater	5.6 ²	9.1
Rice cooker	00.0	68.2
Electric jug	00.0	68.2
Kerosene	22.2	90.9
Gas	11.1	31.8

Notes: 1 All the back-boiler heaters installed in the lodges of Ghorepani run on fuelwood

2 All space heater in the lodges of Ghorepani use fuelwood.

Table 4.24: Lodge Owners' Perceptions of Different Appliances: Ghandruk

(shown in percentages)

Appliances	Efficient and inexpensive		Expensive	
	Ghorepani	Ghandruk	Ghorepani	Ghandruk
Improved stove	100	100	-	-
Back-boiler heater	72	100	9	-
Space heater	100	100	-	-
Kerosene	25	100	75	-
Gas	-	100	NA	-
Solar heater	-	50	-	50
Rice cooker	NA	100	NA	-
Electric jug	NA	100	NA	-

Table 4.25: Lodge Owner Perceptions of Supply of Different Resources if Tourists Were to Double

(shown in percentages)

Existing Facilities	Ghorepani			Ghandruk		
	Ade-quate	Short-age	Don't Know	Ade-quate	Short-age	Don't Know
Firewood	83	11	6	45	9	46
Electricity	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	68	27
Lodges	67	22	11	41	59	-
Water supply	94	-	6	82	18	-
Kerosene	94	6	-	73	27	-
Space	78	11	11	64	27	9

Table 4.26: Lodge Owners' Perceptions of Deforestation and Tourism Benefits

(shown in percentages)

	Ghorepani			Ghandruk		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
Firewood use will increase in future	-	100	-	5	77	18
Tourism will enhance deforestation	72	22	6	36	64	-
Tourism has brought benefits	94	-	6	100	-	-

Table 4.27: Agewise Distribution of Visitors by Type

Age Group	Independent Trekkers			Group Trekkers		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
19-35	9 (81.8)	8 (72.7)	17 (77.3)	4 (57.1)	6 (54.5)	10 (55.6)
36-50	1 (9.1)	1 (9.1)	2 (9.1)	2 (28.6)	3 (27.3)	5 (27.8)
51 +	1 (9.1)	2 (18.2)	3 (13.6)	1 (14.3)	2 (27.3)	3 (16.7)
Total	11 (100.0)	11 (100.0)	22 (100.0)	7 (100.0)	11 (100.0)	18 (100.0)

Note: Figures in parentheses are percentages.

Table 4.28: Percentage Distribution of Trekkers by Nationality

Trekkers	European	Australian	USA	Asian	Total
Independent	77.3	9.1		13.6	100.0
Group	83.3	5.6	5.6	5.6	100.0
Total	80.0	7.5	2.5	10.0	100.0

Table 4.29: Trekking Duration by Nationality, Age, and Sex

Nationality	Independent Trekkers		Group Trekkers	
	Mean (days)	S.D	Mean (days)	S.D
European	10.4	6.76	14.6	7.2
Australian	11.0	4.24	7.0	0.0
USA	-	-	17.0	0.0
Asian	6.3	1.15	7.0	0.0
Age Group				
19 - 35	11.2	6.27	10.3	8.2
36 - 50	4.5	3.5	17.8	0.4
51 +	6.0	3.5	17.7	1.2
Sex				
Male	11.6	7.2	15.7	9.3
Female	8.1	4.6	12.8	5.6
Total	9.86	6.15	13.82	6.96

Table 4.30: Average Number of Days Visitors Use Different Facilities

Visitors' Category	Lodge	Tents	Private House	Lodge+ Camping	Lodge+ House
Independent	9.00	0.68	2.45	9.68	11.45
Group	1.67	11.06	1.89	12.73	3.56
Male	6.39	5.00	3.78	11.39	10.17
Female	5.14	5.64	0.91	10.78	6.05
Total	5.70	5.35	2.20	11.05	7.90

Table 4.31: Visitors' Comment on Meal and Room Quality and Hygiene and Sanitation

(given in percentages)

Comments on	Independent			Group			Both		
	Good	Fair	Bad	Good	Fair	Bad	Good	Fair	Bad
Food	57.1	42.9		57.1	42.9		57.1	42.9	
Rooms	23.8	71.4	4.8	-	75.0	25.0	20.0	72.0	10.0
Hygiene & Sanitation	38.1	47.6		42.9	42.9	14.3	39.3	46.4	14.3

