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Abstract

The fundamental objectives of National Parks are to provide long-term conservation of natural and cultural assets and to provide a natural setting for recreation. Commercial tourism operators (CTOs) have a long established history of delivering visitor services within National Parks, and it is well recognised that government regulation is necessary to control their activities in order to ensure National Park objectives are achieved. In Victoria, Australia, CTOs have been limited to the operation of existing infrastructure or the provision of low-impact activities such as bushwalking or camping. In 2013, the Victorian Government passed the National Parks Amendment (Leasing Powers and Other Matters) Bill 2013 to allow for private investment to build commercial tourism infrastructure within National Park borders. This thesis explores the efficacy of existing, proposed and potential regulatory strategies that control commercial tourism activities in Victorian National Parks, with a focus on these legislative changes and the regulation of potential new developments.

A theoretical framework was designed using Baldwin, Cave and Lodge’s (2011) regulatory strategy approach. Media articles, government documents, and interviews with key stakeholders were used to determine National Park stakeholders’ perceptions of commercial tourism in National Parks and regulatory efficacy. Four elements were found to influence stakeholder perceptions of regulatory efficacy: 1. Stakeholders desired outcomes; 2. Creating regulations; 3. Regulatory strategy performance and system design; and 4. Monitoring & compliance. These elements, and the overall level of trust a stakeholder had in government and the tourism industry to deliver outcomes, strongly influenced a stakeholder’s ‘opposition’ or ‘support’ for commercial tourism inside of National Parks. Findings implied the Victorian Government and tourism industry could improve stakeholder trust by: engaging in genuine stakeholder consultation; creating a clear vision for tourism in National Parks which acknowledges conservation as priority; and developing a comprehensive regulatory system which supports this vision.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Tourism in National Parks

The first National Park, Yellowstone, was created in America’s west in 1872. It was arguably only made possible via a unique set of circumstances and influences that brought together otherwise competing stakeholders who then lobbied government to protect large areas of wilderness for conservation and recreation use. Butler and Boyd (eds, 2000), Hall and Frost (2009a), Nash (1970; 2014), Runte (2010) and Sax (1980) have all described the historical context of the establishment of Yellowstone National Park. Americans had realised they possessed some of the grandest natural areas in the world and, learning from their destruction of nature while settling the west, they believed these areas should now be conserved. They held democratic principles and a newly romanticised urge to spend time in nature, desiring these areas to be available to all people for recreation purposes. As designated National Park areas were remote, visitors would need transport and facilities provided for their stay. Herein lay the perennial issue of how to protect these areas while facilitating people’s enjoyment of them. Tourism was not to be eliminated from National Parks, but encouraged. Hoteliers and train merchants saw the opportunity in creating a network of nature-based attractions, and from this point forward their commercial tourism activities within National Parks would need to be regulated in order to achieve recreation and conservation objectives.

Wilderness historian Roderick Nash (1970) declared the National Park as one of America’s greatest inventions ever exported. Based on the ideals of democracy, wilderness appreciation and nature preservation, Nash (1970) believed National Parks to be a reflection of the most admirable values of American culture. In 1983, Pulitzer Prize winning historian and conservationist Wallace Stegner, agreed, stating ‘National Parks are the best idea we ever had. Absolutely American, absolutely democratic, they reflect us at our best rather than our worst’ (USA NPS, 2009:n.p.). There is no doubt America provided the world with a remarkable conservation concept. According to the International Union for Conservation Network (IUCN) nearly 3000 National Parks have now been established around the world, created to provide natural areas for recreation while conserving natural and cultural assets for future generations (Chape et al., 2003;
Balancing conservation and recreational use, particularly that of commercial tourism, has proved an enduring global challenge to National Park managements. This thesis examined this issue within the Victorian National Park system in Australia, where in 2013, legislation amendments allowing private investment and commercial tourism development within National Parks had reinvigorated the debate of what is the value and appropriate human use of National Parks.

National Park Tourism Definitions & Objectives

In 1879 Australia created the world’s second National Park, Royal National Park, near Sydney. Since then Australia has established a protected area system which Worboys and Lockwood (2007:33) touted as ‘one of the great land-and-sea-use successes of this country.’ In 2009 it included over 7700 protected areas under categories such as National Parks, Marine Parks, Nature Reserves, Indigenous Protected Areas, and conservation reserves (Wearing et al., 2009). These systems are managed by independent Protected Area Management Agencies (PAMAs) established by governments through legislation to oversee operations. Across the world similar systems and PAMAs exist and a common trend in many countries, including Australia, has been the decrease of government funding for National Parks and their management, looking instead to alternate forms of income such as tourism (Figgis, 1999). This trend amplifies the complex task of balancing National Park use and conservation objectives, as tourism’s role within a National Park shifts from facilitating recreational use to one of generating a financial return.

Defining a National Park and its objectives can be difficult. No universal definition or objectives exist, the shared global National Park philosophy of balancing ‘conservation’ with the compatible ‘use’ of natural resources protected by National Parks can be identified throughout various systems (For example USA, Canada, United Kingdom, Kenya, France and Spain). Within academic literature the IUCN classification system is the most commonly cited and generally accepted description (Dearden, 2000; Eagles & Hall & Frost, 2009a; McCool, 2002). First published in 1962, the IUCN classification system was created in an effort to standardise and communicate terms to facilitate global record keeping of protected areas. The thirteenth version was published in 2003 containing six categories. Category I being the highest level of natural protection with minimal human activity allowed to Category VI the lowest level of protection and highest
human activity (Chape et al., 2003; Eagles & McCool, 2002). Category II is named ‘National Parks.’ In 2003, 3881 areas globally were grouped within this category comprising 5.4 percent of the world’s total protected areas (Chape et al., 2003). The IUCN’s description of the National Park category:

A protected area managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation. Natural area of land and/or sea, designated to (a) protect the ecological integrity of one or more ecosystems for present and future generations, (b) exclude exploitation or occupation inimical to the purposes of designation of the area and (c) provide a foundation for spiritual, scientific, educational, recreational and visitor opportunities, all of which must be environmentally and culturally compatible (Chape et al., 2003:12).

This description addresses both founding functions of National Parks - conservation and use - with attention paid to environmental science and cultural values, which may include indigenous or historical landscapes. Eagles and McCool (2002) believed this description to be suitable as it suggested small sections of a National Park may contain tourism infrastructure such as visitor centres, roads and campgrounds to satisfy public recreation, while other areas of the National Park remain protected and largely untouched. It is by no means an all-inclusive definition. The IUCN acknowledged not every National Park would fit this category description. Indeed some National Parks, particularly those in the United Kingdom which include private property within their borders, could not be categorised as Protected Areas at all under the IUCN classifications. Yet Category II is named ‘National Park’ as it most closely resembled National Parks in most countries (Dudley, 2008). Hall and Frost (2009b:310) warned there was minimal positive gain in developing a singular definition concluding:

A single definition may make for good accounting practice, but it also makes for bad management and implementation practice by those affected by National Parks. Instead, the capacity of the National Park meme to adapt to new environments while maintaining its core idea of both conservation and use, however paradoxical it may seem at times, should continue to be encouraged.
In Australia in 2002, there were around 547 declared National Parks; however there were 642 protected areas which fit the IUCN National Park definition, more than any other country in the world (Worboys et al., 2005). Therefore to identify National Parks for the purpose of this study, it has been decided to follow the example set in Hall and Frost (2009a), whereby National Park status is not determined by criteria or category, but by name. If a protected area has been entitled a ‘National Park,’ it must hold significance enough to its own nation’s values to have been declared so. Thus by fulfilling these standards, it will be considered a National Park here within this research.

Within academic literature on National Parks there has been debate about clearly differentiating between National Park tourism and recreational activities. In terms of management, many believe it may in fact be unnecessary as both revolve around visitors utilising the same space, facilities, resources and imposing similar impacts, and therefore both are predominantly controlled by PAMAs through their visitor management plans and strategies (McKercher, 1996; Tourism Victoria, 2008). However throughout legislation and academic literature, the two can be recognised independently. Recreational activities are commonly viewed as those undertaken voluntarily during leisure time and predominantly for pleasure, and in a National Park setting these are usually nature-based such as rock climbing, bushwalking or horse riding (Pigram & Jenkins, 2006). Within these parameters tourism can also be classed as a recreational activity. It is therefore necessary to further distinguish what tourism activities are. Worboys et al. (2005) adopted the World Tourism Organisation definition that tourism involved a person travelling a certain distance from home and included at least one overnight stay in their trip. The greater tourism industry facilitates this travel by providing transport, food, accommodation, tourist attractions and tours, all of which could occur within or close to National Park borders and could be provided by private or public operators. These facilities could also be used by recreationists. National Park visitors could therefore be divided into tourists (those travelling from a distance away for at least one night), and recreationists (those local residents visiting the National Park for a day) even if both undertake the same activity (Worboys et al., 2005).
An alternative method is to categorise National Park visitors along a continuum, measured by their individual emotional and value laden perceptions. The tourist at one end of the continuum defined as those who participate solely in commercial activity utilising tourism infrastructure and who hold less compatible environmental values to the National Park than the other end of the spectrum considered as recreationists who travel independently and engage in nature focused activities (McKercher, 1996). This typology potentially generates a negative perception that ‘tourists’ are visitors who have higher negative impacts, and there is evidence National Park management and other lead opinion stakeholders in National Parks have thought tourists were therefore the non-preferred visitor (McKercher, 1996; O’Neill AO, 2008). However there is also an alternative opinion that as ‘tourists’ remain in developed areas of a National Park, not entering the more sensitive natural areas, they may in fact cause less negative impact than nature-focused recreationists who venture into the less developed areas (McKercher, 1996).

Pigram’s (1983:184) offering on the recreation/tourist definition incorporates elements of both possible typologies, considering tourism as a function of recreation, but also considering the level of infrastructure different visitors may require:

Apart from emphasis on an alien environment somewhat removed from the place of residence, tourism is carried on within an essentially recreational framework. Differences then become a matter of degree and motivation with tourism calling for a more sophisticated infrastructure and tending towards the opposite end of a time-space-cost continuum to recreational travel.

Within general discussion, National Park visitors could be classed by both recreationists and tourists (Worboys et al., 2005). The main consideration of this thesis is to examine the regulation of commercial tourism within National Parks; visitors will therefore be distinguished only where necessary between those who travel independently, and those with a commercial tourism operator (CTO). Within a National Park a CTO is defined by Tourism Victoria (2008:78) as ‘an individual or organisation that conducts a tourism activity (for example, guided tour, special event or facility) that results in some degree of commercial return’. Commercial tourism is considered an all-inclusive term referring to any form of commercial tourism activity (facilitated or non-facilitated), while the infrastructure built to facilitate commercial tourism activities inside National Park borders
will be specifically identified in this study as commercial tourism development within a National Park (CTDNP).

Tourism in National Parks is as difficult to measure as it is to define. For monitoring purposes, Tourism Research Australia (2008) categorised tourists by activity, and considered any visitor to an Australian National Park as a nature-based tourist. An imprecise concept, nature-based tourism has at times been labelled as eco, responsible, green, alternative or sustainable tourism. Simply though, nature-based tourism can be considered as tourism involving the natural environment (Brake, 1988; Priskin, 2001) and therefore includes tourism in National Parks. There has been a general acceptance nature-based tourism has continued to be a rapidly, and perhaps even the fastest, growing sector of the global tourism industry (Newsome, Moore & Dowling, 2013) including in Australia (Worboys & Lockwood, 2007) where Tourism Australia’s (2012:1) large scale international research project into tourist motivations to travel to Australia revealed ‘Australia’s biggest strength is its world class nature’.

In the international tourism market, specific figures show in 2009 the ‘nature experience’ was the number one motivator for international visitors coming to Australia, with 3.3 million international nature-based travellers visiting in 2009, spending $19.5 billion, 64 percent of the total international travellers and growing at an average of 3 percent each year from 2005. There were 12.46 million domestic overnight nature-based travellers who spent $12.6 billion in 2009, with the most popular activities for both international and domestic tourists’ bushwalking and visiting a National Park (Driml, 2010). In 2012/2013 there were an estimated 34.8 million total visitors (both independent and commercial) to State and National Parks in the state of Victoria, generating $20.8 million in revenue (Parks Victoria, 2013). Tourism Victoria’s (2008) “Nature-based Tourism Strategy 2008-2012” reported 70-80 percent of commercial nature-based CTOs in Victoria held a licence or lease to conduct activities in Victorian National Park. There were 321 licensed CTOs (DSE, 2013a) who provided activities for 84,941 of these visitors, mainly bushwalking (44 percent), bus-tours (31 percent), bird-watching (21 percent) and coastal waling (16 percent) (Parks Victoria, 2013).
These statistics highlight the importance and growth of nature-based tourism to the Australian economy, and specifically the role of CTOs in National Parks. Eagles (2002) also listed Australia as a leader in nature-based tourism. Eagles (2002:132) posited that a successful nature-based tourism industry has ‘two fundamental components: (1) appropriate levels of environment quality, and (2) suitable levels of consumer service,’ both of which Australia provided. However he noted then, and others more recently, (Darcy & Wearing, 2009; Moore & Weiler, 2009; Weiler, Laing & Moore, 2007) that times are changing and the tourism structure in National Parks need more consideration to ensure continued quality nature-based tourism and conservation are delivered. McKercher (1993a) realised tourism activities, just like mining or logging, consumed and impacted natural resources in National Parks and therefore needed to be suitably regulated to manage impacts.

The frequently used analogy is that tourism in natural areas is a ‘double edged sword,’ (Behrens, Bednar-Friedl & Getzner, 2009) able to encourage and foster conservation with positive benefits such as health, community wellbeing, education, awareness, and economic development; while potentially having disastrous effects if not managed effectively. Overcrowding and inappropriate development can negatively affect local communities, the visitor experience itself, and environmental damage such as pollution, rubbish, erosion, and destruction and disturbance of habitat, inhibit conservation objectives (Worboys et al., 2005). The irony is nature-based tourism is based on the quality of its natural setting, but if mismanaged can destroy that asset, effectively leading to its own downfall, highlighting the need for effective tourism planning, regulation and management (Byrd, 2007; Folke, 2006; Newsome, Moore & Dowling, 2013).

The duality of National Parks and their importance to both tourism and conservation raises the contentious issue of what is considered an appropriate balance and well-managed CTDNP (Hewitt, 2010). On paper at least, conservation remains priority. As stated in Victoria’s Parks Victoria Act 1998, ‘in carrying out its functions Parks Victoria must not act in a way that is not environmentally sound.’ Similar requirements could be found in the Canadian National Park Act 2000 and the United Kingdom’s Association of National Park Authorities Sandford Principle (UK ANPA, 2008). In reality, the balance may be seen shifting as governments increasingly seek to realise the economic benefits
tourism activities in National Parks can bring (VCEC, 2011a; Munanura, Backman & Sabuhoro, 2013) and their public funding continues to decrease (Director of National Parks, 2010). State-based legislation and regulations imposed by governments and their PAMAs largely define and control how CTOs can carry out their tourism activities within the National Park system and at what economic and environmental costs (Buckley, 2011). It is the regulatory system controlling commercial tourism and the conservation and recreation balance inside of Victorian National Parks which will therefore be the focus of this research.

1.2 National Park Legislation, Regulation & Management

With no world governing body or agreed model, National Park management and regulatory strategies are developed independently for each system. The structure of CTDNP within each system is therefore unique, with varying levels of commercial involvement and tourism facilities. For example in America there has been a long history of CTO involvement and a high level CTDNP (Gross et al., 2009) whereas for other countries, such as New Zealand and Canada, they have only recently moved in this direction. In Australia the declaration and control of National Parks is the responsibility of state governments, all able to change legislation and control activities in National Parks under their care (Gross et al., 2009). All states and the Northern Territory have allowed limited forms of CTDNP, while up until 2013 this had been prohibited by Victorian legislation (Darby et al., 2013).

Nationally, the Australian government in its National Long-term Tourism Strategy, “Tourism 2020”, recognised the importance of establishing a national sustainable nature-based tourism industry for its economic, environmental and social benefits. Unique landscapes and nature-based attractions were recognised as a competitive advantage for Australia. The strategy also noted investment into new tourism ventures had been hindered due to inefficient regulations acting as a barrier to entry (Tourism Australia, 2011). Those ventures affected were typically accommodation and small to medium size tour operators seeking access to public land, including National Parks, concerning for Victoria given that small to medium enterprises make up the majority of Nature-Based Tourism providers (Tourism Victoria, 2008).
The Federal Government ordered a “Tourism Investment and Regulation Review.” In this review tourism was found to be a heavily regulated and largely misunderstood industry, fundamentally hindered by its fragmented structure. For example an accommodation facility needed to adhere to planning and building, food hygiene, liquor licensing, taxation, and occupational health and safety regulations, complex, costly and time consuming. It was also clearly established that ‘government policies, regulations and incentives have a significant impact on the tourism sector and can play a key role in encouraging tourism growth’ (L.E.K. Consulting, 2011:1). The review also concluded the Australian Government had focused too much on tourism demand, seeking out and strengthening markets, failing to adequately consider tourism supply by not encouraging and facilitating investment into appropriate tourism experiences. Regulatory reform recommendations were therefore made for state governments to create tourism development zones within their National Parks and to streamline application processes and costs for CTOs in an effort to improve Australia’s CTDNP and experience delivery (L.E.K. Consulting, 2011).

