An introduction: Do No Harm & Tourism

Exploring ways in which tourism related donor projects in fragile situations can "do no harm" or positively contribute to processes of statebuilding.
This presentation is for:

- **Tourism professionals** – who are interested in international development & knowing more about how assistance projects in fragile or post-conflict destinations can apply the concept of ‘Do No Harm.’

- **Development professionals** – who are interested to know more about how tourism can be an effective tool in achieving peaceful societies & sustainable development goals.

With thanks to:

- Eva Helene Østbye, CDA Myanmar Country Director, Myanmar.
- Simon Richards article in DevPolicyBlog, on Jan 8, 2016: ‘Aid in contested areas — setting the scene’
'Generally, donors lack the knowledge of local politics, of the balance of power between locally contending groups and elites or how they are linked to the centre, so support in this area is often blind and therefore in danger of provoking unintended outcomes.'

(OECD 2010 Do No Harm: International Support for Statebuilding)
‘By not understanding the history and power dynamics in a partner country, donor actions can disrupt the political settlement that underpins the state, weakening the incentives for powerful elites to ‘buy in’ to statebuilding processes and increasing their incentives to ‘opt out’.

(OECD 2010 Do No Harm: International Support for Statebuilding)
‘Aid’s negative effects are inadvertent and unintentional, but that does not lessen the need to avoid them.’

www.cdacollaborative.org
Despite the best of intentions, donors can inadvertently undermine statebuilding processes.

When the resources they deliver or the reforms they advocate weaken rather than strengthen the state’s decision- and policy-making functions, their efforts can do more harm than good.

Donors can also do harm by creating a brain drain away from state organisations – for instance, by hiring the most qualified civil servants.

When aid is delivered in a way that actually acts as a disincentive to states to consolidate their own revenue base, this can retard the development of the state’s own capacity.
Origins of Do No Harm (DNH)

The Collaborative for Development Action, Inc. was founded as a consulting agency in 1985 by economists, Mary B. Anderson and Catherine A. Overholt.

Both had worked for some years in international development and health policy.

CDA, Inc. - based in Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA. It has provided the base from which the Do No Harm, Reflecting on Peace Practice and Corporate Engagement programs where initiated.

CDA Collaborative Learning Projects was created in 2003 as the continuing non-profit home for these efforts. Over time, people have referred to the organization as simply “CDA”.

Source: www.cdacollaborative.org
‘Echoing the words of the Hippocratic Oath, the author of Do No Harm challenges aid agency staff to take responsibility for the ways that their assistance affects conflicts.’

‘Anderson cites the experiences of many aid providers in wartorn societies to show that international assistance — even when it is effective in saving lives, alleviating suffering, and furthering sustainable development — too often reinforces divisions among contending groups.’

Mary B. Anderson (1999). Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—or War

www.rienner.com/title/Do_No_Harm_How_Aid_Can_Support_Peace_or_War
CDA's Do No Harm Program History

Beginning in the early 1990s, a number of international and local NGOs collaborated through the Local Capacities for Peace Project, also known as the “DO NO HARM” Project (DNH) to learn more about how assistance that is given in conflict settings interacts with the conflicts.

The Local Capacities for Peace Project was formed in 1993 to learn how aid and conflict interact in order to help aid workers find a way to address human needs in a conflict without feeding conflict.

Full details: www.cdacollaborative.org/programs/do-no-harm/cdas-do-no-harm-program-history/
CDA's Do No Harm Program History

1994 – 1996: DNH began by writing case studies on the stories of projects from 15 aid agencies in 14 conflict zones - in the expectation that broad inclusion is necessary for generalizable learning.