Table 4.32: Visitors' Perceptions of Prices of Meals and Lodging

(given in percentages)

Perception on	Independent Trekkers			Group Trekkers		Both (%)		
	Fair	Low	High	Fair	Low	Fair	Low	High
Price of Meal	61.9	28.6	9.5	85.7		67.9	25.0	7.1
Price of Lodging	73.7	26.3	-		50.0	69.6	30.4	-

Table 4.33: Average Cost of Trekking Trip Paid by FITs

	Mean (Rs)	Std Dev	Min	Max	% Responding
Round-trip travel	49585	49034	1000	182896	45
All accommodations	9822	13328	100	39960	25
Food expenditures	4768	4536	150	14961	28
Visas, fees, taxes	3496	3878	300	14961	38
Other expenses	35925	43479	500	159840	37

Table 4.34: Average Cost of Trekking Trip paid by GT

	Mean (Rs)	Std Dev	Min	Max	% Responding
Round-trip travel	84097	45582	19948	144623	37
All accommodations	6891	2683	1995	9431	18
Food expenditures	2751	1036	1598	4987	20
Visas, fees, taxes	2486	966	1247	4000	22
Other expenses	91588	69668	4987	249350	30

Table 4.35: Average daily Expense Per Visitor on Various Items

(given in rupees)

Visitors' Category	Breakfast	Lunch	Dinner	Drinks	Fruits & Handicraft	Total Per Trip
Independent Trekker	51	54	66	51	144	3318
Group Trekker	10	17	17	35	58	6524
Both	32	37	44	44	89	4761

Table 4.36: Average Number of Porters Hired by the Visitors and Average Wage Rates

Type of Porters hired	Independent	Group
	Mean	Mean
Male porter	6	12
Female porter	-	3
Total number of Porters	6	15
No. of hired days	5	12
Male wage (Rs/day)	275	168
Female Wage (Rs/day)	-	85

**Table 4.37: Visitors' Motivating Factors in Ranked Order
(Independent and Group Trekkers)**

(given in percentages)

Motivation Factors	Independent			Group			Total		
	Ran k 1	Ran k 2	Ran k 3	Ran k 1	Ran k 2	Ran k 3	Ran k 1	Ran k 2	Ran k 3
Viewing scenery	47	47	5	59	18	24	53	33	14
Trekking	15	31	54	36	21	43	26	26	48
Experiencing Nature	31	31	39	17	42	42	24	36	40
Visiting Nepal	36	27	36	67	33	-	43	29	28
Others	60	20	20	20	80	-	40	60	-
Relaxation	100	-	-	33	33	33	14	14	71
Camping	-	-	100	-	-	100	-	-	100

Table 4.38: Visitors' Knowledge about Annapurna and Reinvestment of the Conservation Area Fee

	Independent	Group	Both
Heard of Annapurna	18 (54.5)	15 (45.5)	33 (82.5)
Heard of ACAP	7 (32.0)	4 (22.2)	11 (27.5)
Knowledge of Fee's Use	7 (39.0)	5 (33.3)	12 (36.40)

Note: figures in parentheses are in percentages.

Table 4.39: Visitors' Overall Trekking Experience

	Independent	Group	Overall
Most Enjoyable	19 (90.5)	18 (100)	37 (95)
Less Enjoyable	2 (9.5)		2 (5.1)
Total cases	21 (100)	18 (100)	39 (100)

Note: figures in parentheses are in percentages.

Table 4.40: Household Perception of Cleanliness and Sanitation

(given in percentages)

	Perception	Household-Perceived Factors Responsible for Change					Total
		Tourism	ACAP	Both	Others-1	Others-2	
Village	Improved	10.00	38.75	41.25	17.92	56.25	82.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	4.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	8.00	46.00	34.00	2.00	6.00	100.00
Water Sources	Improved	17.65	36.85	32.85	2.13	6.25	94.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	6.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	12.00	42.00	28.00	3.33	8.00	100.00
Trails	Improved	8.55	32.15	34.50	4.23	12.10	100.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	6.00	40.00	34.00	4.00	8.00	100.00
Schools	Improved	17.90	22.50	7.50	6.62	32.20	98.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	2.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	8.00	36.00	12.00	6.00	26.00	100.00
Scenic Spots	Improved	72.05	25.85	12.05	0.00	0.00	96.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	30.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	26.00	30.00	14.00	0.00	30.00	100.00
Public Places	Improved	28.85	38.90	14.95	0.93	14.60	100.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	30.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	26.00	42.00	16.00	0.67	14.00	100.00
Health & Sanitation	Improved	93.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.25	18.50
	Same	1.60	0.00	0.00	3.23	38.70	62.00
	Worse	5.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	15.00	20.00
	Total	20.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	56.00	100.00