**Victorian National Park Tourism Policy, Legislation & Regulations**

There is a generally accepted public policy process by which governments create the policies, legislation and regulations by which we live. Government first identifies the key issues they believe need to be addressed in public interest. They establish the most desired outcomes for these issues and identify the possible courses of action that will deliver these outcomes. At this point some form of consultation by way of accepting submissions and feedback from a range of stakeholders is conducted, and analysed. The best course of action and outcome is then determined and communicated through a government policy. Legislation supporting the policy is put forward and once passed, implemented by allocating resources and putting policy instruments, such as regulation, into action. After implementation, evaluation of effectiveness is conducted and if needed changes can be made to improve outcomes (Fenna, 1998; Worboys et al., 2005).

Tourism in National Parks and the regulatory control of commercial tourism particularly, have been key policy issues in Victoria. The government has moved through this policy process influencing National Park tourism as outlined in Table 1.1 over four main areas: firstly, competition between public and private entities; secondly National Park tourism
and recreation policy; and thirdly licensing and permit systems. These first three reform areas seemed to be accepted by all stakeholders. It is the fourth and last area of review and regulatory reform increasing the length of CTO leases and encouraging private investment and tourism development inside National Parks which has brought strong debate from national Park stakeholders, and is therefore the focus of this research.

To date the policy process surrounding the issue has taken four years, outlined in Table 1.1 in the section ‘Victorian Tourism Industry Inquiry’ and in more detail in Appendix A (page 266). The complexity of the debate is apparent when considering the public nature of National Parks and the duality of their ethos to both protect and to be used. In addition, the decision-making processes surrounding commercial tourism in National Parks have become even more contentious as government has sought to increase the involvement and economic return from the tourism industry. The increasing involvement and influence of stakeholders within National Park decision making processes represents a change in the governance of these areas. Borrini-Feyerabend, Johnston and Pansky (2006:116) explained that “governance is about power, relationships, responsibility and accountability. It is about who has influence, who decides and how decision makers are held accountable.” It is important to realise then, governance is not the sole responsibility of the government, but increasingly involves those stakeholders with influence and power, such as the tourism industry in relation to decisions surrounding the regulation of commercial tourism within National Parks. In addition, Nkhata and Breen (2010) explained the failure to consider the various stakeholder opinions in determining the public interest can result in intense stakeholder conflict and potential policy failure (Foster, 2006; Nkhata & Breen, 2010; Slattery, 2002). This research explores these concepts by determining the stakeholder’s perceptions of regulatory efficacy surrounding commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks.
### Competition principles agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>State Government’s introduce competition policy: government legislation &amp; regulation should not restrict competition, except in the public interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Regulation of Commercial Activities in Victoria’s National Parks &amp; Melbourne Waterways (Allen Consulting Group, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Government Response to review released (DSE, 2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome**

National Parks remain public goods. Elements of National Park visitor services fall under this competition policy, where PAMAs cannot unfairly compete with CTOs.

### National Park tourism & recreation policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Sustainable Recreation &amp; Tourism on Victoria’s Public Land (DNRE, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Nature Based Tourism Strategy 2008-2012 (Tourism Victoria, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Policy review of NBT strategy initiated by the Labour government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome**

As yet, there has been no new policy from the Liberal government, however changes have been made during inquiries into the tourism industry as below.

### Licensing & permit system for CTOs in National Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Review &amp; implementation of licensing system managed by Parks Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Review of licensing system requested by Minister for the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Issues paper “Reforms to Public Land Tour Operator Licensing – Current Situation, Issues &amp; Policy Proposals” released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Stakeholder consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Directions paper released for public comment (DSE, 2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome**

Legislation came into effect 1st July, 2011 amending the *National Parks Act (1975)(Vic)*:

- Increase CTOs licence term to up to ten years if requirements met
- Introduce penalties for those breaching conditions or operating without a licence
- Increases of fees to be phased in up to 2014

### Victorian tourism industry inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2010</td>
<td>Victorian Labour Government Treasurer appoints Victorian Completion &amp; Efficiency Commission to conduct an inquiry into the regulatory system &amp; other potential barriers to Victoria’s tourism industry, opens submission period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>Draft report released “Unlocking Victorian Tourism” &amp; further submission period open until April 2011 (VCEC, 2011b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>Final report released “Unlocking Victorian Tourism: An Inquiry into Victoria’s Tourism Industry” (VCEC, 2011a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>“Tourism Investment Opportunities of Significance in National Parks: Guidelines” released to guide Expressions of Interest process (DSE, 2013b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2013</td>
<td><em>National Parks Amendment (Leasing Powers &amp; Other Matters) Bill 2013</em> passed. NP Minister to approve private investment &amp; leases up to 99 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome**

Streamline the approval process for development on public land. Further guidelines & regulations for these leases are yet to be released.
In 2010 the then Labour Victorian Treasurer requested the Victorian Competition and Efficiency Commission (VCEC) ‘to conduct an inquiry into Victoria’s tourism industry’ (VCEC, 2011a:vi). There was a particular focus on Victorian National Parks as at the time they were receiving the highest number of visitors than any other state/territory National Park system, yet returning the least yield. The VCEC inquiry accepted submissions from stakeholders and engaged in a stakeholder consultation process. Their report was released in 2011 stating that Victorian National Parks were not realising their full tourism potential, and were in a unique position to be further developed to capture the growing Indian and Chinese markets (VCEC, 2011a).

Conservation groups responded negatively to the VCEC inquiry. The strongest voice heard was perhaps the Victorian National Parks Association’s (VNPA) Matt Ruchel. He believed the review was largely pressured by commercial tourism lobby groups and therefore taken from an economic perspective, rather than conservation. The VNPA (2012b) supported commercial tourism in the form of eco-tours; however their submission clearly outlined their stance that any new larger infrastructure should be developed outside National Park borders, as per Tourism Victoria’s (2008) “Victorian Nature-Based Tourism Strategy” (VNPA, 2011a). The Victorian tourism industry supported the potential for regulatory reform. They feared the inefficient and outdated regulatory system was reducing their ability to keep up with the growing demand for nature-based tourism and development of a sustainable industry. For example Roger Grant, head of the regional tourism body responsible for the iconic Twelve Apostles in Victoria, believed tourists to his area were unsatisfied with tourism facilities. He noted, due to regulations, visitor facilities had been restricted to a large toilet block, leaving the nature-based experience lacking and not being able to compete with the likes of the Grand Canyon National Park (Stewart, 2012).

In 2009 Parks Victoria removed National Park entry fees in an effort to increase visitation and generate income for regional communities through tourism, but the VCEC (2011b) inquiry recommended CTDNP would better facilitate tourism activity and increase economic generation for both surrounding communities and Parks Victoria. They presented successful eco-tourism accommodation ventures in Queensland, Western Australia, Tasmania, South Australia, and the best practice regulatory system in New
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Zealand, as examples of what they considered good National Park tourism development. Inquiry leader Deborah Cox stated ‘the Commission does not agree with the current regulatory scheme, which effectively assumes that tourism related developments must be incompatible with environmental, heritage and other social outcomes’ (VCEC, 2011c:1).

In November 2010, the Liberal Party was voted in to lead Victoria’s government and their response to the VCEC inquiry was released in August 2012 supporting the majority of the recommendations (DTF, 2012). Government agreed public land regulations were inhibiting future prospects in growth for the tourism industry, particularly for regional areas and Asian markets. Despite opposition from the VNPA, the National Parks Amendment (Leasing Powers and Other Matters) Bill 2013 was passed allowing private investment and CTDNP, granting leases for up to 99 years. This signalled a new direction for the Victorian Government who released “Tourism Investment Opportunities of Significance in National Parks: Guidelines” (DSE, 2013b) to guide all future Expression of Interest (EOI) processes. In 2013 they called for EOI for Point Nepean National Park, and began accepting proposals for commercial investment and CTDNP of existing and potentially new infrastructure. The Environment Minister was to consider the compatibility of each proposal with National Park values and the existing Point Nepean National Park Management Plan. As proposals were accepted, more detailed guidelines, lease terms and conditions were to be developed to manage the balance of the CTDNP with conservation (DEPI, 2014).

Whether or not commercial tourism can be developed inside National Parks in line with conservation objectives has been an ongoing theme within both public and academic debate. Within academic literature both Butler (2000) and Eagles and McCool (2002) argued tourism could be a beneficial and sustainable industry supporting conservation objectives if managed and regulated effectively. There has remained however a resilient opposition (Figgis, 1999). What is agreed upon is that if National Parks are to successfully fulfil their many responsibilities, there needs to be a cooperative effort between the various stakeholders, including: government departments; PAMAs; CTOs; interest groups; surrounding communities; and even the tourists and visitors themselves, to understand what National Park values are to be upheld, and within this ethos what is acceptable commercial tourism (Visconti, 1998; Worboys & Lockwood, 2007).
In Victoria, stakeholder opinions of the legislation changes allowing CTDNP were divided. Addressing stakeholder concerns could be an important step in developing suitable regulations and gaining support for CTDNP; the regulatory reform; and its successful implementation. What is undeniable is that now that the 2013 legislation has passed to allow CTDNP, the efficacy of the regulatory strategies that will control these developments will become crucial to managing and delivering conservation and recreation objectives.

1.3 Research Framework

National Park regulatory strategies have predominantly been addressed in tourism management literature as methods or techniques used to control visitor impacts on the environment and to enhance the visitor experience (Eagles & McCool, 2002; Worboys et al., 2005). More recently, the regulation of CTOs in National Parks has been addressed in the growing literature on public/private partnerships (PPPs). Here regulations have been found to be a source of frustration to CTO business activity and the ability to develop successful partnerships between PAMAs and CTOs (Moore et al., 2009; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). Despite these findings, to date there has been little empirical research of the National Park regulatory system controlling commercial tourism, and that which does exist has a limited theoretical framework, inhibiting the ability to generate theoretical discussion or conclusions. Hjalager (1996) is one exception. She identified sustainable tourism management strategies from tourism literature and then extended her study by classifying these techniques into a regulatory strategy framework outlined by Ouchi (1980) (bureaucracy/government regulatory strategies; market forces; and clans/self-regulation). This framework was used to analyse how these regulatory strategies affect innovation in the tourism industry of Denmark. The advantage of utilising regulatory theory here is that Hjalager (1996) was able to draw upon both tourism management literature and regulatory literature in discussion of results and further recommendations.
A clear gap in the literature exists for a comprehensive review of National Park commercial tourism regulatory strategies incorporating regulatory theory. The framework for this thesis was designed to begin to fill this gap by following the method outlined in Hjalager (1996), by identifying the existing management strategies used to regulate CTO behaviour in National Parks from the literature (Buckley, 2011; Eagles & McCool, 2002; Eagles, McCool & Haynes, 2002; Hill & Pickering, 2002; Kuo; 2002; More, 2002; Newsome, Moore & Dowling, 2013; Worboys et al., 2005), and then categorising these into a well-regarded and comprehensive regulatory framework outlined in Baldwin, Cave & Lodge (2011): (1) control and command; (2) incentives; (3) market harnessing controls; (4) disclosure; (5) direct action and design; (6) rights and liabilities laws; (7) public compensation/social insurance; and (8) self-regulation.

In addition to regulatory strategies, this research considered stakeholder National Park values and their National Park objectives. Several studies concluded that it may be the values, perceptions, beliefs and attitudes towards National Parks, the environment and tourism which cause conflict between stakeholders (Crowley, 1997; Darcy & Wearing, 2009; McKercher, 1997; Munro, King & Polonsky, 2006; Slattery; 2002). The precise constructs of a person’s psychology was beyond the scope of this study. However understanding what beliefs were held about tourism and the value placed on National Parks, has given an insightful dimension to previous studies in determining stakeholders attitudes toward tourism development and potentially their perception of regulatory efficacy. Perhaps most importantly it was necessary to identify each stakeholder’s idea of what were National Park objectives. Ultimately stakeholder perceptions of regulatory efficacy related to how each stakeholder perceived how efficient and effective regulations would be in achieving their desired outcomes and objectives for National Parks.
Case Study Methodology

Victorian National Parks are managed under a state regulatory system. Further to this, 42 of the 45 National Parks within the system have their own Management Plan with specific regulatory conditions (DSE, 2013a). This structure of the National Park system lent itself suitable to Yin’s (2009) embedded case study research design, whereby the overriding Victorian National Park system was the primary unit for the case study and three individual National Parks were chosen as sub-units to ensure a deeper understanding of the case was obtained (Figure 1.1). The three National Parks were chosen on the basis of their high level of potential tourism development and their presence in the current debate over regulatory reform. The debate over private investment and commercial tourism in Victoria’s National Parks developed over the time this research study was conducted. The number of stakeholders and the value-laden nature of the issue added to the complexity of the research setting. Appendix A (page 266) outlines the timeline of events and the corresponding data collection conducted to gain a comprehensive representation of the case study.

Figure 1.1: Map of Victorian National Parks & research sites

(DEPI, 2006)
Research Outline
Within National Parks, sustainable tourism development is not only desirable, but essential to achieving both National Park tourism and conservation objectives and thus it remains a large focus of National Park tourism research. As Butler and Boyd (eds, 2000:14) and Eagles and McCool (2002) observed due to the dynamic nature of tourism, National Park management responses to tourism have largely been reactive and *ad hoc* in providing ‘solutions to long term issues’. A critical issue for Australian National Parks has been their dwindling government funding and resources which have seen them turn to commercial enterprise to provide tourism services and generate income (Figgis, 1999). This recent shift of government focus to private/public partnerships in National Parks has motivated research to move in this direction (Buckley & Sommer, 2001; De Lacy et al., 2002; Griffin & Vacaflores, 2004; Laing et al., 2009; Moore et al., 2009; Weiler, Laing, & Moore 2007; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). Regulations have been identified in much of this research as a barrier to successful partnerships and National Park outcomes, yet remains largely overlooked in further research. Further to this, Eagles (2013) listed the regulatory structures which control these partnerships (licences, permits, and leases) as a priority for National Park tourism research. Bramwell (2005) believed generating a better understanding of policy instruments would aid in better tourism policy outcomes. This study attempted to fill this literature gap, by exploring government regulation of commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks, and how stakeholders perceived its efficacy in controlling potential issues and delivering positive outcomes.

The regulatory issue at hand within the Victoria National Park system was certainly worthy of further investigation. In essence this was a pivotal time in Victoria’s National Park history, with critical decisions being made which determined how tourism would be developed and controlled in the future. There was not only value in recording these changes, but exploring deeper into the constructs of the regulations and how stakeholders viewed these changes. As has been firmly established, tourism has been a fundamental element within National Park systems from their establishment, and continued partnership with CTOs can be both beneficial and in some sense inevitable. How commercial tourism is regulated to ensure it is sustainable and respectful to Victorian National Park values and objectives is critical, and has not been seriously explored within academic literature. With these considerations in mind, the following research aim and questions were developed:
Research Aim
The aim of this study is to explore the efficacy of current, proposed and potential regulatory strategies used to control commercial tourism in the Victorian National Park system from a stakeholder perspective.

Research Questions
1. How do stakeholder’s value and perceive:
   a. The role of National Parks in Victoria; and
   b. The role of commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks?
2. How do stakeholders perceive the efficacy of existing, proposed and potential regulatory strategies controlling commercial tourism within Victorian National Parks?

Delimitations
This study involved analysing stakeholder perceptions. It is important to note it was not the aim of this study, or within its scope, to conduct a comprehensive stakeholder analysis of the National Park tourism system, deciphering networks and power orientation of interest groups and exploring the shift in governance. Further to this, as each National Park system is unique to its circumstances, research results reflect the Victorian National Park system at the time the study was completed. Generalised contributions to National Park tourism research and theoretical discussions were done so with respect to the unique circumstances of the case study.