2001 + Bringing DNH into the mainstream of humanitarian practice

2006 – 2012: Collaborative learning around the Framework and concepts of DNH
What is Do No Harm...and what is it not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do No Harm is:</th>
<th>Do No Harm is not:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- A principle</td>
<td>- A tool that focuses on specific issues (gender, environment etc.), unless these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A methodology/tool that helps the user to better understand the context in</td>
<td>are identified as having an impact on relationships that relate to violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which it operates by analyzing *relationships that relates to violent</td>
<td>conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict*</td>
<td>- A peacebuilding tool (DNH support activities to not cause harm, but is not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A methodology/tool that helps organizations to look at their own *actions</td>
<td>saying that all activities should focus on building peace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and behaviors*—and how they have an impact on <em>relationships</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A methodology/tool that helps organizations to understand how their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity have an impact on relationships—and how to develop options for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seven steps to apply the Do No Harm framework:

1) Understand the context of conflict.
2) Analyse dividers and sources of tension.
3) Analyse connectors and LCP.
4) Analyse the assistance project.
5) Analyse the assistance programme’s impact on the context of conflict through Resource Transfers (RTs) and Implicit Ethical Messages (IEMs).
6) Generate programming options.
7) Test options and redesign programme.

‘Good development and humanitarian practice espouses the principle of ‘the context’ as a starting point for engagement.’

‘Aid in contested areas — setting the scene’, Simon Richards, January 8, 2016 DevPolicyBlog.
http://devpolicy.org/aid-in-contested-areas-setting-the-scene-20160108/
Flow diagram for conflict assessment and project planning

1. Analyse the Context of Conflict
   - What are the major divisions / tensions in the area of / at the level of / the intervention? How do they manifest themselves? [update if necessary]
   - What are the connectors in the area of / at the level of / the intervention? How do they manifest themselves? [update if necessary]

2. Unpack Assistance Programme
   - Describe in detail what actions are planned / underway in the area of the intervention
   - You need detail because the devil is in the details... [update as often as necessary]

3. Analyse the Impact of your assistance programme on the Context of Conflict
   - Your actions will always have some impact on the context of conflict.
   - What will it be? → Use the mechanisms by which assistance interacts with conflict (Resource Transfers / Implicit Ethical Messages)
   - Will your actions reinforce a connector (+) or weaken one (-)?
   - Will your actions aggravate a division (-) or lessen one (+)?

4. Generate Options
   - For each negative impact (exacerbating divisions or weakening connectors) you have discovered as a consequence of (planned) actions:
     1. Brainstorm programming options that might work.
     2. Check options for their likely impact on dividers / connectors.

5. Redesign Project
   - Use the best options you have identified as having minimal negative / maximal positive impact to redesign your project

6. Repeat...
   - As often as the developments of the context of conflict situation demands,
   - As often as your project cycle requires it

Copyright Local Capacities for Peace Project (LCPP) 2001, adapted from Stephen Jackson
**Context of Conflict**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Dividers / Sources of Tension / Capacities for War</th>
<th>Assistance in Development</th>
<th>Connectors / Local Capacities for Peace</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems &amp; Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Systems &amp; Institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes &amp; Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes &amp; Actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different Values &amp; Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td>shared Values &amp; Interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>common Experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symbols &amp; Occasions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Symbols &amp; Occasions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mandate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fundraising / Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>HQ Organisation &amp; Donor Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Why?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Where?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>When?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>With Whom?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>By Whom?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>How?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Redesign / adjust activity**

**Resource Transfers & Implicit Educational Messages**
This report examines ways in which donor interventions in fragile situations can ‘do no harm’ or positively contribute to the processes of state-building.

**DONOR ACTIVITY**

- **POLITICAL PROCESSES**
  - i.e. elections, parliamentary process, decentralisation

- **STATE-SOCIETY RELATIONS**
  - public dialogue, society input in policy making

- **SOCIAL EXPECTATIONS**
  - what social groups expect of the state

- **LEGITIMACY OF THE STATE**
  - divergent grounds for loyalty

- **CAPACITY TO PERFORM STATE FUNCTIONS**
  - security, rule of law and access to justice, taxation, economic and environmental management, and service delivery
‘Doing no harm means ensuring donor-supported programs do not impact negatively on statebuilding processes, and that donors recognise that statebuilding is a long term process and requires detailed analysis since what is appropriate in one country will not be appropriate for another.’

How is DNH Relevant to the Tourism Industry?