Table 4.41: Household Perception of Environment Conservation

(Independent and Group Trailers)

(given in percentages)

	Percep- tion	Household-Perceived Factors Responsible for Change					Total
		Tourism	ACAP	Both	Others- 1	Others- 2	
Forests	Improved	0.00	74.30	10.25	0.93	12.65	100.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	26.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	0.00	78.00	10.00	0.67	10.00	100.00
Wildlife	Improved	0.00	62.80	12.30	3.13	15.55	98.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Worse	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
	Total	0.00	70.00	12.00	2.00	12.00	100.00
Pastures	Improved	0.00	34.00	0.00	1.18	62.15	38.00
	Same	0.00	8.35	0.00	4.63	77.80	42.00
	Worse	0.00	88.90	0.00	1.85	5.55	20.00
	Total	0.00	34.00	0.00	4.67	5.00	100.00
Water- sheds	Improved	0.00	81.70	11.35	1.50	2.25	54.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.88	73.35	44.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	2.00
	Total	0.00	38.00	10.00	7.33	30.00	100.00
Environ- ment Awareness	Improved	24.55	47.35	16.60	1.62	6.25	90.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	6.00
	Worse	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00
	Total	22.00	48.00	16.00	1.33	10.00	100.00

Note: figures in parentheses are in percentages.

Table 4.42: Household Perceptions of Cultural Preservation and Promotion
(given in percentages)

	Percep- tion	Household-Perceived Factors Responsible for Change					Total
		Tourism	ACAP	Both	Others-1	Others-2	
Sacred Places	Improved	3.55	30.70	13.55	0.00	52.15	38.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	5.00	3.33	85.00	60.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	2.00
	Total	2.00	10.00	6.00	3.33	72.00	100.00
Sacred monu-ments	Improved	4.55	55.70	0.00	4.42	88.75	30.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	68.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	72.00	2.00
	Total	2.00	14.00	0.00	4.00	72.00	100.00
Village life	Improved	49.05	3.70	8.35	12.95	0.00	66.00
	Same	0.00	3.55	3.55	2.37	85.70	30.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.33	25.00	4.00
	Total	32.00	6.00	4.00	11.33	24.00	100.00
Family ties	Improved	6.25	2.10	0.00	30.55	0.00	54.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.97	94.10	36.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	29.17	12.50	10.00
	Total	6.00	2.00	0.00	19.33	34.00	100.00
Family planning	Improved	0.00	10.00	0.00	6.67	20.00	10.00
	Same	0.00	1.35	0.00	0.45	97.30	80.00
	Worse	20.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	10.00
	Total	4.00	4.00	0.00	64.00	80.00	100.00
Religious values	Improved	0.00	6.25	0.00	10.42	12.50	16.00
	Same	0.00	1.45	0.00	0.48	97.15	74.00
	Worse	75.00	0.00	0.00	8.33	0.00	10.00
	Total	6.00	4.00	0.00	5.33	74.00	100.00
Cultural values	Improved	9.10	0.00	4.55	23.93	14.55	32.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.93	97.20	40.00
	Worse	46.45	0.00	0.00	1.18	0.00	28.00
	Total	30.00	0.00	2.0	8.67	42.00	100.00
Crime and theft	Improved	15.40	11.55	0.00	3.85	11.55	26.00
	Same	0.00	2.00	2.00	1.33	92.00	56.00
	Worse	33.35	0.00	0.00	3.70	5.55	18.00
	Total	20.00	8.00	2.00	4.67	56.00	100.00
Dance and music	Improved	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	4.00	1.33	92.00	84.00
	Worse	25.00	0.00	0.00	5.55	8.35	12.00
	Total	10.00	0.00	4.00	2.67	78.00	100.00
Crafts	Improved	85.90	0.00	7.25	0.75	4.55	64.00
	Same	20.00	0.00	0.00	2.08	73.75	26.00
	Worse	30.00	0.00	0.00	6.67	63.33	10.00
	Total	64.00	0.00	4.00	2.67	24.00	100.00