1.4 Summary
This introductory chapter has outlined the historical context of National Park creation and the complexity and importance of balancing conservation and tourism within these systems through government regulation. The specific issue of commercial tourism within Victoria National Parks was explained in order to justify the need for the study. The research framework, objectives and questions were outlined. The following chapter provides a further chronological exploration of National Park creation and values within Victoria, with respect to previous research and literature; followed by a detailed analysis of studies containing National Park regulatory strategies and of the broader regulatory literature. Further chapters explain the research methodology, present the research results, and provide conclusions and explain the contributions of the study.
The relationship between National Parks, tourism and conservation has been firmly established from the beginning of the National Park idea; however as a research focus it is relatively new (Hall, 2000). The two entities were subjects treated separately until Butler and Boyd (eds, 2000) composed the foremost in-depth work in this area in 2000 with their book “Tourism and National Parks: Issues and Implications”. Previously tourism and its impacts, including those within the natural environment were investigated, and research into National Parks well documented; however research into the complexities of the relationship between tourism and National Parks was lacking. Since 2000, National Park tourism research and literature has continued mainly in the form of developing visitor and resource management techniques to ensure tourism is developed to both enhance the visitor experience and contribute to local economies while ensuring environmental impacts are controlled and conservation achieved (for example: Eagles & McCool, 2002; Newsome, Moore & Dowling, 2013; Worboys et al., 2005).

In Australia there has been a recent shift in National Park structure toward creating PPPs between government, management agencies and commercial tourism operators (CTOs) in order to capitalise on tourism potential. Research into how to best manage these partnerships has emerged throughout the last decade, and interest into how government should control partnership outcomes has become of interest. This thesis examined stakeholder’s perceptions of the relationship between Victorian National Parks’ legislated objectives and commercial tourism development from a government regulatory perspective. The first section of this chapter presents a chronological history outlining the evolution of the Victorian Government National Park policy, discussing stakeholder values and input into how tourism in National Parks has been controlled in order to achieve their objectives. The second section provides a theoretical discussion of regulatory literature pertaining to National Park tourism in order to establish a suitable framework for the conduct of this study.
2.1 Victorian National Park Stakeholders

**Land Protection Values: 1800 - 1951**

In Victoria the early colonial settlers saw wilderness as inhospitable, to be conquered and its natural resources exploited for their human progress. From this time to the 1950’s, any land protection Acts by government were predominantly aimed at ensuring a long-term sustainable use of these resources, such as the *Lands Act 1862* (Vic) which controlled logging of forests. Some areas were protected for recreation under the legislation of the *Wasteland Act 1842* (Vic), but only after this land had been deemed ‘worthless’ for any other purpose or possibility of economic generation (Hall, 2000). The Victorian Railway Department utilised protected recreational areas to promote train based leisure travel, producing an annual publication “*Picturesque Victoria and How to get there*.” The unforeseen and welcoming economic value tourism generated from these ‘wastelands’ would become a strong argument for natural area protection long into the future (Anderson, 2000; Hall, 1992).

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, conservation issues were featured in Australia’s media, generating public interest and soon organised naturalist groups began to appear (Worboys et al., 2005). Groups such as the Field Naturalist Club of Victoria created in 1880, and the Royal Society of Victoria, were interested in the scientific elements of Australia’s flora and fauna, spending time hunting and collecting samples. Fortunately sketches and photographs replaced the need for guns, and they began to see the uniqueness and vulnerability of the Victorian environment, realising the importance of its protection for future generations. Recreation groups also formed around this time, such as the Melbourne Amateur Walking and Touring club in 1894. Artists, poets and writers were also beginning to appreciate the unique nature of Australia, romanticising it in their works. Influenced by these groups, the hostility of the colonial community toward wilderness slowly changed to appreciation (Anderson, 2000; Hall, 1992; Worboys et al., 2005).

Naturalists of the time lobbied government for general conservation values to be upheld, but this was largely unsuccessful as the government did not hold environmental protection as a priority. A more successful approach was those campaigns based on
science and which formally petitioned government to protect specific areas, as opposed to a general conservation policy (Anderson, 2000; Worboys et al., 2005). These campaigns lead to the establishment of Victoria’s first National Park, Tower Hill, under the Tower Hill Act 1892 (Vic). National Park status and protection was later revoked from Tower Hill when the government wanted to quarry its volcanic material (Black & Breckwoldt, 1977). Naturalist groups and local resident groups continued to push for protection of areas they were personally associated with, and by 1898 six areas including the Grampians, Wilson’s Promontory and Ferntree Gully were granted protection as land reserved for National Parks through amendments to the Lands Act 1862 (Vic) (Hall, 1992).

In 1901 the Commonwealth of Australia was inaugurated. By this time Australian states had well established independent land management systems and therefore fought hard, and successfully to retain their land rights along with control and ownership of natural resources. As a result, Australia did not have a national conservation plan for protected lands or resources, but left this responsibility to individual State Governments. Concerned more about long-term natural resource supply than conservation, the priority for the Victorian Government continued to be the State Forest system creating the Forests Act 1907 (Vic) to formally establish a State Forest Department. However there remained no policies, management or funding for conservation or National Parks within Victoria (Anderson, 2000; Worboys et al., 2005).

The few Victorian National Parks in existence in the early 1900’s were managed by local council and volunteer committees. With no government funding they were forced to lease out areas of the National Parks to grazers or sell timber to fund maintenance, essentially destroying the area they were bound to protect. Some National Parks, such as the Dandenong’s, Grampians and Yarra Ranges were popular tourist attractions. Road access and accommodation facilities were built and income from tourism obtained (Anderson, 2000; Hall, 1992). As the economy improved after the Depression and an increase in leisure time, money, and car ownership occurred, National Park visitation rose. Bushwalking groups joined in petitioning government for greater protection of natural areas for recreation on the basis of aesthetic and spiritual values, and called for the end to cattle grazing and logging in reserved areas. The Victorian State Government continued
to prioritise settlement needs for natural resources over recreation and conservation, continuing to grant protection only to those areas deemed worthless, illustrated perhaps most strongly in their refusal to protect the north-east Alpine region from logging and grazing, despite strong calls for a National Park to be established there for both recreational and ecological reasons (Anderson, 2000; Hall, 1992).

**Developing the Victorian National Park System: 1952-1990**

From 1952, the conservation movement became more organised and pushed government for more environmental protection. Concerned about the deteriorating condition and lack of funding for Victoria’s National Parks, various interest groups such as naturalist groups, bushwalking groups, tourist groups, and conservation groups met to discuss how to best manage these areas. In 1952 representatives from these groups formed the Victorian National Park Association (VNPA), in order to better articulate their objectives through one voice, and lobbied government successfully to establish a government funded PAMA. The first Victorian National Parks Authority (NPA) was established by the Victorian National Parks Act 1956 (Anderson, 2000).

The NPA promoted both the physical and mental health benefits of recreation in natural areas to gain government funding (Anderson, 2000). Tourism was seen as ‘the lesser of many development evils’ and was used as a justification to encourage government protection of areas of natural significance (Hall, 2000:36). National Parks continued to be popular destinations for recreationists of all types; rock-climbers, artists; family campers; bushwalkers and naturalists. As numbers increased, the duality of tourism was being realised. More visitors resulted in more income from car parking fees; however it also meant a greater need for more facilities. Toilets, fences, signage, water, larger car parks, bins, walking tracks, brochures and picnic and camping areas all drained National Park funding. Visitor behaviour was a new concern, intoxicated campers disturbing other visitors; vandalism and theft; illegal logging; rubbish dumping; all increased the need for greater management presence in National Parks (Anderson, 2000; Worboys et al., 2005).

As visitation increased and funding stagnated, the challenge of managing the delicate balance between conservation and tourism was becoming more apparent. The NPA
needed to determine and manage the appropriate level of visitor facilities, and find ways
to fund them. Leases were granted to CTOs in two National Parks in order to build and
provide tourist facilities. At Wilsons Promontory National Park there were plans to build
a chalet and motel accommodation for 600 guests, conference facilities, and housing for
200 staff with power supply, water supply and sanitation to be developed. In Mt. Buffalo
National Park there were plans to flood thirty-five acres of the Bogong Plains to build a
five storey hotel. After in-depth discussion between NPA, government departments and
the lease holders, it became clear the lessee’s were unaware of the conservation aspects to
National Parks and unprepared to manage the potential environmental damage they would
cause. With urging from the NPA, both contracts were cancelled by government
(Anderson, 2000).

The NPA went on to build and manage smaller accommodation facilities themselves
within Wilsons Promontory National Park. The incident prompted them to address their
concerns of private development in their Annual Report 1963-1964:

The Authority has come to recognise all too clearly that ‘private enterprise’
means what it says - ‘private’ and ‘enterprise’. To be successful from the
viewpoint of those providing the capital, restrictions must be minimal, and the
task of controlling the development so as not to despoil the park is a
continuing one for the Authority, nor will it end soon. It is the very essence of
a commercial enterprise that its success must ultimately be expressed in
financial reward, and all activities must be hastened and promoted to that end.
It is difficult... under these circumstances for the welfare of the park to be
kept in sharp focus... and indeed it is too much to expect that a commercial
enterprise will even understand the factors which need to be considered in
order that a park may not suffer unduly. The Authority recognises the value of
tourism as a stimulus to the economy, as a cultural medium and as a means of
promoting a better understanding between the people of the world. But within
a National Park the tourism must always be subservient to the main objective
– preservation of the natural environment. Tourism uncontrolled would soon
destroy the very amenity on which it was fostered, tourism controlled will
provide for continuance of the natural features and tourist enjoyment. The
Authority believes the association between private enterprise and National
Parks will be satisfactory only if the Authority remains in complete control
It was not until the 1960’s and the global rise of the environmental movement, that National Parks were established for their intrinsic environmental value in Victoria (Hall, 1992). Larger conservation groups were formed at this time (Hall, 2000) with the Australian Conservation Foundation created in 1965 and the Conservation Council of Victoria in 1969 (Anderson, 2000). Two significant and influential environmental battles of this time led the movement; the fight to protect Lake Pedder in South West Tasmania, gaining international attention, and protecting Little Desert in Victoria’s west from agricultural development (Hall, 1992). Both these areas were to be used for government economic gain through resource development and therefore, as they were not ‘worthless,’ they were not considered protectable for conservation or recreation purposes. Conservationists adopted protest methods such as educating the greater public to gain community support and direct action such as rally’s and blockades (Worboys et al., 2005) responsible for exposing the importance of environmental protection to the greater Australian public (Anderson, 2000; Hall, 1992).

In Victoria, protecting the Little Desert became a significant symbol to a population becoming more aware of the effects of pollution and the importance of quality of life. It officially set environmental protection as a political issue with the government losing a seat due to the backlash of its development plans for the area. This led them to finally declare Little Desert National Park in 1968 and include a section on conservation for the first time into their policy speech for the upcoming 1970 State election (Anderson, 2000). Anderson (2000:125) reported ‘from 1970 onward there was a plethora of legislation, both state and federal, concerned with conservation and affecting National Parks directly and indirectly.’

During the Little Desert event, it became clear that the power of land use decisions were essentially held with one minister, a situation which was now unsatisfactory to the public (Worboys et al., 2005). In response to public pressure, the State Government created the Land Conservation Council (LCC) under the Land Conservation Act 1970 (Vic) to investigate Victoria’s crown land and make suitable recommendations for its future use in order to better balance conservation and development (Anderson, 2000). A systematic assessment of all state land was undertaken and recommendations were made based on the gathering of scientific and biophysical data (Worboys et al., 2005). Rather than
previous politically based land decisions, the LCC had a formal process to consider input from a range of stakeholders, including farmers, business, conservation and local communities in order to better discuss options and to avoid a repeat of Little Desert (Anderson, 2000).

The LCC defined a National Park as an ‘extensive area(s) of public land of nation-wide significant because of outstanding natural features and diverse land types, set aside primarily to provide enjoyment, education, and inspiration in natural environments’ (Anderson, 2000:126). During its operational years (1971-1997), the dramatic increase in protected area declaration from 3 percent of Victoria’s land to 15 percent, was largely due to the bipartisan support for the LCC (Worboys et al., 2005). Worboys et al. (2005:147) noted ‘no other Australian state or territory has had such an influential or wide ranging planning process specifically dealing with public land use.’ LCC prioritised conservation, believing protected areas held intrinsic value, a vital representation of Victoria’s ecosystems providing essential habitat for flora and fauna. To ensure protection they recommended confining tourism facilities to small areas of National Parks, closing some tracks throughout wilderness areas within National Parks to limit visitor use to support this standpoint (Anderson, 2000).

The Department of State Development was created by the 1970 State Government to balance the ongoing development of industry, immigration, tourism and National Parks. The new Minister disbanded the existing NPA declaring its existing members of representatives from government departments were now too busy and acted mainly in self-interest. Through the National Parks Act 1970 (Vic) and the State Development Act 1970 (Vic) a new Victorian National Parks Advisory Committee (VNPAC) made up of representatives from a variety of stakeholders, and a Victorian National Park Service (VNPS) to manage the operations of the National Park system, were implemented. Globally the importance of National Parks, environmental conservation and tourism were becoming increasingly recognised. The VNPS Director attended the second IUCN World Conference on National Parks in 1972, and believed Victoria was in line with the majority of IUCN recommendations for National Park management of the time. For the newly created VNPS however, the next few decades were times of constant upheaval as conservation and land management responsibilities were continuously changing within
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the State Government. In 1982 in an effort to break down the ongoing conflict between VNPS and the State Forest Commission, the two were merged under a Department of Conservation, Forest and Lands. In 1986 VNPS merged with the Fisheries and Wildlife Service to become the Victorian National Park and Wildlife Service (VNPWS). Pressure intensified as the workload was continually increased with more National Parks declared and increases in visitor numbers (Anderson, 2000).

Noteworthy and considerable changes were made to legislation increasing the responsibility of the VNPS in the Victorian National Park Act 1975 which remains the current National Park legislation. The Act converted remaining volunteer management committees to advisory committees only, giving full management responsibility to the VNPS and updated the National Park definition to a ‘certain Crown land characterised by its predominantly unspoiled landscape and its flora, fauna or other features and should be reserved and preserved and protected permanently for the benefit of the public’ (Victorian National Park Act 1975:1). The public were not all supportive of the National Park system. Surrounding communities and local farmers doubted the ability of the VNPS, believing National Parks were breeding grounds for vermin and fire hazards. In 1975-76 the VNPS saw some improvement in government support and were able to overcome these difficulties with a strong effort in stakeholder consideration and a show of good management (Anderson, 2000).

The VNPS recognised community support as essential to a strong National Park system, community values influence government action and funding, and embraced their new motto ‘Parks are for people to use and enjoy’ (Anderson, 2000:132). Community support increased by creating ‘Friends of’ National Park groups who volunteered time to carry out revegetation projects, weed control, pest eradication, and rubbish removal. Concerned individuals and other community groups, including conservation groups, recreation groups, four-wheel drive clubs, walking clubs, bird watch watching, Scouts, Guides, and Lions volunteered their time for track maintenance, and flora and fauna monitoring (Anderson, 2000). National Park planning became a strong focus and the VNPS utilised recreation literature which had developed visitor management frameworks. They adopted the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (Clarke & Stankey, 1979) to plan and provide a variety of quality visitor activities while minimising visitor and environmental conflict.
The VNPS implemented a range of other management techniques to minimise visitor environmental impacts and enhance visitor experience (Anderson, 2000) such as zoning (Carr, 2002) interpretation (Ham, 2007), and carrying capacity (Cole, 2001). Restrictions on activities raised questions of the most appropriate management strategies and uses of National Park resources (Grandage & Rodd, 1981). There was an emerging perception National Parks may better protect natural and cultural assets by limiting visitation. However human activity created and added value to National Parks and a fundamental objective was to provide these areas for recreational use (Eagles & McCool, 2002). Eagles and McCool (2002:16) stated National Park ‘value assessment is fundamentally a political, not a scientific, process.’ Ultimately needs, wants and values of visitors and public and private interests determine National Park usage, after which government and management bodies need to establish suitable plans of how this is to best be achieved. A more constructive debate was then what recreational activities should be allowed in National Parks and how management can plan to ensure they are conducted, controlled and regulated to ensure a sustainable use of resources.