It helps to:

- **Understand the context** e.g. Kayah (also known as Karenni State) is the smallest state in Myanmar, situated in the Southeast abutting the border with Thailand. The population of c.290,000 people consists of at least nine different ethnicities, (particularly Kayah at c.55%), four different religions, and seven armed groups (the major one being the Karenni National Progressive Party, KNPP) distributed across seven townships. Agriculture is the livelihood of most people but resources, mining and timber production are also significant sources of income, as well as conflict, in Kayah (Richards 2016). How might tourism contribute to peace and prosperity in the future?

- **Understand your own business activity** e.g. Would you be willing to accept & manage business risks to promote new tourism business opportunities in Kayah State, Myanmar that might appeal to your target customers?

- **Understand how your business activity interacts with the context** e.g. See next slide on an interaction at Dung Hla Village, near Kalaw, Myanmar. What could be the consequences when a well intentioned donor funded program seeks new business opportunities for the industry and new economic development opportunities for a local village which has a strong giving & sharing culture.
'Khun Khamauk from Dung Hla village, used by trekking operators between Kalaw & Inle Lakes, Myanmar. When I asked him how much he would sell a mat similar to the one we sat on he said if a visitor wanted such an item it he would be pleased to give it to them. Poor by most standards (material?) for these village people, it's all about sharing and satisfying a visitor - there is little or no commercial consideration.'  Steve Noakes, 2014, Myanmar
Example:
DNH is a key principle in guiding documents on tourism in Myanmar

- ‘Do No Harm to local communities’ Policy on Community Involvement (MTF, MOHT, Hans Seidel Foundation)

  **“DO NO HARM” Approach for Projects on Community Involvement in Tourism**

  - Stakeholder Discussion on “How do we DO NO HARM” in CIT Projects?
  - Focus of Discussion: How to Avoid Undesirable and Unintentioned Effects?
  - Searching for Different Ways of Managing Projects/Activities to Achieve the Most Beneficial Outcomes
  - Tourism Consultants/Development Workers are able to handle the complexity of such a Project with more clarity and better outcomes for the Community

- DNH is a tool that helps you understand the context/community in which you operate, and minimizes the risks that your activity causes harm, and instead actually benefits the community.
Tourism’s capacity to contribute to peaceful societies.

‘... given the economic weight of the tourism industry today, no great evidence is needed to back up the statement that tourism can be both the best friend and the worst enemy of development, understood not only in terms of economic growth but also as a means of achieving a more satisfactory, intellectual, emotional, moral, spiritual existence, social cohesion and peace’

(UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, Article 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Manila, Philippines</td>
<td>Declaration on World Tourism</td>
<td>[Tourism as a] ‘vital force for peace and international understanding’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Sofia, Bulgaria</td>
<td>Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code</td>
<td>[Tourism’s contribution to] ‘improving mutual understanding, bringing people closer together and, consequently, strengthening international cooperation’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Santiago, Chile</td>
<td>Global Code of Ethics for Tourism</td>
<td>‘through the direct, spontaneous and non-mediatised contacts it engenders between men and women of different cultures and lifestyles, tourism presents a vital force for peace and a factor of friendship and understanding among the peoples of the world’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tourism, Progress and Peace
edited by Omar Moufakkir, Ian Kelly (2010), CABI Publishing
The International Institute For Peace Through Tourism (I IPT) was founded in 1986, the UN international year of peace.

It is a not for profit organization dedicated to fostering and facilitating tourism initiatives which contribute to international understanding and cooperation, an improved quality of environment, the preservation of heritage, and through these initiatives, helping to bring about a peaceful and sustainable world.

It is based on a vision of the world's largest industry, travel and tourism - becoming the world's first global peace industry; and the belief that every traveler is potentially an "Ambassador for Peace."

A primary goal of IIPT is to mobilize the travel and tourism industry as a leading force for poverty reduction.

www.iipt.org
Fundamentals of inclusive tourism ...

Do well.
Do good.
Do no harm.
‘We always think that everybody can do a little bit more, if not a lot more.’

Aung San Suu Kyi.
Flores.
Indonesia.

For communications:
steve@pacificasiatourism.org