Table 4.43: Household Perceptions of Poverty Alleviation, Employment and Income

(given in percentages)

	Percep tion	Household-Perceived Factors Responsible for Change					Total
		Tourism	ACAP	Both	Others- 1	Others- 2	
Poverty	Improved	85.90	0.00	7.25	0.75	4.55	64.00
	Same	20.00	0.00	0.00	2.08	73.75	26.00
	Worse	30.00	0.00	0.00	6.67	0.00	10.00
	Total	64.00	0.00	4.00	8.00	24.00	100.00
Employ- ment	Improved	90.10	0.00	6.05	1.28	0.00	76.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.08	43.75	16.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	8.00
	Total	68.00	0.00	4.00	14.00	14.00	100.00
Income	Improved	89.65	0.00	5.80	0.00	4.55	72.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.03	40.90	22.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	0.00	6.00
	Total	64.00	0.00	4.00	10.00	22.00	100.00
Land price	Improved	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.85	94.45	26.00
	Worse	83.35	0.00	0.00	2.23	10.00	68.00
	Total	64.00	0.00	0.00	6.00	30.00	100.00
Labour	Improved	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	32.00
	Worse	72.65	1.80	0.00	8.53	0.00	62.00
	Total	54.00	2.00	0.00	12.00	32.00	100.00
Self- reliance	Improved	73.30	4.55	0.00	7.38	0.00	60.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.18	96.45	40.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	40.00	4.00	0.00	18.00	38.00	100.00
Migration	Improved	20.00	51.50	0.00	4.03	16.25	58.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.57	92.30	42.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	4.00	42.00	0.00	8.00	46.00	100.00

Table 4.44: Household Perceptions of Skill Development

(given in percentages)

Percep- tion	Household-Perceived Factors Responsible for Change					Total
	Tourism	ACAP	Both	Others-1	Others-2	
Improved	0.00	86.10	13.90	0.00	0.00	90.00
Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	6.00
Worse	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00
Total	0.00	82.00	12.00	0.00	6.00	100.00

Table 4.45: Household Perception on the Changing Status of Women

(given in percentages)

	Percep- tion	Household-Perceived Factors Responsible for Change Total					Total
		Tourism	ACAP	Both	Others- 1	Others- 2	
Women's work burden	Improved	30.95	0.00	2.40	21.43	2.40	44.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.67	98.00	52.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	4.00
	Total	26.00	0.00	2.00	20.00	52.00	100.00
Women's education	Improved	3.70	12.55	9.10	18.83	18.10	80.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	20.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	4.00	8.00	8.00	48.00	32.00	100.00
Women's Income	Improved	65.55	0.00	25.55	1.85	3.35	48.00
	Same	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.43	95.65	50.00
	Worse	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	2.00
	Total	34.00	0.00	10.00	8.00	48.00	100.00

Table 4.46: Household Perceptions of Various Community Development Activities

(given in percentages)

Conditions Related to	Better	Same	Worse	Don't Know
School	96	4	0	4
Health	89	12	2	0
Sanitary/Toilet	94	2	4	4
Drink	88	12	4	0
Bridge	76	20	4	4
Trail	100	4	0	0
Post Office	68	21	11	2
Bank	100	0	0	0
Veterinary	59	42	1	0
Market	0	100	0	0
Lodge	98	2	4	0
Campus	100	4	0	0
Forest	91	4	4	3
Community Health	89	11	2	0
Tourism Development	97	3	2	0
Other Development	75	25	1	0
Women's Development	73	24	3	2
Women's Skills and Training	52	31	18	2
Male Skill and Training	67	33	0	0
Training Related to Tourism	87	11	3	3
Environment Conservation	93	5	2	3
Adult Education	79	11	11	3
Food Crop Production	70	27	3	2
Cash Crop Production	83	17	1	0
Vegetable Production	71	27	2	3
Livestock Practices	42	58	2	0
Craft	42	58	2	0
Private Nursery	100	0	0	0
Public Nursery	97	3	3	0
Plant Distribution	97	3	3	0
Private Plantation	95	5	3	0
Community Plantation	100	3	0	0
Pasture	100	3	0	0
Improved Stove	100	3	0	0
Boiler	100	3	0	0
Solar Heater	100	3	0	0
Space Heater	100	3	0	0
Bio-Gas	100	3	0	0
Kerosene	100	3	0	0
Total	89	9	2	100