The creation of National Park policy, regulations and management to this point was largely influenced by the values of conservation and recreation groups. In an early National Park study, Turner (1981) analysed the history and existence of these groups in the New South Wales (NSW) National Park system; the study research implications are worthy of mention. National Parks were public goods, to this point not influenced by market pressures, but interest groups and lobbyists who persuade politicians to enact policies which support their group’s values and beliefs of the most appropriate use or management of National Park resources. This scenario is evident in the majority of National Park systems, including NSW and Victoria. Turner (1981) proposed stakeholder values and beliefs could be described through an individual’s National Park ‘image,’ built up by their desired and accepted National Park resource use activities, and their environmental attitudes. Images can represent a spectrum of environmental attitudes, from the colonial approach of exploiting and valuing resources for their human use (anthropocentric), to the ecological approach protecting landscape for its intrinsic value (eco-centric)(Table 2.1).
Table 2.1: National Park stakeholders (NSW 1879-1979)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Images &amp; values in policy making</th>
<th>Environmental images held by society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colonial (anthropocentric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadian (Park making)</td>
<td>Pioneering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Wise-use’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecological (eco-centric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romantic (aesthetic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Major actors promoting images    |                                  |
| Trustees of National Parks       | Graziers and other primary industries | Soil conservation and Water Resource Development Lobbies |
|                                  | Bushwalkers                         |
|                                  | Nature Conservationists and Organised Science |

(Based on Turner, 1981:158)

In NSW Turner (1981) placed conservation and outdoor recreation groups at the eco-centric end of the scale, protecting nature and utilising it for ‘self-reliant’ forms of recreation. These groups had been largely responsible for inspiring a shift in societal environmental values toward natural protection and creating a political climate which supported National Park creation. Now, however, Turner (1981) criticised them for not keeping up with the increased interest and variety of outdoor recreation activities and therefore not adequately addressing the issue of how to best manage the balance of conservation and the increasing visitor use of National Parks. He found elite opinion leaders were distinct to all other visitor groups and believed this indicated the loudest voices to date influencing National Park policy, were not representative of the general population nor in fact the majority of National Park visitors. Turner (1981) proposed this may have resulted in National Park management not offering the recreational opportunities the wider community desired, such as car recreation, which largely conflicted with the conservation group and elite opinion leader values.

During the 1980’s, research and literature detailing negative tourism impacts increased. Whereas previously academic literature had advocated for tourism (Jafari, 1990), works such as Mathieson and Wall’s (1982) respected text “Tourism: economic, physical and social impacts”, encouraged better management of its negative social and environmental impacts. The industry, and tourists themselves, began to move away from the mass tourism style of travelling to alternative types of tourism which considered and focused
on the cultural and environmental aspects of a destination, increasing the popularity of tourism in natural areas. Scientific research into tourism and its impacts continued to mature into the 1990’s, and greater information allowed the industry to be developed and managed on a greater knowledge-based platform from this point (Jafari, 1990). Concepts such as ‘sustainable tourism’ evolved, and so too nature-based tourism, adventure tourism and ecotourism in an attempt to provide tourism in a responsible manner (Weaver, 2001).

It could be argued it was at this point the tourism industry began to take a much more concerned and active interest in National Park policy and management. As government funding remained insufficient, National Park management engaged CTOs as both an alternative source of income and to ease the pressure of having to provide tourism facilities themselves. A gap in the market for CTOs to provide these new trends in tourism in National Parks opened up then for two main reasons: the increase in demand for nature-based, adventure and eco-tourism; and the limited resources and knowledge of National Park management to provide the quality tourism experience the market was now calling for (Darcy & Wearing, 2009; Figgis, 1999). Tourism industry groups entered the National Park policy arena, putting forward an alternative viewpoint from conservation groups who had dominated discussions.

The relationship between National Parks and tourism, and the balance between conservation and visitor use, became more complex with the added consideration of managing the public/private relationship. Within the National Park setting, nominal government funding saw the growing nature of dependency between public and private sectors to deliver National Park tourism, meant achieving objectives would rely upon a co-operative relationship between the two. Carter (1996:27) extended ‘as it is highly unlikely that major changes in the level of government spending on nature conservation will occur in Australia in the foreseeable future, the question therefore is not ‘should the private sector be involved in protected areas’ but rather ‘how and when’.
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The ‘how and when’ of involving the private sector in public National Parks proved difficult to define and implement. Ultimately, the structure and nature of the public/private relationship was determined and managed by government public policy and National Park management agencies (Eagles, McCool & Haynes, 2002). Policy makers were now experiencing a new set of pressures which they needed to adapt to. The Victorian National Park system went through a difficult decade in trying to progress through these issues between 1990-2000. Figgis (1999) identified the key influences and associated issues on developing government National Park policy during this time in a discussion paper put together for the Australian Committee for the IUCN which included: firstly the changes in management structure and shrinking size of government; secondly the increase of nature-based tourism demand and interest of CTO in National Parks; thirdly the increasingly anthropocentric value of nature; and finally the economic pressure placed on National Park management. These influences are discussed here individually, with respect to Figgis (1999) who described them as an interconnected wave of change which fundamentally shifted how National Parks were managed and by whom.

National Park Management Structure: 1990-2000

Victoria’s political, economic and social system comprised of both the private and public sectors. The ‘public sector’ consisted of a government and parliament voted in by the eligible public. Also referred to as the ‘state,’ the public sector is ‘responsible for pursuing the common good on behalf of its citizens’ (Worboys et al., 2005:47) and does this by developing and implementing public policy. The concept of public policy can be difficult to define. A common acknowledgment is given to Dye (1992:2) who stated policy is ‘whatever governments choose to do or not to do’ (Scott, 2011). Further explanation can be taken from Brooks (1993:12) who stated policy ‘involves conscious choice that leads to deliberate action, the passage of law, the pending of money, an official speech or gesture, or some other observable act, or inaction’. Finally Hall and Jenkins (1995) offer public policy as the ‘government action, inaction, decisions, and non-decisions, as it implies a deliberate choice between alternatives. Seen in this way, public policy is a process’.
Ultimately National Parks were created through this process. The government determined desired outcomes, and created and actioned policy, legislation, and regulation in order to achieve them. Government policy further determined the ongoing legal protection status of National Parks, their allocated public funding, National Park management structure and management resources in order to continue the achievement of these outcomes (Worboys et al., 2005). Management functions are generally seen as the planning, organising, leading and controlling of resources, both human and technical, in order to achieve objectives (Worboys et al., 2005). Victoria’s National Park managing agency was therefore responsible for the management of National Parks and their allocated resources on behalf of the Victorian Government to achieve their legislated objectives to conserve natural and cultural heritage, and to provide natural areas for recreation, tourism, education and research for the Victorian public.

Historically in Victoria, National Park policy and management was strongly influenced by internal and external forces and was ever changing as new governments were voted in, departments changed and new lobbyist groups formed (Anderson, 2000). There was pressure from public constituents, as Eagles and McCool (2002) attested a government acted only when there was enough public and private interest to produce such a desired outcome. For National Parks this means there had to be enough community and industry support to encourage government to divert public funds and resources away from other needs such as health, education or safety, to those of environmental conservation and natural areas for recreation. This was perhaps most evident in the 1960’s with the rise of the global environmental movement and Little Desert issue in Victoria which ultimately set conservation as a key policy agenda issue and led the public to demand a greater influence of how public land is used (Anderson, 2000). In the early 1990’s, community support for environmental protection was swayed by Australia’s recession, with lobbyist from logging groups for example, protesting employment in their industry should take priority over conservation (Figgis, 1999).

The ‘private sector comprises of individuals, companies, and the mechanisms for exchanging goods and services’ which allowed people to acquire their necessities and wants for life within their means (Worboys et al., 2005:47). In Victorian National Parks private sector CTOs provided visitors with increased tourist facilities, those which the
public sector did not have the resources or perhaps the expertise to provide. CTOs were not constrained by the reliance on government funding, and could therefore innovate and provide better quality and more efficient tourist facilities responding faster to market demands, especially those of the maturing nature-based tourism sector (Eagles, McCool & Haynes, 2002). The ‘market’ is the ‘set of rules, and institutions that facilitate orderly exchange of goods, to the benefit of both the buyers (consumers) and sellers (producers) (Worboys et al., 2005:47), and was considered a strong contextual element in influencing National Park management (Sowman & Pearce, 2000). In a National Park setting, visitors act as consumers of a National Park product, and as their demands increase or change, National Park service’s needed to adapt in order to cope (Eagles, McCool & Haynes, 2002).

Regardless of the involvement of the private sector in tourism facilities, National Parks themselves remained public goods. They offered an intrinsic environmental value and positive community benefits through recreation in natural areas which could not be efficiently fully provided by the private sector. Therefore they qualified for and relied upon public government funding to exist (Worboys et al., 2005). As Cohen (1996:32) soberly stated, ‘the environment does not win votes’ and throughout the 1990’s National Parks seemed to be low on the government list of funding priorities. In addition to economic strain, continuing changes to their management structure added pressure to National Parks and the VNPS. In 1990 there was a department change and management restructure with the creation of the Department of Conservation and Environment, and in 1993 it again changed to become the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR).

In 1994 a performance audit was conducted into the current VNPS ‘to determine the effectiveness, efficiency and economy of the organisation and the extent of its ability to meet its statutory obligations’ (Anderson, 2000:198). Despite the constant changes, VNPS staffs were praised in the resultant report ‘Managing Parks for Life’ for their professionalism and commitment. There were however several criticisms on the management processes of the organisation and the varying quality of facilities in the National Parks themselves. Overall the inquiry could not determine if VNPS were meeting their legislated obligations to provide recreation, education and conservation as
they found there was insufficient data on both the environmental condition of National Parks in their care, and on the needs and satisfaction levels of visitors (Worboys et al., 2005).

During this time the Kennett Liberal State government had a ‘commitment to the separation of the policy function of Departments from their operational activities’ and was making substantial changes to the structure of government to a ‘purchaser-provider’ model (Anderson, 2000:198). The government ideology was based on the belief that they held a responsibility to provide and fund public goods, such as National Parks, however in the most efficient way, and they considered private sector and market based operations were more efficient than that of government departments. It was hoped this new structure would solve the issues of bureaucracy and government overspending in a range of departments, including National Park management. Under this model, the State owned the protected land, and set priorities and objectives through policy, legislation and regulation. The State continued to fund and monitor these management outcomes making changes as necessary (Worboys et al., 2005). The VNPS was subsequently separated from the DNCR and merged with Melbourne Parks and Waterways to form Parks Victoria under the Parks Victoria Act 1998 (Vic). Twenty VNPS staff remained with the DNCR responsible for policy, legislation and regulation as the ‘purchaser’, while the remaining staff of around five hundred went to Parks Victoria to manage protected areas as the ‘provider’ of service delivery and operational functions (Anderson, 2000; Worboys et al., 2005).

One of Parks Victoria’s first tasks was to produce a “State of the Parks Report” to determine the current condition of Victoria’s protected area system in order to best allocate resources for management (Worboys et al., 2005). They developed a draft management plan for each National Park covering conservation and visitor management as per legislation. Draft plans were published for community input, before being finalised and fully implemented. With over eleven million visitors per year in 1997/1998, balancing conservation and visitor management was a continued focus and concern for Parks Victoria, who increased environmental monitoring and research by partnering with community groups and universities. Training was increased for rangers in areas of visitor interpretation, and extended to include eco-awareness and education for CTOs. Signage and visitor centres in National Parks were improved, and education pamphlets for
minimising visitor impacts were designed for activities such as bushwalking to be handed out to visitors (Anderson, 2000).

Particularly active in Victoria, conservative governments were influential across Australia between 1990-2000, with Figgis (1999) summarising their National Park policies as: utilising land for use over conservation; increasing lobby power and access of interest groups advocating multiple use and anti-conservation messages; and less funding for conservation and its management. These policies often resulted in a demoralised PAMA as their employment focus was shifted from environmental protection to National Park development and use, all within a less secure organisational environment of upheaval and restructuring. Nationally the federal government also restructured the public sector to reflect the effectiveness and efficiency of the private sector market based on competition. The National Competition Policy was the federal government’s attempt to even out the market when government competes with private firms in the same market. Amendments to the Trade Practices Act 1974 (Cth) were made in 1996 to induce competitive neutrality into markets where both public and private sectors existed. For PAMAs, essentially this meant they could no longer offer goods or services at a discounted price which would disadvantage a CTO from conducting business within a National Park, but were to charge a competitive price. Essential public goods and services were exempt from these competition laws (Worboys et al., 2005), however Parks Victoria continue to take these laws into consideration when delivering visitor services (Parks Victoria, 2013).

**Increasing National Park Tourism Demand: 1990-2000**

With its unique natural environment, Australia began to establish nature-based tourism images promoting areas such as the iconic Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, Uluru Kata-Tjutu National Park and Kakadu National Park to both domestic and international visitors (Worboys et al., 2005). CTOs offered to build facilities inside National Parks to provide for visitor increases. These requests were denied and CTOs were limited to mainly tours and interpretation (Carter, 1996). The increased focus on National Park tourism frustrated National Park management who believed with limited funding their priority should remain conservation. Increased tourist interest led the natural environment and National Parks to becoming a ‘product’ for Australia’s $26.7 billion tourism industry (Figgis, 1999). Tourism, once seen as an instrument for conservation, now had its own self-
interest in protecting pristine environments (Huybers & Bennett, 1997). Academic articles appeared warning the industry and government not to succumb to the temptation of development in these areas for short term economic gain, but to plan and manage impacts for long-term sustainable use and returns (Buckley & Pannell, 1990; Eagles, 2002; Huybers & Bennett, 1997; Worboys et al., 2005).

In Canadian National Parks, Woodley (1993) observed the tourism industry was already beginning to exploit the natural environment, jeopardising conservation objectives and shifting the values of the visitor experience away from natural appreciation. He believed priorities were being confused as tourists viewed the National Park environment not as the main attraction, but as a backdrop for an increasing array of activities, such as fine dining, concerts, white water rafting and shopping. Sax (1980) had made several similar claims about the American National Park system in his prominent book “Mountains without Handrail: Reflections on the National Parks”. He too was concerned at the increase in facilitated recreation in National Parks, and the path to commercialisation American National Park recreation appeared to be on. Sax (1980) proposed National Parks should be protected and regulated as settings for ‘reflective recreation’, only that which is based on the appreciation of nature.

There was genuine concern that economic gain was being given priority over protection, for although visitors may not be aware, their very presence was disturbing the delicate ecosystem. In line with Eagles and McCool (2002), Woodley (1993) believed visitation was crucial to gaining community support for National Parks, and should not therefore be banned but managed with a sustainable ecosystem focus. The increasing role of CTOs in National Parks meant they were essential stakeholders to consult, support and promote such a focus; until they do, tourism ‘should be regulated as a polluting industry’ (Woodley, 1993:94). In Australia, McKercher (1993a:7) put together the well-cited piece ‘Some Fundamental Truths About Tourism: Understanding Tourism’s Social and Environmental impacts’, outlining eight inevitable truths concluding tourism was an industry capable of exploiting resources and needed to be regulated by government to ensure sustainable use (Table 2.2).
Table 2.2: Eight inevitable truths of the tourism industry

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>As an industrial activity, tourism consumes resources, creates waste and has specific infrastructure needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>As a consumer of resources, it has the ability to over consume resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Tourism, as a resource dependent industry must compete for scarce resources to ensure its survival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Tourism is a private sector dominated industry, with investment decisions being based predominantly on profit maximisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tourism is a multi-faceted industry, and as such, it is almost impossible to control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Tourists are consumers, not anthropologists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Tourism is entertainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Unlike other industrial activities, tourism generates income by importing clients rather than exporting its product.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(McKercher, 1993a:7)

Neo-liberalism values further influenced Victorian State Government, pushing the development of relationships between public and private sector. For National Parks, the ideal situation was perceived to be for CTOs to provide tourism services within their expertise allowing Parks Victoria to continue their work of conservation. Economic generation from tourism could fund environmental protection and with effective government regulation a balance could be maintained (Carter 1996). Tourism could open access and opportunity for visitor education, increasing awareness and support for conservation initiatives. Figgis (1996) had little faith in such a scenario, believing previous government regulations had proven malleable in the light of economic gains and the want of people’s demand for the environment as a product, not protection. Supported by Crowley (1997) who observed Australia had rarely managed its natural areas for their intrinsic environmental value. After spending decades using tourism as a justification for protection, conservationists became concerned with the increase of CTOs inside National Parks, and the level of impact they were having (Figgis, 1996; McKercher, 1993a, 1993b).
Conservation groups across Australia developed tourism policy statements outlining their position on appropriate visitor use and regulation of National Parks. These policies, including the VNPA’s tourism policy and Victoria’s LCC, were analysed by McKercher (1993b) whose overall impression was that conservation groups showed a general disdain for tourism activities. Conservation groups were not a homogenous entity, however all displayed strong eco-centric or preservation values in their goals and beliefs of appropriate use. McKercher’s (1993b) main criticism of their policies was their lack of understanding of the tourism system. Their over simplification of narrowly defining tourism as any commercial activity, effectively meant any visitor not with a commercial group would not be classed as a tourist, even though they may be travelling further from home and participating in a similar activity. More importantly this definition denied conservation group members themselves could be classed as tourists:

By denying they are tourists, they also deny that they are a part of the park management problem associated with over-use. Further, parks and conservation organisations can avoid addressing the apparent philosophical dilemma that faces them. On one hand their client groups are among the heaviest users of National Parks. On the other hand, these organisations are philosophically orientated towards limiting human impacts in parks.
(McKercher, 1993b:312)

VNPA supported non-facilitated commercial tourism activities in National Parks, such as walking tours, on the condition they were highly regulated, controlling tour size, activity and environmental impact. The VNPA failed to mention such regulations should extend to non-commercial visitors engaging in the same or similar activities. The VNPA opposed any built developments inside National Park borders, proposing instead tourism facilities should be built in nearby towns which had sufficient infrastructure to cope. The existence of the strong eco-centric voices in National Park policy debate was positive in that they held CTOs accountable, however McKercher (1993b) referred back to the Turner (1981) study and re-emphasised that to better facilitate practical policy and management outcomes, conservation groups needed to accept and work toward the dual National Park mandate of conservation and use. To do this, he advised conservation groups should concentrate their recommendations on the management of activity and not the recommendation of desired visitors, as suggestions of limiting access to those who do not share their environmental values only supports Turner’s (1981) theory of elitist views of self-interest. In addition their policies needed to show a better understanding of the
complexity of the tourism system to be inclusive of both commercial and independent tourists, or better articulate their policies referred to commercial visitor’s specifically.

In 1994 a conference involving representatives from conservation groups, academia, and the tourism industry was held to discuss the issue of “Private Sector involvement in Parks and Protected Areas” (Charters, Gabriel & Prasser, eds, 1996). The conference revealed the divide between these stakeholders, which can be illustrated using Russell, Lafferty and Loudoun’s (2008:127) continuum of stakeholder opinions toward ‘the role of government regulation protecting the natural environment’ (Figure 2.1). At one end the neo-capitalism approach supports market control solutions. Advocating less government involvement through deregulation and competition, and an increase in private sector participation and self-regulation, these supporters argued CTOs would provide a market solution to fund and protect National Parks. They reasoned nature based CTOs would, through self-interest, protect the quality of the environment their product is based on (Carter, 1996; Gross et al., 2009). The other end of the scale supported government ownership, management and controlled regulation of CTOs on public land (Charters, Gabriel & Prasser, eds, 1996; Figgis, 1999). This group did not believe CTOs would hold such altruistic values, but needed to be controlled through high government regulation. Their predominant concern was CTOs were economically motivated, a stance that may ultimately conflict with National Park values and environmental protection (Figgis, 1996). The middle ground was considered to be a partnership approach in National Park management whereby government offered some regulation, yet allowed CTOs freedom to respond to market demands.

Figure 2.1: Continuum of government environmental regulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Control</th>
<th>Partnership Approach</th>
<th>Government Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Self-regulation only</td>
<td>• Part govt. Regulation, part self-regulation</td>
<td>• High govt. Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Market forces alone will ensure conservation of product (environment) and successful ventures</td>
<td>• Market forces also encouraged</td>
<td>• Operators can still gain competitive advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conservation is priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Russell, Lafferty & Loudoun, 2008:127)
Huybers and Bennett (1997) investigated CTO attitudes toward government environmental regulations with the study “The Significance of the Environment and its Regulation to Australia’s Tourism Industry”. They surveyed 208 members of the Tourism Council Australia in 1995 including both CTOs who utilised natural resources on public land and those operating on privately owned areas. The overwhelming consensus by both groups was that Australia’s natural environment was now the tourism industry’s key drawcard, a view confirmed also in visitor surveys at the time (CDT, 1994). Environmental management was therefore regarded as a critical issue by all CTOs and it was accepted some form of government regulation was necessary to ensure ongoing environmental protection. All CTOs claimed to adhere to the current government regulations; however those on private land were found to be more pro-active, carrying out some form of self-motivated environmental management actions in addition to government controls. CTOs expressed the complexity and time taken for government decision-making were costs incurred by their businesses. Complaints such as these would become a recurring theme in future research (Moore et al., 2009; RRTF, 1997; Russell, Lafferty & Loudoun, 2008; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009).

In 1997, The Victorian Department of State Development led a regulatory audit/reform into the tourism industry which confirmed CTOs were not satisfied with the current National Park regulation system. “Access to Crown Land and the Commercial Tour Operator’s Permit System” was found to be a key area in need of reform (RRTF, 1997). The predominate concerns were the number of permits required by CTOs for the one activity; the time taken to administer permits; the lack of PAMA resources for enforcement and the increase of illegal operators; that fees paid were not utilised for National Park development; and finally the short length of time permits were issued for, reducing business security.

Any allowances or weakening of CTO regulation brought debate by concerned conservationists. Environmental damage was hard to measure, and there was concern CTOs could be unaware or hide impacts under their ‘green cloak’ promoting themselves as eco focused businesses, while in reality negatively impacting National Parks. Any allowance to CTOs could be seen to break a barrier that once broken could open up dialogue and weaken opposition to development risking inappropriate development
moving in. Moreover, increasing PAMA reliance on CTO income risked the PAMA to pandering to CTO needs. For example if a PAMA needed to temporarily close a track to protect it from erosion, a CTO may pressure them to keep it open if their commercial activity relies upon access. Long-term, this could change the focus, resource allocation and the organisational culture of a PAMA to that of tourism and commercial interests and away from conservation and environmental protection (Figgis, 1999).

The nature-based tourism industry was maturing with conferences, workshops, university degrees, guidelines, guides, and strategies all focusing on the tourism relationship with the environment, and the development in visitor interpretation and education techniques, and environmental operational practices. Australian governments followed with state based ‘Nature-based tourism strategies’ and a federal ‘Ecotourism strategy’ (CDT, 1994; Figgis, 1999). Up to now, within academic literature, tourism and National Parks were treated as separate entities, however as the relationship developed resulting issues needed to be addressed. With the growth in numbers of nature-based tourists visiting National Parks; the lack of expertise and resources of PAMAs; the increase in CTO activity and interest; the negative reaction from conservation and recreation groups; and the growing divide in stakeholder opinion of acceptable resource use; National Park tourism management and research needed a focused and integrated approach.

Butler and Boyd (eds, 2000) edited the seminal book “Tourism and National Parks: Issues and Implications”, with chapters covering issues of National Park tourism and: local communities; indigenous people; vulnerable areas; private lands; developing countries; resource conflicts and impact management leading the way into an integrated National Park tourism literature. Within this text Sowman and Pearce (2000) presented their conceptual framework of an integrated National Park tourism system. Their model placed CTOs at the centre of visitor services in National Parks, in partnership with the PAMA. The partnership relationship between CTOs and the PAMA was interwoven and dependant on government policies and regulations, the shared responsibilities of both parties and a mitigation of the costs and benefits. In addition stakeholder values and attitudes were identified as an influential factor on their partnership. Stakeholder values became a focus for National Park research into CTDNP proposals during this period, as discussed below.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

National Park Values & CTDNP Proposals: 1990-2000

The value stakeholders placed on National Parks and the natural environment greatly influenced National Park management and public policy (Figgis, 1999; Sowman and Pearce, 2000). The general acceptance throughout the twentieth century had been conservation groups held eco-centric values toward nature, predominant in their lobbying of government, while the growth of nature-based tourism within the industry had now motivated tourism industry groups to represent the alternative anthropocentric views towards environmental protection. However it was becoming evident categorising stakeholder values this way was not entirely accurate, nor productive, and further substantiation was needed. McKercher (1997:101) extended ‘the debate over tourism is clouded by emotion, bias, and the belief that, because of the commercial nature of tourism, tour operators must have different park values from non-commercial groups.’ This is not necessarily true, and it led the proposition that conservation groups, National Park management and CTOs may conflict only because of their perceived difference in National Park values and a certain ‘unwillingness to appreciate others’ views,’ where in fact no real conflict of interests may exist (McKercher, 1997:99).

The confusion in defining tourism, and the complexity or misunderstanding of the tourism system, often negatively affected a person’s belief or perception of tourism activity and tourists. This meant two people who saw a commercial tour group in a National Park may have had different responses. One may perceive it as desirable or destructive, depending on: their overall value of the environment; their attitude toward tourism; and their belief of how the two interact and the positive or negative impacts tourism can have on a National Park. Values are nurtured as we grow and from here are said to be the constant and over-arching principles by which we live, influencing our attitudes and beliefs of the world. Williams and Lawson (2001:272) further explained that ‘values are a more enduring and all-embracing concept,’ and thus can be seen as person’s ‘guiding principle’ influencing a broader scope of attitudes and perceptions. Rokeach (1968:160) described them as ‘an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally and socially preferable to alternative modes of conduct and end-states of existence.’
It is a person’s values which determined their desired use, or end-state, of a National Park and their subsequent belief of what activities are appropriate within National Park borders to achieve this outcome. When discussing stakeholder tourism attitudes, measuring values is therefore imperative, as it is a more reliable predictor of an individual’s ethical stance on issues such as the environment, and in predicting future behaviours and support, than measuring attitudes and perceptions alone (Perkins & Brown, 2012).

Environmental values have been commonly described along a continuum from anthropocentric to eco-centric (Eckersley, 1992; Hay, 2002), and these terms have been adopted by National Park tourism literature (Crowley, 1997; Darcy & Wearing, 2009; Figgis, 1999; McKercher, 1997; Turner, 1981). Eco-centric values are descendent from holding the environment as more valuable than social or cultural values, valuing the environment for its intrinsic worth, and believe it has a right to exist for its own sake. Traditionally they uphold conservation as the primary reason for National Park status and maintain these areas should be left largely undeveloped. Others who propose National Park resources should be valued and utilised for their human use capabilities, such as economic generation through tourism, are described as anthropocentric, as anthropocentric attitudes ‘value biodiversity in terms of its social utility’ (Lane 2001:658)(Table 2.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.3: Anthropocentric &amp; Eco-centric value messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anthropocentric</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human centred - Natural environment is a resource for human use to fulfil needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports access to National Parks and multiple use as society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation means a wise-use of resources to ensure availability for future use or to maintain quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low intrinsic value placed on environment, but high value to nature useful to fulfilling human needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Crowley, 1997; Eckersley, 1992; Figgis, 1999; Hay, 2002; McKercher, 1997; Turner, 1981)
It is important to note that individuals may hold a combination of both value sets. For example in a study on the public protest against a tourism development on Tasmania’s Mt. Wellington, the public disputed the development on the grounds of its potential to destroy the environment (eco-centric) and disturb the scenery (anthropocentric). Crowley (1997:126) explained the public’s ‘eco-centric views may hold (some would argue invariably) for anthropocentric reasons, but also confirms that, in the case of Mt. Wellington, these views spring from a transpersonal appreciation of the mountains ecological integrity’. The Mt. Wellington development was never realised, Crowley (1997) added this had more to do with the poor economic forecast of the development rather than government upholding the intrinsic values of the area. Further relevant considerations from other research findings on environmental values suggested an individual’s eco-centric or anthropocentric environmental values do not necessarily determine support or opposition toward tourism. It remains however, that measuring core values has added an insightful dimension to research results by discovering underlying foundation and influences such as differing beliefs on variables of: commercial or non-commercial activity; facilitated or non-facilitated activities; and motivations for conservation of National Parks (Crowley, 1997; Darcy & Wearing, 2009; McKercher, 1997).

With the increase of tourism use, Australian National Park policies and justification for more environmental protection appeared to be becoming more and more anthropocentric focused; Pressey (1993) contended this did have benefits. By determining value and protecting areas by both measures, of eco-centric (biodiversity) and anthropocentric (human use through landscape, recreation, spiritual, and education), the types and amount of protected areas may expand, which could ultimately result in more protection. Figgis (1999:8) posited that protection for biodiversity protects ‘things we must keep’ but may not be able to capture ‘things we want to keep’ and therefore a balanced approach to debate and policy is beneficial to overall conservation outcomes.

A Victorian study was conducted by McKercher (1997) to explore the values of stakeholders and their perceptions and beliefs of tourism in Victoria’s Alpine National Park, McKercher (1997) collected qualitative data across three groups of stakeholders: tour operators; National Park management; and interest group opinion leaders. Table 2.4
illustrates how each stakeholder group can represent sub-groups of alternate values, beliefs and attitudes. McKercher’s (1997) findings suggested that despite their anthropocentric or eco-centric values, the beliefs of the cost of tourism to National Parks were similar between all stakeholders; however the views of tourism benefits were distinctly different. Pro-tourism opinion leaders were the most active in expressing the positive impact of tourism, with the tour operators also identifying economic, social and environmental benefits. The neutral and anti-tourism opinion leaders could see little if any benefit from tourism, instead believing on the whole it was an exploitive industry incompatible with National Park values.
### Table 2.4: Stakeholder’s environmental values & tourism beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horse and 4WD tour operators: Anthropocentric</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Main focus on economic benefits such as income for CTO and NP management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide access to remote areas and raise awareness of environmental conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental degradation, focus on localised damage such as erosion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro-tourism opinion leaders: Mainly anthropocentric</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visitor access, environmental awareness, education &amp; support for NP system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emphasis on economic generation for surrounding area, PAMA &amp; infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in tourists may displace recreational visitors or restrict their activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tourism activity will greatly influence NP policy toward over development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental damage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-tourism opinion leaders: anthropocentric</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If any, economic, but this outweighed the costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visitor displacement by tourism activity. They greatly feared powerful tourism interest groups would threaten their recreational use of NP, for example closing 4WD tracks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation and change in NP values to economic generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased fees will restrict visitor access</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral tourism opinion leaders: Even mix of anthropocentric and eco-centric</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental awareness, education and support for NP system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intrinsic benefit to visitors from the NP experience and greater access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic generation for local area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CTOs will exploit NP and damage environmental resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inappropriate or increase development may change the NP visitor experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other tour operators: Mainly eco-centric</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Main focus on raising visitor access and awareness of environmental conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic benefits: income for both company and NP management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental degradation, focus on broad damage to general area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can lead to increase in inappropriate development &amp; visitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DNCR staff: Various positions, consistent responses mainly eco-centric</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater opportunity to increase access and awareness of the natural environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic benefits for local community and region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater interest from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Negative effects of inappropriate development including environmental degradation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management policies may preference tourism interests &amp; CTOs may prioritise profit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If DNCR could not control tourism, it would ultimately exploit the NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-tourism opinion leaders: eco-centric</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-facilitated tourism can increase environmental awareness &amp; education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NP experience altered by inappropriate tourism development &amp; increase in visitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tourism can be the enemy of conservation as it becomes the policy priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(McKercher, 1997)
Most stakeholders believed conservation remained the crucial objective for National Parks, and most were concerned that tourism interests and economic generation may take priority over environmental protection values in policy making and management. The predominant fear expressed by all stakeholders was that inappropriate over-use and over-development of the National Park or the possibility CTOs would seek exclusive access to some areas, could inhibit the visitor experience and access for other recreational users. Therefore most believed tourism should be tightly regulated and controlled to manage potential negative impacts in order to uphold their desired National Park values (McKercher, 1997). McKercher (1997) did not expand; however there appeared to be a perception among stakeholders in general, that tourism threatens not only conservation objectives, but also recreational visitation objectives. Never the less, McKercher’s (1997) study drew attention to the complexity of stakeholder opinions and the benefit of measuring environmental values and tourism beliefs to gain a deeper understanding of the policy debate and to move toward solving conflict.

During the 1990’s, governments in both Victoria and NSW put forward proposals for existing and new purpose built facilities inside National Parks to be operated by CTOs. The response to these proposals indicated environmental values and stakeholder attitudes toward tourism were indeed conflicted, with the debates so hotly contested by not only those with an active interest in the outcome but also members of the general public, that many plans were abandoned or the process drawn out (Buckley, 2002a; Darcy & Wearing, 2009; Foster, 2005; Munro, King & Polonsky, 2006; Slattery, 2002). These situations became the subject for several case studies within the literature, addressing areas of the government proposal process, and further initiating academic research into CTOs in Australian National Parks.

As this was the early stages of research into the subject, and with small sample sizes and the public availability of documents for analysis, empirical studies utilised mainly qualitative techniques of secondary resources, and case study methodology. These studies built on McKercher’s (1997) and Turner’s (1981) earlier studies on stakeholder values, with the added dimension of discussing built tourism facilities in addition to tour operators. Key stakeholder groups within the CTO in National Park debate were able to be identified and these studies were therefore able to produce strong evidence of their
divided opinion of National Park values and attitudes toward tourism (Darcy & Wearing, 2009; Foster 2005; 2006; Slattery, 2002).