Table 4.47: Perception on Factors Responsible for Comm. Development
(given in percentages)

	Tourism	ACAP	Both	Govt	Villagers	Don't Know	Total
School	5	21	10	29	17	19	3
Health		23	19	46	8	4	2
Sant/Toilet		9	67	20		2	2
Drink Water		2	26	6	58	6	2
Bridge		11	14	46	16	14	4
Trail		4	16	16	6	58	
Post Office					100		
Bank					100		
Veterinary		43				57	1
Market	50				50		0
Lodge		90		8		2	
Campus	88		10		2		4
Forest		85			15		4
Health Com			67		13	17	4
Tour dev	28	34	28		9		3
Other dev	13	25	25		25	13	1
Women dev		75			16	9	3
Women Train			45		41		14
Male Train			67		33		
Tour Train		5	63	24	3	3	3
Env Conser			98				3
Adult edu		87		5		8	3
Food Crop		7		21	7	64	1
Cash crop		50		50			0
Veget			13		19	6	63
Livestk Occup				20	10	70	1
Craft					20	10	70
Privt Nursery		100					0
Pub nursery			97				3
Plant Distr			97		3		
Private Plant		76		5	20		3
Comm Plant			74		7	19	
Pasture		74		7	19		4
Imprv Stove			74		7	19	
Rural			74		7	19	
Boiler		74		7	19		4
Solar Heater		74		7	19		4
Space heater		74		7	19		4
Bio-Gas		74		7	19		4
Kerosene		74		7	19		4
Total	9	54	5	14	13	5.6	100.0

Table 4.48: Household Perception on Beneficiaries of Community Development

(given in percentages)

	Wealthy	Poor	Local	Tour	HH	Don't
School	2	5	96	5	2	4
Health		8	92			2
Sant/Toilet			98		2	3
Drink			100			4
Bridge			100			4
Trail			98		2	4
Post Office		4	96			2
Bank			100			0
Veterinary		6	94			1
Market			50	50		0
Lodge		4	2	94		4
Campus			4	96		4
Forest	9	7	84			3
Health		11	85		4	2
Tour dev			16	84		2
Other dev	14		86			1
Women		3	74	3	19	2
Women	7	26	59		7	2
Male Train		67	33			0
Tour Train	3	3	11	84		3
Env		5	92		3	3
Adult edu		14	83		3	3
Food Crop		12	82		6	2
Cash crop		27	73			1
Veget		9	91			3
Livestk		18	82			2
Craft		18	82			2
Privt			100			0
Pub			97		3	3
Plant Distr			100			3
Private	10		90			3
Comm			100			3
Pasture			100			3
Imprv			100			3
Rural Elect			100			3
Boiler			100			3
Solar			100			3
Space			100			3
Bio-Gas			100			3
Kerosene			100			3
Total	1.0	3.6	82.7	11.5	1.3	100

Table 4.49: Lodge Owners' Opinions on Different Community Development Programmes

(given in percentages)

	Better now than 5yrs ago	Same as 5 yrs ago	Worse now than 5 yrs ago
<u>Basic Development Infrastructures:</u>			
Ghorepani	95.1	3.5	1.4
Ghandruk	96.0	2.9	1.1
<u>Health:</u>			
Ghorepani	94.3	-	5.7
Ghandruk	100.0	-	-
<u>Human Resource:</u>			
Ghorepani	84.85	15.2	-
Ghandruk	96.70	1.7	-
<u>Income Generation:</u>			
Ghorepani	100.0	-	-
Ghandruk	100.0	-	-
<u>Conservation:</u>			
Ghorepani	90.6	7.5	1.9
Ghandruk	96.0	4.0	-

Table 4.50: How Lodge Owners Attributed Change in Community Development

(given in percentages)