A predominant case was the debate surrounding the 1996 Wilsons Promontory National Park proposal for CTDNP by the Liberal Government in Victoria. After the previous 1960 proposal in this National Park for a privately owned development was abandoned, accommodation had since been provided in the form of publicly built and managed cabins and camping areas. The new draft management plan contained proposals for the government to firstly build a 150 bed luxury accommodation facility to be leased to a CTO, aiming to attract the new higher end nature-based tourist market; and then to develop a ‘Great Prom Walk’ with a 45 bed hotel at Tidal River, and a series of walkers hut to which could be utilised by CTOs. Slattery (2002) commented the plan was reminiscent of the newly elected Liberal Victorian State Government at the time who prioritised profit from public land over its protection. The VNPA spearheaded a campaign, ‘Hands off the Prom’, joined by a number of individuals and interest groups to campaign against the development. Their protests included a public rally on the steps of Victoria’s Parliament House and gatherings at the National Park itself (Figure 2.2) (Anderson, 2000).

**Figure 2.2: Campaign photograph against CTD in Wilsons Promontory NP**

On December 29, 1996, the VNPA organised nearly 2000 people on to Norman Beach at Wilsons Prom to spell out ‘HANDS OFF!’

(VNPA, 2012a)
The public outcry in this case was of particular interest as the government’s development plan received a staggering 3500 submissions, more than any other Victorian government proposal in history, with those submissions directly mentioning the CTDNP being 98 percent opposed. Due to the conflict with conservation values and community backlash, the plan was abandoned. Slattery (2002) investigated the public interest and resistance. Given the general consensus of opposition, Slattery (2002) was able to analyse 10 percent (352) of the submissions against an 8-point typology of National Park values (shown in Table 2.5). These values were derived from Hamilton-Smith’s (1998) possible multiple purposes of Australian National Parks and their associated perceptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of values &amp; perceptions (Hamilton-Smith, 1998)</th>
<th>% of submissions using this value for argument against (n=346)</th>
<th>for (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The worthless lands hypothesis: NP were declared because the land was demonstrably of little use for economic benefit</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP represent the dignity and standing of a society</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP provide an important scientific resource</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP are an important resource for recreation</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP provide health, well-being &amp; good order of urban society</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP protect places of beauty and so uplift the human spirit</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP are a major means of conserving nature &amp; cultural heritage</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP are a major resource for economic development</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Slattery, 2002:568)

As expected there were protests from organised conservation groups, but the remarkable find in this case was the enthusiasm from individual citizens in protesting against the development, which Slattery (2002) believed highlighted the sensitivity of the topic and the need for government to carefully consider any future public policy development and implementation of CTDNP. The main argument (68 percent) from the public supported the eco-centric view that the National Park role is to conserve and protect natural areas and against the anthropocentric view (80 percent) that National Parks are for economic means. Whereas previous studies had found conservation groups eco-centric values misrepresented the wider community belief (Turner, 1981), Slattery’s (2002) results indicated that these views may be largely supported in Victoria. The analysis further
showed the Victorian community also held a balance of both value sets, similar to those in the Tasmanian study (Crowley, 1997), as they believed National Parks purpose was to also provide anthropocentric human use as: a setting recreational activities (28 percent); social benefits of spiritual uplifting (40 percent) and well-being (28 percent).

The complexity of stakeholders National Park values (anthropocentric and eco-centric) extends to conflicted opinions over facilitated and non-facilitated recreation, and commercial and non-commercial tourism. In Wilsons Promontory National Park, many feared CTDNP would detract from the natural setting, and believed it to therefore be adverse to conservation objectives. Submissions appealed to the government to refrain from allowing such individual private gain from a public area, stating the government’s role is to protect it from such an occurrence, not support it. With many submissions commenting that National Parks should be provided at a cost to the government and not reliant on tourism dollars, Slattery (2002) surmised the Victorian community view is such that National Parks are indeed a public good to be valued and retained as natural and cultural assets.

Foster (2005; 2006) completed a larger in-depth study on the management of the CTDNP proposal in Wilson Promontory National Park, and in addition the proposal process for Victorian developments in Port Campbell National Park, Cape Otway National Park and Philip Island. Foster (2006:1439) outlined the process taken by the newly elected government, concluding from his research they held an ‘egocentric approach toward strategy development’ and a manipulative attitude toward stakeholder consultation, which clashed with the previous governments processes based on a consultation relationship of trust between Parks Victoria and other various stakeholders. Similar to Figgis (1999) and Slattery (2002), Foster (2005) believed this new approach was reflective of the new Liberal Government’s neo-liberalist anthropocentric approach of exploiting the economic potential from tourism off public land. In his view it seemed the new government were unaware of the potential public outcry from such development plans, with the new executives making the preliminary plans in secret with little to no consultation, and disregarding input from long-term ground staff at Parks Victoria. Ultimately trust between the various stakeholders was broken, and the consequential negative outcomes extended from the predictable stern opposition from public and conservation groups to the
unexpected extreme case where Parks Victoria employees leaked important information to opposing groups, thereby adding strength to their protest arguments. Foster (2006) concluded these results emphasised the two key elements to ensuring successful stakeholder relationships: timing and trust of information sharing; and stakeholder consultation.

Commonly a stakeholder is considered an individual or organisation who has a direct interest in the outcome of a situation, Foster’s (2006) findings supported those by Slattery (2002), of a large and varied stakeholder response from both individuals and groups of the public who had little or no direct self-interest. Working through several stakeholder engagement and self-interest theories, Foster (2006) concluded the tourism development scenario and subsequent public outcry, is best described by Mouffe’s (2005) societas theory which suggested when deciding upon a National Park strategy, the public do not expect management to find a solution fitting all stakeholders, nor do they have their self-interest in mind, but rather believe the solution must be one that follows certain accepted society rules. When government attempted to change these rules by allowing CTDNP, it was not the particular development in question they opposed, but the potential change to these rules and a change in the accepted societal notion National Parks were there to protect natural settings, not tourism exploitation. For future debates within this area, Foster (2006) therefore recommended government must realise not all stakeholders are concerned with self-interest, and hence a greater emphasis on true engagement of a variety of stakeholders is necessary along with a public discussion of what role National Parks are to play in society.

Another noteworthy Victorian National Park government/community conflict occurred along the Great Ocean Road during the late 1990’s when in 1995 the government proposed to build a visitor centre within Point Campbell National Park. Munro, King and Polonsky (2006) examined the proposal process and stakeholder management concluding conflict had resulted due to a poor coherent vision for the CTDNP between stakeholders, and particular between the State Government and locals of the area. Many saw any CTDNP contradicting National Park conservation values. As found previously in Wilsons Promontory National Park, the government underestimated the opposition from the community, and did little to appease it, resulting in the project being delayed for several
years and eventually built in the nearby township. Munro, King and Polonsky (2006) argued this outcome reinforced that stakeholders need to be identified and involved in planning and policy from early stages to develop a shared vision and encourage support, and better mitigate issues of conflict.

NSW also experienced controversial cases of CTDNP. A significant case study was conducted by Darcy and Wearing (2009) on the CTDNP proposed for a visitor and interpretation centre at North Head Quarantine Station, in North Head National Park, Sydney. This study utilised media reports alone, from 1990 – 2003, in order to identify stakeholder groups, and ascertain their views and involvement in the development process. The results were similar to Victoria in that there were strong opposition voices coming from the community from both those directly and indirectly affected by the development, supporting the findings of both Foster (2006) and Slattery (2002), again highlighting the importance of understanding public and stakeholder views in such a sensitive situation. Darcy and Wearing (2009) concluded there has been a significant gap in the literature in this area that must be filled if National Park management are to understand and build successful and supported PPPs.
Darcy and Wearing’s (2009) media analysis identified the main stakeholders detailed in Table 2.6 and went on to calculate the number of occurrences each stakeholder group appeared in the media, the type of media they appeared in; how their viewpoints were represented; and at what point in the process they appeared. The study also explored each stakeholder’s viewpoint against the eco-centric-anthropocentric value set and Dear’s (1992) Not in My Backyard (NIMBY) spectrum. As with McKercher’s (1997) early study, stakeholder groups were found not to be homogenous and can hold a combination of values as featured in Table 2.6. Both State Government and the NSW National Park and Wildlife Service illustrated a relatively even balance of both eco-centric and anthropocentric values, understandable given the dual mandate of National Park management being to provide conservation and recreation. The Friends of the Quarantine Station and residents groups displayed eco-centric values while illustrating the highest level of NIMBY attitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manly Greens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP &amp; Wildlife Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Govt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Darcy & Wearing, 2009:193)
Similar to the Victorian cases, it is believed the public sensed there was a lack of community participation in the decision-making processes, and a lack of adequate information being communicated from government to the public. Darcy and Wearing (2009) referred to Sandercock and Berry’s (1983) work to support their findings and concluded it was this lack of community integration which increased community protests, suggesting better communication of the development and a recognition of community values could have secured better public support. Unlike Victoria, this development went ahead with CTO Mawland obtaining a 21 year lease.

The findings of these four case studies highlight the need for greater consideration of all stakeholders when planning tourism development within National Parks, including those who may not necessarily have a direct interest in the outcome. This recommendation is supported by literature which states there needs to be a cooperative effort between various government departments, management bodies, CTOs, interest groups, surrounding communities and the tourists and visitors themselves if National Parks are to be successfully managed and developed to fulfil their many responsibilities (Visconti, 1998; Worboys & Lockwood, 2007). As CTDNP’s have been and continue to be proposed, the conflict between stakeholders has increased; a situation not always conducive to moving forward. Gross et al. (2009) emphasised that for threats such as inappropriate tourism development to be overcome, all stakeholders need to be aligned to solve issues. Therefore the recognition of stakeholder values and their input to management needs to be a continued focus for National Park tourism research and a strong consideration for government and National Park management, especially during policy and regulation development. Tremblay (2008:67) highlighted ‘the most persistent challenge to park management is arguably the handling of changing, and often competing, stakeholder values.’ Understanding stakeholder values and their beliefs about tourism may assist in identifying areas of agreement and those in conflict. To this point it appeared within the literature a strong difference could be identified as opinions towards facilitated and non-facilitated recreation, and commercial and non-commercial tourism. Slattery’s (2002) results indicate it may not be about use, but perhaps about economics, or in other words, who pays for National Parks and who receives economic benefits.
**National Park Economic Structure: 1990-2010**

Economic considerations strongly influenced the Victorian National Park system, and increasingly so from 1990 (Sowman & Pearce, 2000; Worboys & Lockwood, 2007). PAMAs remained under pressure to validate their existence and become more self-sufficient which may affect their level of integrity, leaving opportunity for decisions to be made in their own self-interest. Figgis (1999) explained the retreat of government funding during the 1980 - 2000 pushed PAMAs to turn to generating income from commercial tourism and entering into contracts with CTOs, threatening National Park conservation objectives. Buckley (2003) and More (2002) pointed out this move could encourage an overall shift in National Park values and management from environmental protection to economic generation. As government resources continued to decrease and demands upon natural areas increase (Director of National Parks, 2010:6), Buckley (2003) explained those decisions in Australia could be National Park management entering into unbalanced partnerships with CTOs who utilise cheap access to publicly funded resources for their own private gain. Indeed as long as public National Parks were made available to the nature-based tourism industry, there were few incentives for CTOs to purchase their own private natural areas in which to run their business (Buckley, 2004).

When it comes to the question of who should pay for a National Park system, Gross et al. (2009) believed the answer should start with the question of who benefits. Global environmental circumstances meant by protecting the natural environment arguably everybody benefits. Hundloe (1996) proposed the public understood this and was generally willing to pay for the existence of well-managed National Parks. As management costs were increasing due to an increase in visitor and CTO use, he believed there did need to be a balance of non-user (tax-paying public) and user (tourism operators, independent visitors) funds (Hundloe, 1996). As CTOs lease fees did not necessarily cover the cost of actually providing them with the public infrastructure they used (Buckley, 2003; Worboys et al., 2005), it was reasoned the public cannot be expected to continue to pay for a National Park system to benefit CTOs who profited from its resources (Eagles, 2002).
Worboys and Lockwood (2007:35) believed lack of funding ‘is the single greatest factor impacting effective Australian protected area management in the 21st century’. While the government is obliged to provide for public National Parks, more effective planning and management could lead to other legitimate forms of income being generated from National Park users, such as CTOs, and lessen reliance on unstable government funds (Chhetri, Arrowsmith & Jackson, 2004; Christoff, 1998; Worboys & Lockwood, 2007). One ongoing issue was the inability for PAMAs to recoup tourism dollars. Eagles (2002:135) stated ‘parks often supply the most important part of the nature tourism experience but typically capture little of the economic value of the stream of economic benefits’. CTOs were given the leases or licences to operate the few income generating activities that National Parks have, not only effectively reducing any potential direct income for PAMA, but also potentially increasing the cost of providing for visitors, as seldom did lease and licence fees cover the true cost of management required for tourism activities (Buckley, 2004). Further to this, visitors usually spent on tours, accommodation, food, transport and activities external to a National Park, spending very little directly to the National Park management in which they visit (Buckley, 2004). Whitelaw, King and Tolkach (2014) investigated methods for National Parks to recoup tourism related funds, for example payments for ecosystem services, concluding PAMAs will need to adopt such innovative methods in the future.

There is clear support in the literature for National Parks to better manage commercial tourism in order to generate a deserved and practical sustainable income by those who actually use it (Chhetri, Arrowsmith & Jackson, 2004; Eagles & McCool, 2002; Worboys & Lockwood, 2007). However, National Park management has historically been focused on conservation and recreation, not business and economic generation, and reasonably a PAMA cannot be expected to fully sustain themselves monetarily. The move toward basing PAMA on a business model as with Parks Victoria has legitimacy in that managing visitor and retail services and dealing with private enterprise in negotiating leases are business activities; however this model may signal a move toward PAMA generating its own income and re-inventing itself as a partner to the tourism industry (Figgis, 1999).
Seeking Solutions: Sustainable Tourism & PPPs: 2000-2010

In her report, Figgis (1999) declared it was now inevitable PAMAs needed to consider generating alternate economic funding, and therefore environmentalists needed to address this issue as opposed to continue their objections to commercial tourism and reliance on government funding. Similar to McKercher’s (1993b) earlier study, conservationists were urged to refocus their arguments and recommendations to address what activities and conduct they did see as acceptable and how CTOs should be controlled and utilised as partners to support conservation efforts. Butler (2000) also urged all stakeholders to take a deeper consideration. He suggested that as the nature-based tourism industry had matured, management and research knowledge had advanced, allowing the industry to take sustainable tourism initiatives and develop facilities in a more responsible manner with careful consideration to social, economic and environmental impacts.

Butler (2000) argued moving a potential CTDNP outside of National Park borders did not necessarily remove its negative impacts from the area. A poorly developed private hotel outside the border, or even a poorly located and mismanaged public campsite inside, could do more damage than a well-designed and controlled CTDNP. Indeed perhaps having development inside the National Park would allow for greater control of resource use and impacts through effective and efficient government legislation and regulation (Butler, 2000). There was the possibility that allowing more activities within National Parks could increase the availability of land to be protected, and increase the opportunity to regulate extractive industries to ensure sustainability. The issue of course remained measuring and determining the boundaries of use and what constituted sustainable or unsustainable behaviour (Figgis, 1999).

The debate of exactly what facilities constitute ‘sustainable tourism’ was most recently seen in 2010, after reforms in NSW saw the term ‘sustainable tourism’ added to the allowable activities legislated in NSW National Parks. This had a strong reaction from conservation groups, with controversial accusations coming from the Colong Foundation for the Wilderness (Bryson, 2004) who took independent legal advice from Senior Counsel Tim Robertson (2010:2) who made the damning claim about the new legislation that:
It provides legal authority for the privatisation of National Parks by enabling exclusive possession rights to be given for commercial purposes to private interests under the broad rubric of sustainable tourism. Under this rubric, National Parks will be able to be used for general tourist purposes, such as tourist resorts, convention centres, shopping centres, fast food outlets, sporting activities and fun parks, at the discretion of the Minister, even where those uses do not promote the conservation of the Parks.

Robertson (2010:6) went on to say ‘indeed, there is very little that is done at Darling Harbour and Disneyland that will not be able to be done in a National Park.’ Within academic literature, sustainable tourism had been a strong research focus since the Brundtland report introduced the sustainable concept in 1987. Focusing on the responsible use of renewable and non-renewable resources, sustainable development was defined then as ‘development which meets the needs the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (Brundtland, 1987:43). The sustainable concept generated interest from the tourism industry for a number of reasons. Tourism predominantly relied upon cultural and environmental resources as key elements to its product and therefore had both a vested interest and a social responsibility to safeguard these resources. In addition to this, tourism was often seen as an industry which can generate sustainable economic, environmental and social benefits for its community (Hjalager, 1996; Swarbrooke, 1999).

Discussions have been lengthy over the past thirty years, yet exactly what ‘sustainable tourism’ is and how it should be achieved has not been established, making it a difficult concept to implement, measure, and achieve (Boyd, 2000). There is some agreement it should pay respect to the environmental, cultural and economic elements of tourism, and manage these impacts, both positive and negative, for the long term. The United Nations Environment Program and World Tourism Organisation explained:

Sustainable tourism development meets the needs of the present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing the opportunity for the future. It is envisaged as leading to management of all resources in such a way that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled, while maintaining
cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems. (World Tourism Organisation cited in De Lacy et al., 2002:4)

New Zealand’s government has incorporated ‘sustainable policies’ from the early 2000’s (Mitchell, Wooliscroft & Higham, 2013). They have successfully introduced a partnership approach in the provision of visitor facilities in their National Parks to encourage sustainable tourism initiatives in the form of accommodation and a quality nature-based visitor experience. The most predominant is the development of the partnership between the New Zealand Department of Conservation and CTO Ultimate Hikes, commonly recognised as best practice (L.E.K. Consulting, 2011; TTF, 2007; VCEC, 2011c). Walk-up lodges have been built within the National Park along iconic walking trails such as the Milford Track, and Ultimate Hikes have the exclusive rights to their commercial use. In return they adhere to responsible tourism guidelines and provide economic generation for the PAMA and conservation through lease payments. In addition they also provide track maintenance and assisted in the monitoring of wildlife in the area, all of which eased workload from the PAMA (L.E.K. Consulting, 2011).

Figgis (1999:vii) had stated there was ‘a need for a reassertion of nature conservation as the primary objective of core protected areas’ and if not, ‘protected areas are likely to be compromised by modern human demands and commercial motives.’ In Queensland when National Parks began moving towards commercial tourism partnerships, Larsen and Valentine (2007) found poor communication and understanding of the new approach and its policies resulted in on-ground PAMA staff resenting tourism, believing it to be in conflict with their National Park conservation values. It appeared the government was moving toward an anthropocentric management focus, while their employees held eco-centric values.

Internationally, Haukeland (2011) found in rural Norway there was a shift from the traditional conservational priorities to that of a partnership approach, as the tourism industry was looked to as a source of employment in declining economic conditions. Here CTOs supported the creation of National Parks, but found the lack of PAMA experience in managing tourism and the extensive environmental regulations debilitated their
potential business opportunities. Low CTO involvement with National Park planning, management and communication, suggested these partnerships had not been fully utilised. CTOs believed their tourism knowledge should have been an asset to management and further expressed a willingness to take on extra responsibilities such as visitor education.

Despite the controversy surrounding the previous proposals during the 1990’s, neo-liberalism continued to influence Australian governments during the 2000’s, and CTOs were increasingly looked to for providing tourism services within Australian National Parks. There needed to be a much greater understanding of PPPs, and of stakeholder views, if community support was to be gained and successful PPPs developed. Research and industry therefore sought to fill this gap and throughout the 2000 - 2010 period, several reports surrounding the management of PPPs were put together through the Corporate Research Centre for Sustainable Tourism (CRCST), highlighting the importance the government, academic field and the tourism industry were placing on both naturally National Parks and the provision of a sustainable tourism infrastructure. These studies were qualitative in nature, utilising both secondary and primary data from case studies of existing PPPs.

The early reports utilised existing case studies (Buckley & Sommer, 2001) and extensive literature reviews (Laing et al., 2008) to establish partnership success factors and possible sustainable tourism partnership frameworks (De Lacy et al., 2002). Toward the end of the decade, the Moore et al. (2009) report reflected that National Park funding had continued to decrease as nature-based tourism had continued to grow into a significant Australian industry with desire for further future growth. PPPs had therefore been advocated as necessary by industry (TTF, 2007), government (DITR, 2003) and academic literature (Buckley, 2012) to improve National Park resources

The Moore et al. (2009) report aimed to address the opportunities and concerns raised in previous CRCST reports. As opposed to other studies which had relied upon secondary sources to create success factors, this research design added value by collecting primary data through a theoretical framework. They used case study methodology and importance-satisfaction analysis to determine the key features, expectations, outcomes...
and satisfaction of partners. Moore et al. (2009) collected primary data from one hundred participants from twenty-one PPPs across Australia, varying in size from small to large commercialised operations. Most participants were satisfied with the outcomes of their PPP, but there were several criticisms. Communication, sharing of information and understanding between partners was important, as to working toward a shared goal. Issues with government regulations and partnership agreements occurred frequently, predominately ‘inconsistency in regulations across state boundaries, a lack of coordination in licensing approval processes within governments, short lease/licence terms, and regulations not covering all protected area users/visitors’ and an overall feeling current legislation did not support tourism in National Parks (Moore et al., 2009:ix).

A further study by Wilson, Nielsen and Buultjens (2009) focused on current small to medium CTOs who leased existing infrastructure in NSW National Parks on a short-term basis. They conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with National Park management and CTOs, gathering primary qualitative information, and used stakeholder analysis to construct a deeper understanding of the multiple views within this context. Their results uncovered five key themes describing the quality and construct of the PPP relationship: lease bureaucracy; service and management of lessees; appropriate recognition; importance of collaboration; and determining success.

Wilson, Nielsen and Buultjens (2009) discussed the inevitability of a PAMA and CTOs holding differing goals. A PAMA is legislated to conserve natural areas, whereas private commercial lessees must run a financially viable business responding to customer needs to continue their existence. It must be realised both PAMAs and CTOs rely upon each other, and thus Wilson, Nielsen and Buultjens (2009) recommend National Park management take a ‘partnership’ approach to management, treating CTOs as valued contributors as opposed to tenants. They concluded this would involve elements of greater trust, commitment, flexibility and conflict management; clear indicators for measuring lessee performance; and similar to Moore et al. (2009) better communication channels; and improved ease of dealing and complying with regulation and legislation constraints.
One of the more interesting reflections from the Wilson, Nielsen and Buultjens (2009) study was that CTOs felt there was a reluctance of management to promote or recognise CTO partnerships in the public forum. CTOs felt ‘hidden’ in the fear that the public would backlash against such partnerships as previously seen in the Wilson’s Promontory National Park and NSW Quarantine sites. CTOs felt if they had more appropriate public recognition from PAMAs, they could generate a greater public knowledge and understanding of what they do and the benefits these partnerships bring to encourage their desired community support (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009).

The shift toward a partnership structure of tourism and National Parks has increased the complexity of management, with decisions and plans now requiring input and consideration of a multitude of stakeholders. It is widely accepted an integrated approach to protected area management is necessary to achieving sustainable outcomes (Tomičević, et al., 2012). This has meant in addition to CTOs and PAMAs, National Park management progressively more involves: indigenous groups; local communities; international community; and a myriad of interest groups from recreation and conservation. Literature has examined these various interactions and the possibility of creating a symbiotic relationship between tourism and National Parks. Topics have addressed the relationship nexus; between conflicting visitor activity groups (Collins, 2011); between global and local communities (Uddhammar, 2006); between tourism, local communities and National Parks (Jaafar et al., 2013; Zachrisson et al., 2006); from a network theory perspective (Dredge, 2006) from a governance perspective (Kaltenborn, Qvenild & Nellemann, 2011); and of stakeholder participation and perceptions of National Park planning (Cottrell & Cutumisu, 2006; Haukeland 2011). In 2009, the Journal of Sustainable Tourism published a special edition on tourism and protected area partnerships, featuring articles looking at co-management (Jamal & Stronza, 2009; McCool, 2009; Plummer & Fennell, 2009), multi-disciplinary approaches to partnerships (Bramwell & Cox, 2009; Laing et al., 2009) and finally partnerships as governance (Dredge & Thomas, 2009; Eagles, 2009; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). This study seeks to add to the literature pertaining to partnerships and an integrated management approach by focusing foremost on the specific regulatory relationship between government and CTOs from a stakeholder’s perspective, an area as yet to receive its due attention.
The research is timely, given that CTDNP has remained minimal within Victorian National Parks up until the 2013 legislation amendment which now allows private investment and CTDNP. CTOs were previously vocal in calling for lesser restrictions and more manageable regulations, increasingly eager to exploit National Parks for their tourism potential. This was to the point where once seen as a good alternative, Buckley (2011:410) believed now ‘tourism is a threat to conservation as property developers push to build private facilities inside public protected areas.’ This apparent negative reputation of tourism has led to a strong opposition from conservation groups; recreation groups (McKercher, 1996); the public (Slattery, 2002); and in some instances National Park management, against any further commercial tourism (Larsen & Valentine, 2007). The concern in the increased involvement of the private sector lies predominantly in what values were upheld and prioritised in National Park management, that of environmental conservation or that of the business of tourism. Wilson, Nielsen and Buultjens (2009) discussed, inevitably a commercial venture must aim to create an economically viable and sustainable business, whereas PAMAs are legislated to protect the natural environment in their care.

Buckley (2012:12) has since stated ‘for good or bad, tourism has become an unavoidable component of conservation efforts worldwide’ as it provides funding for conservation activities and is a substantial component of all National Parks activity and management. Exploring the efficacy of government regulation is therefore crucial in determining how to best control commercial tourism activities within National Parks, mitigating potential negative impacts, while enhancing the benefits and ultimately balancing both conservation and use National Park objectives to achieve successful outcomes.
2.2 National Park Regulation

Regulation was described by Weimer and Vining (2005) as a policy instrument used by government to form and establish rules to achieve a desired outcome or to address market, distribution or government failure. Regulations ‘seek to alter choices that producers and consumers would otherwise make in these markets,’ a method government can use to manipulate circumstances in order to achieve their objectives (Weimer & Vining, 2005:237). Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) listed several reasons a government needed to regulate, and suggested in any given market there could be a combination of reasons. For commercial tourism activities in National Parks the reasoning was clear. The government was responsible for protecting the environment for future generations and therefore need to plan, control and monitor the sustainable use of resources. This included regulating externalities, such as cost of maintaining and conserving the environment where activities occur. Government had a legislated commitment to providing recreation in these areas, often not able to provide these services themselves, they engaged and regulated a CTO to provide recreation as a public good (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011; McKercher, 1993a; Worboys et al., 2005).

By introducing CTOs into National Parks, National Park commercial tourism fits within Baumol and Bowen’s (1976) definition of a mixed good. A good or service which generates social benefits and positive externalities which demand government provision for part of the cost (National Park) combined with a private paid component (such as paying a CTO). National Park tourism generated such positive externalities as; the education of visitors on environmental issues; generating income for National Park management; supporting greater areas being protected for conservation; and facilitated well-being and health for visitors. Government provides the National Park as the setting, and then CTO provides the tourism service. Veal (2002:60) further explained National Parks are mixed goods as ‘they are enjoyed by the users directly (private good), in some cases by vicarious users, (public good), by owners of property that overlooks the open space (externality), and by the general public who visit or live in the area and benefit from pleasant views (public good).’ In addition, National Parks provide clean air, protect biodiversity and ecosystems, and provide a recreational space; even if a member of society does not visit a National Park directly, they may support their existence for these reasons.
Regulation of commercial tourism exists as governments and PAMAs seek to restrict and control commercial tourism activities within National Parks in order to achieve their desired conservation and tourism outcomes (Hughes, 1998). Worboys et al. (2005:527) explained most simply that ‘well-constructed regulations create a clear understanding of what can and cannot be done, and enable the community, through its parliamentary representatives, to protect natural resources’ by developing regulations which seek to; prevent action (such as land clearing); require action (such as environmental impact assessment reporting); establish institutions and processes; or ban technology that causes negative impact. In Australian based studies, research has indicated government regulation is a potential barrier to successful PPPs in National Parks, and often a source of stress for CTOs in the running of their business (Huybers & Bennett, 1997; Moore et al., 2009; RRTF, 1997; Russell, Lafferty & Loudoun, 2008; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). Regulatory systems within Australia have been deemed inefficient as legislation and regulations were found to be inconsistent and overlapping in areas, rendering the administration in abiding by the law tedious (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009) and ‘criticised for emphasising process over outcomes’ (Worboys et al., 2005:122).

Effective government policy and regulation are needed to achieve a sustainable tourism outcome. Early comments in sustainable tourism research by Pigram (1990) and Hjalager (1996) noted there was a large gap between the plethora of studies on developing, recommending and adopting a sustainable tourism policy, to the lack of studies into the actual implementation or action of such policies. Despite this observation over a decade ago, research into specific regulation techniques, their structure, and effectiveness in implementing policy, continues to be lacking and therefore an area in which further research would greatly aid the development of effective and efficient National Park policy (Bramwell, 2005; Eagles, McCool & Haynes, 2002). Bramwell (2005:407) commented:

> It is important to examine the potential consequences of different policy instruments for society and culture, for the environment and economy, and for various affected actors. It is necessary to understand these potential consequences so that political debate can be more informed and policy makers might be better placed to meet their desired objectives.

This study aimed to begin to fill that gap by examining the policy instrument of regulation.
Empirical National Park Regulatory Studies

National Park regulation had predominantly been addressed within the literature as both a way for PAMAs to manage CTO activities and as a technique to control visitor behaviour. Texts such as Eagles & McCool (2002), Newsome, Moore and Dowling (2013) and Worboys et al. (2005), outlined various strategies available such as commercial leases and licences; permits; and zoning, with minimal theoretical discussion or further analysis on use and implementation (Bramwell, 2005). Within the existing empirical research, there was little focus on linking management techniques with regulatory theory. Hjalager (1996:3), who viewed regulation as an effective tourism policy instrument, noted ‘tourism academics and practitioners have shown little concern for regulation theory’.

The void of regulatory theory evident in tourism research is most apparent in the research framework designs. The majority of works used the management plans being studied to identify and categorise management strategies and to create a framework of analysis (Cater et al., 2008; Hill & Pickering, 2002). This meant each framework was unique to its study making theoretical and research comparisons difficult. Few studies went beyond this to organise management strategies within a regulatory framework based on regulatory theory. Amongst those that did, Hjalager (1996), Huybers and Bennet (1997) and Hyslop and Eagles (2007), showed a greater depth of regulatory understanding and were able to offer research recommendations from an expanded level of knowledge from both tourism management theory and regulatory theory.

Further exploration of the National Park empirical research revealed two main themes. The first theme was studies examining regulation compliance (Table 2.7), noted as a growing focus in regulatory studies across many disciplines (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). Within tourism it addressed those who the regulation seeks to affect and contemplated regulatory effectiveness and potential environmental impact within a National Park setting.
Table 2.7: Regulatory strategies in empirical research (Theme One Compliance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firm based regulations</td>
<td>1. Zonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Industry based regulations</td>
<td>2. Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Government regulations</td>
<td>3. Licence/Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Market</td>
<td>5. Travel Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Mandatory Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horse-riding:</td>
<td>Continuum of regulatory structures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Government control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Partnership approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Market control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-road vehicles:</td>
<td>Continuum of regulatory response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock climbing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hill and Pickering (2002) examined how regulation was used as a visitor management technique to control summer visitors (both commercial and independent) in alpine and subalpine National Parks spread across NSW, Victoria, Australian Capital Territory and Tasmania. Primarily busy with ski tourism in winter, visitation was increasing to these areas during the summer months. Hill and Pickering (2002:1) surmised ‘regulation is one mechanism by which they (PAMAs) can monitor, control, and where necessary limit tourism and thereby minimise negative impacts.’ In addition to document analysis, they surveyed National Park staff from nine National Parks through a written survey containing both qualitative and quantitative data across four areas: (1) vehicular activities; (2) water activities; (3) other activities; and (4) camping, and from their data analysis determined there were seven main systems of regulating National Park visitors outlined in Table 2.7.

Their study further explored the restrictions based on each of the four activity categories and concluded there was a lack of consistency across the states in regards to regulation, especially activities such as horse riding, vehicle use and back-country camping. This was found to be a concern as visitors here were largely responsible for their own education.
and compliance to these codes of conduct, and such inconsistencies may lead to visitor confusion and negative environmental impacts. They concluded Australia’s National Park management agencies could improve regulatory compliance by extending the permit system to high-impact and overnight visitors creating an avenue for visitor education. The Hill and Pickering (2002) study was valuable in building a foundation for examination and offering an insight into Australian visitor management regulations, but did not differentiate between independent and commercial visitors.

Cater et al. (2008) explored visitor management regulations for both independent and commercial visitors of three high impact activities, horse-riding, rock-climbing and off-road vehicles, in Australian National Parks. These activities had obvious potential for high environmental impact, but also social impacts when conflicting with other National Park users. With similar findings to Hill and Pickering (2002), these activities were largely regulated through zoning and voluntary behaviour guided by education, PAMA direction and advice. Cater et al. (2008) re-iterated concern of the level of regulatory awareness participants in these activities held. They recommended further studies into the expectations, reactions and attitudes of both horse-riders and rock-climbers to management regulatory strategies in order to increase their efficacy, believing these maybe a key factor in participant compliance.