	Tourism	ACAP	Both	Govt	Villagers	Don't Know
<u>Basic Dev Infra.:</u>						
Ghorepani	32.4	10.1	1.0	14.4	12.2	30.2
Ghandruk	18.8	22.9	8.2	22.9	18.8	8.2
<u>Health:</u>						
Ghorepani	9.8	56.0	-	-	13.7	19.6
Ghandruk	7.8	70.3	6.3	-	1.6	14.1
<u>Human Resource:</u>						
Ghorepani	3.0	97.0	-	-	-	-
Ghandruk	1.7	78.3	3.3	16.7	-	-
<u>Income Generation:</u>						
Ghorepani	2.3	67.4	-	-	23.3	7.0
Ghandruk	2.1	84.7	1.4	-	11.1	1.0
<u>Conservation:</u>						
Ghorepani	2.3	67.4	-	-	23.3	7.0
Ghandruk	2.1	36.4	4.5	31.8	25.0	2.3

Table 4.51: How Lodge Owners Perceived Who Benefits More from Community Development

(given in percentages)

	Local People Have Also Benefitted	Only Tourism Related Have Benefitted	Don't Know
<u>Basic Dev Infrs:</u>			
Ghorepani	72.2	26.4	1.4
Ghandruk	70.5	28.9	1.0
<u>Health:</u>			
Ghorepani	78.8	15.4	5.8
Ghandruk	81.3	18.8	-
<u>Human Resource:</u>			
Ghorepani	54.5	45.5	-
Ghandruk	88.3	11.7	-
<u>Income Generation:</u>			
Ghorepani	100.0	-	-
Ghandruk	97.9	2.1	-
<u>Conservation:</u>			
Ghorepani	73.8	21.4	4.8
Ghandruk	79.6	17.7	1.0

Table 4.52: Visitors' Perception about Information

(given in percentages)

Visitor's Category	Helpful and Adequate	Helpful but Inadequate	Not Helpful
Independent Trekkers	40	53	7
Group Trekkers	39	39	22
Total	39	45	15

Table 4.53: Visitors' Perceptions whether the Code of Conduct is obeyed by Trekkers and Local People

(given in percentages)

Visitors Category	Trekkers		Local People	
	Most Obey	Most Don't	Most Obey	Most Don't
Independent	72.7	27.3	68.2	31.8
Group	94.1	6.0	75.0	25.0
Total	82.1	17.9	71.1	28.9

Table 4.54: Visitors' Perceptions of the Number of Trekkers Permitted to Visit the ACAP area

(given in percentages)

Perception by Category	Too Many	Adequate	Not a problem
Independent Trekkers	14	48	38
Group Trekkers	12	53	35
Total	13	50	37
Perception by Purpose			
Viewing Scenery	18	47	35
Trekking	17	50	33
Nature Experience	20	20	60
Relaxation	-	-	100
Like Visiting Nepal	-	67	33
Others	-	100	-

Table 4.55: Visitors' Perceptions on Garbage, Littering and Sanitation in the Different Places

(given in percentages)

Areas	Garbage				Littering				Sanitation			
	Good	Fair	Bad	%	Good	Fair	Bad	%	Good	Fair	Bad	Case
Dining	57	43	-	75	55	45	-	73	37	43	20	30
Lodge	44	44	11		37	63			18	55	26	27
Camp sites	67	33	-	38	67	33	-	38	47	40	13	15
Trek routes	33	47	19	90	14	66	20	88	35	32	32	34
Villages	19	54	27	93	28	42	31	90	14	41	45	29
Homes	33	58	8	30	27	73	-	28	25	42	33	12
Scenic spots	39	55	6	83	31	56	13	80	35	38	28	29
Schools	60	40	-	50	58	42	-	48	50	43	7	14
Religious sites etc.	44	20	36	63	48	29	24	53	38	31	31	16
Others	50	-	50	5	50	-	50	5	50	-	50	52

Table 4.56: Sources of Possible Leakage from Tourist Generated Income

(given in percentages)

Items	Ghorepani		Ghandruk	
	Local%	Import%	Local%	Import%
Rice	0.00	100.00	3.18	96.82
Flour	4.12	95.88	48.41	51.59
Bread	14.71	85.29	42.42	57.58
Vegetables	85.25	14.75	79.09	20.91
Meat	75.00	25.00	81.94	18.06
Egg	0.00	100.00	1.14	98.86
Milk	0.00	100.00	21.14	78.86
Fruit	0.88	99.12	0.00	100.00
Jam/Butter	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Furniture	90.29	9.71	85.45	14.55
Cloth/Drinks/Mattresses	5.56	94.44	0.00	100.00
Total	23.59	76.41	31.91	68.09