Russell, Lafferty and Loudoun (2008) focused on CTO compliance in their valuable study “Examining Tourism Operators’ Responses to Environmental Regulation: The Role of Regulatory Perceptions and Relationships.” Conducting five case studies of tourism accommodation operators in close proximity to World Heritage sites in Eastern Australia, to find how CTO’s perceived regulations and their relationship with their regulator. Data was collected through semi-structured interviews, site visitation and relevant documents sourced from the internet, policy manuals, brochures, and accreditation information, and analysed by coded and themed techniques common to qualitative research. Their research findings suggested the human element to regulation needed to be considered, predominantly the relationship between CTOs and the PAMA controlling regulation, with the CTO’s perception of both the regulators and regulations affecting the organisational behaviour of the CTO and how they responded to regulations.
Russell, Lafferty and Loudoun (2008) used a strong theoretical foundation based on the typologies of Aragón-Correa (1998), Roome (1992) and Sharma and Vredenburg (1998) to map the CTO’s responses to regulation on a continuum from pro-active (organisations who comply and go beyond regulations) to reactive (organisations who comply when forced, or do not comply). CTOs with a positive outlook toward regulations and PAMAs were found to be more pro-active in both adhering to regulations and taking their own further initiatives to environmental protection. CTOs who viewed regulations and regulators with fear or apprehension were less likely to comply. The case studies highlighted the need to consider CTO’s access to resources and financial situation, as some smaller CTOs were prepared to risk some environmental damage if it reduced business costs, while larger CTOs were more likely to adopt environmental protection as a priority. Russell, Lafferty and Loudoun (2008) suggested regulating agencies should consider liaising more with CTOs to nurture a more positive relationship, possibly encouraging a positive response to regulations and environmental protection. They emphasised the need however for further research into this area to gain a greater understanding of how regulations and regulators are perceived and how to increase compliance.

From these three Australian compliance studies, the level of visitor knowledge of regulations was found as a significant issue. Given that visitors can only comply to regulations if they know what they are, it was suggested more work could be done in education and awareness to improve regulatory outcomes. There was some consensus visitor’s perception of regulations and, in the case of CTOs, perception of the PAMA, could influence regulatory compliance.

The second theme identified in the National Park empirical research considered the content of the policies and regulations themselves (Table 2.8). The majority of these adopted comparative methods between two or more case studies. Comparative analysis has obvious merit in some circumstances; as the following discussion indicates within National Park tourism studies where unique circumstances apply in each system, without a strong theoretical framework, it can limit the potential analytical and theoretical possibilities of the study.
## Table 2.8: Regulatory strategies in empirical research (Theme Two: Policies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rules</td>
<td>1. Categories &amp; management objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fees</td>
<td>2. Planning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>3. Leases and Licences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Goals or objectives of visitation</td>
<td>1. Environmental Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Visitor use plan</td>
<td>2. Infrastructure development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use of an established visitor</td>
<td>3. Monitoring plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management framework</td>
<td>4. Alternative Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Permitted/Encouraged Visitor levels</td>
<td>5. Waste Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and uses</td>
<td>6. Risk analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trails and markings</td>
<td>9. Concession user fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Noise restrictions</td>
<td>10. Income requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Restricted items</td>
<td>11. Maintenance/repair reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Accessibility (for disabled</td>
<td>13. Financial capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Dates and hours of operation</td>
<td>15. Education level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Length of stay</td>
<td>16. Language abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Fees and pricing</td>
<td>17. Legal Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Risk management</td>
<td>19. Lateness or Non-payment fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Emergency response</td>
<td>20. Facility ownership after concession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Retail services &amp; concessions</td>
<td>26. Local community employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Human resources required for</td>
<td>27. Community Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visitation</td>
<td>28. Revenue sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Marketing &amp; competition for visitation</td>
<td>29. Local business involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Measurement of economic impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Visitor use monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Assessment of visitor satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Assessment of attainment of objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commercial licence and permit</td>
<td>1. Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Licence term</td>
<td>2. Taxes &amp; pricing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fees, revenue retention, admin costs</td>
<td>3. Incentives &amp; penalties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quotas</td>
<td>4. Negotiable licences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Activity specific conditions</td>
<td>5. Bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Site specific conditions</td>
<td>6. Legislation or planning regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public liability insurance</td>
<td>7. Direct action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Operator qualification and experience</td>
<td>8. Clans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Permit procedure manual for staff</td>
<td>10. Awards, symbols, eco-declarations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Permit information for CTO</td>
<td>11. Demonstration projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Agency consultation on multi-park tours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Agency – operator consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buckley, Witting and Guest (2001), collated information of the permit and licensing procedures and fees for commercial tours and commercial photography activities in National Parks as part of the CRCST series of reports, titled “Managing People in Australian Park”. The report was more of a knowledge sharing exercise collating and comparing the procedures of the nine Australian PAMAs in an attempt to provide accurate and useful information to both industry and park managements across the country, and was extremely valuable in this sense. Due to the nature and audience of the publication, there was little to no discussion in terms of theory or recommendations however, and thus was limiting from an academic research perspective.

The Tourism and Transport Forum (TTF) (2007) industry report, “Natural Tourism Partnership Action Plan” is perhaps the most comprehensive contribution to date. The TTF compiled several case studies of regulatory systems within Australian National Parks as part of their larger study into natural tourism partnerships, stating regulations has a direct impact on the commercial viability for CTOs and their investment decisions. The regulatory component lacked a strong theoretical framework, but compared and detailed the current laws regulating CTOs in Victoria, NSW, Queensland and the Commonwealth National Parks to determine the potential regulatory barriers to natural area partnerships. Inconsistencies across the nation and poor co-ordination between tourism and National Park management throughout Australia were deemed weaknesses of the system. Further to this, regulatory restrictions on private sector involvement in National Park tourism, the complexity of assessment and approval, and the nature of leases and risk sharing were discouragements for developing successful partnerships. Since this time, extensive regulatory reforms have been implemented in several systems, and thus a current theoretical based research study would be valuable in expanding on these findings.

Hyslop and Eagles (2007) compared PAMA visitor management policies of all visitors, independent and of CTOs, from Canada and the USA. As opposed to creating a framework from the data, this study created an initial framework of visitor management policies from taking the thirty IUCN global guideline categories of sustainable tourism (Eagles, McCool & Haynes, 2002) (Table 2.8) and measuring policies from both countries to these criteria. This methodology added a greater dimension to the results, as they were able to identify gaps in both countries visitor management plans that would not have been
discovered with comparative analysis alone. Hyslop and Eagles (2007) believed this was the first such policy analysis framework attempted within the protected area visitor management field, and surmised further study would be beneficial to both academic literature and PAMAs.

Focusing on the partnership between CTOs and PAMAs, Wyman et al. (2011) compared concession agreements from twenty-two countries, against five principle components identified from their literature review, and twenty four sub constructs identified from the data collected in order to determine what best practices exist and where improvement is needed. If a country addressed a construct, the study recorded it as strength; if they did not it was measured as a weakness of the agreement. This analysis has some obvious limitations. Determining if a country addressed a construct does not necessarily establish their efficacy of delivering a desired outcome. Wyman et al. (2011) acknowledged their access to agreement terms was based on available internet data, which can be limiting in detail, and the findings did not adequately deal with the complexity of some systems. This is especially true in the instance of Australia, which was treated as a whole even though National Parks are managed at a state level. Australia received strengths in two components, waste management and alternative energy for practices identified on Great Keppel Island Resort. The study did produce a valuable contribution in beginning to develop a guideline for best practices for PPP agreements, any further study would benefit from a more reliable form of data collection and analysis.

Hjalager (1996) created a research framework combining both tourism and regulatory literature. She first identified environmental regulatory strategies from the general sustainable tourism literature, and then organised them into three categories; market forces; bureaucracies (government regulation); and clans (self-regulation) based on Ouchi’s (1980) regulatory model. Examining tourism policy from Denmark, this framework facilitated discussion and findings on the potential strengths and weaknesses of each strategies influence on environment and tourism innovation. The advantage shown here of utilising a regulatory framework was that Hjalager (1996) could then draw upon the extensive regulatory theory available to discuss results and make further recommendations for policy action.
Theoretical Framework: National Park Regulatory Strategies

Given the diversity and complexity of regulations of National Park tourism, there was a clear need to utilise a framework based on regulatory theory for this research. Hjalager’s (1996) study illustrated how the breadth of sustainable tourism regulatory strategies available could be organised and understood within such a framework, raising the possibility to extend this further to the National Park situation. As yet, strategies to regulate CTOs in Victoria’s National Parks had not been systematically analysed using such a regulatory theory framework. It was therefore decided to follow the path set out by Hjalager (1996) to organise National Park management and regulatory strategies into a regulatory theory framework to enable a deeper analysis of data collected within this study and to develop more valuable results and recommendations.

From various National Park management literature regulatory strategies specific to CTOs were identified as: contracts, licence and permits; lease contracts; fees and economic structure; monitoring and enforcement; and further to this general visitor management regulations which seek to control both independent and CTO visitors; specific activity regulations; zoning and temporal conditions; built facilities; and education and interpretation. In addition to government and management regulations, the tourism industry has developed strong self-regulatory programs and firms themselves have implemented their own self-regulatory strategies (Buckley, 2011; Eagles and McCool, 2002; Eagles, McCool & Haynes, 2002; Hill and Pickering, 2002; Kuo, 2002; More, 2002; Newsome, Moore & Dowling, 2013; Worboys et al., 2005;).

Following the example set by Hjalager (1996), management strategies could be further categorised into a regulatory theory to develop a framework for the research. Several possible regulatory theories were identified: Huybers and Bennett (1997); Ouchi (1980), utilised by Hjalager (1996); and Weimer and Vining (2005). The downfall with these frameworks was they contained only three to four categories each; potentially not adequately addressing the complexity of regulating commercial tourism in National Parks. Baldwin and Cave (1999) offered a more comprehensive framework, later revised in 2011 (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011) covering eight possible regulatory strategies; (1) control and command; (2) incentives; (3) market harnessing controls; (4) disclosure; (5) direct action and design; (6) rights and liabilities laws; (7) public compensation/social
insurance; and (8) self-regulation. A highly regarded regulatory text, their approach has been utilised in a variety of areas such as: sports policy (Hoye, Nicholson & Houlihan, 2010); electricity distribution (Bakovic, Tenenbaum & Woolf, 2003); and health care (Saltman & Busse, 2002). In regards to National Park regulations, it immediately addressed several of the techniques identified in the visitor management literature identified: ‘command and control’ covered ‘permits’ and ‘legislation’; ‘direct action and design’ related to ‘built facilities’ and ‘zoning’; economic ‘incentives’ discussed ‘fees’; and self-regulation which was a prominent theme in both literatures. Following the example set by Hjalager (1996), management techniques identified were matched to their regulatory strategy counterpart from the Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) theory to form a theoretical framework for the current study (Appendix B, page 268).

This theoretical framework facilitated the analysis and conclusions of the current study results to be drawn from both National Park management and regulatory theory. It was important to note management strategies may utilise more than one regulatory strategy to enforce a visitor management technique. For example zoning areas within a National Park can be considered as a design solution strategy; however it uses command and control strategies to enforce it and incentive strategies to encourage good behaviour form CTOs (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). Each of the eight are discussed below in relation to Victorian National Park regulations and National Park literature.

**Command & Control**

Command and control regulatory strategies seek to direct CTO behaviour by outlining specific rules for acceptable behaviour which are supported by enforceable laws. Rules demand CTOs to behave in an acceptable manner or prohibit them from certain actions and cover requirements for CTO quality and qualification standards. They address the allocation of National Park resources, and which areas and what resources CTOs are allowed to utilise to carry out their activities. Enforceable by law, there is usually some form of penalty for non-compliance, potentially strengthening the success command and control regulations may have in inducing desired behaviour and outcomes to achieve National Park objectives (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). Bramwell (2005) offered that as these strategies are often quantifiable in nature, such as the number of visitors
permitted into an area, the outcome and level of impact is more predictable and allows for more precise management than other more abstract measures.

PAMAs can regulate command and control strategies through a permit and licence system. Mandatory rules are part of the permit and licence system, whereby permits and licences are given to CTOs to carry out certain activities and to conduct tours in National Parks once management requirements have been fulfilled and as long as ongoing conditions are met. Permit and licences rule CTO behaviour in four main areas: general conditions; activity specific; location specific; and special conditions. These can include restrictions on: group sizes; types of activities allowed; equipment; allowable animals; guns; fires; and requirements to carry certain equipment such as safety equipment or waste control equipment (Buckley, 2011). For high impact activities these rules are extensive to ensure visitor safety, a high quality visitor experience, as well as environmental protection (Hill & Pickering, 2002).

Heavily supported by legislation, command and control regulations are usually created by the government departments responsible for National Parks. In many National Park systems, the PAMA is instated as a statutory authority, which allows them to also create and enforce such regulations (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). In Australia this responsibility falls to the individual state PAMA, this can mean CTOs who conduct business across several states in Australia can have an increased level of bureaucracy to deal with in complying with each of the State’s regulations (Hill and Pickering, 2002). Over-regulation can be a justified complaint. Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) offered ‘legalism’ as a potential weakness to command and control regulations, stating when rules and systems become inflexible and too complex, they can eventually become a barrier to entry for some parties, an occurrence found to be true in National Parks by Moore et al. (2009) and often an argument made by the tourism industry and CTOs when calling for regulatory reform (RRTF, 1997; TTF, 2007).

In Victoria, Parks Victoria (2012) required activities to be conducted in accordance with the guidelines set out by the Adventure Activity Standards. Further to this, CTOs were required to hold a St. Johns Ambulance Level Two Basic First Aid or equivalent
certificate, and all employees, volunteers, contractors, agents, utilised in carrying out licensed activities for the CTO needed to be sufficiently competent and experienced to complete necessary tasks (Buckley, Witting & Guest, 2001). The main grievance with this system was the high level of requirements placed on CTOs, while independent visitors partaking in the same activities were not bound by the same restrictions, opening them up to potential safety risks or impacting on the environment (McKercher 1993b; Moore et al., 2009). Hill and Pickering (2002) believed there was opportunity for PAMAs to increase environmental protection by extending these permits to independent visitors, and by doing so increasing awareness and education on desired behaviour for all visitors, not just those travelling with a CTO. Other major concerns were time delays in making decisions and processing permits and the low level of involvement the tourism industry had in developing regulations (Moore et al., 2009).

Russell, Lafferty and Loudoun (2008) found CTO compliance to regulations was highly linked to their relationship and perception of their regulatory PAMA. One of the potential weaknesses of command and control strategies is this relationship between the regulatory body, PAMA, and those who are being regulated, CTOs. Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) explained there is a concern a PAMA may be ‘captured’ and begin acting in their own best interests, or that of who they are regulating, as opposed to that of the public at large in which they represent. This can happen for several reasons. Buckley (2003) explained the economic dynamic of the relationship may cause a shift in National Park priorities, seeing PAMAs becoming answerable or feeling obligated to CTOs who pay to support National Park existence through their lease and permit fees. Moreover, a PAMA must also consider the ability and cooperation of CTOs adhering to the regulations when developing strategies, which often relies upon information from the industry in creating necessary restrictions to achieve their objectives. Over time the relationship can become close, and this can lead to the ‘capture’ of the PAMA to the industry or CTO needs and wants (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). Capture is often used by conservationist groups in their arguments against CTO activity in National Parks. But Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) extended capture could also occur by the power of interest groups, such as conservation groups, who can also unduly influence the behaviour of PAMAs.
A further challenge is the setting of standards to be enforced and the necessary resources to monitor outcomes and enforce command and control regulations. Gaining baseline information of the condition of National Parks is often difficult for under resourced PAMAs (Bramwell, 2005), for example it was not until the “State of the Parks” report from Parks Victoria in 2000 that such data had been available (Anderson, 2000). The lack of data inhibits ongoing monitoring of the changes to the area as a result of CTO activity, making the setting of standards and their enforcement problematic. Moreover there are issues in setting general standards across all National Parks and CTOs. It is commonly understood each scenario has its own contextual elements which need to be considered in the planning and management of CTOs and visitors, adding extra pressure to PAMAs in creating applicable and appropriate standards (Sowman & Pearce, 2000). As command and control strategies are part of the law, penalties can be time consuming to enact and paperwork extensive. This can be to the point where the regulators themselves do not seek to enforce the rules. In addition CTOs can find ways around restrictions, or can continue to conduct their activities in National Parks without a permit illegally and therefore largely unregulated, until caught (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011; Bramwell, 2005).

**Incentive Based Regulatory Strategies**

Whereas command and control strategies are restrictive in nature, incentive strategies aim to induce good behaviour and desired outcomes by offering rewards for desired actions and outcomes or by penalising undesired actions or outcomes (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). This has several advantages for CTOs; their regulating agencies; and the achievement of desired outcomes as once an effective incentive program is installed, the responsibility of achievement relies upon the action of the CTO and not the constant control and monitoring of the PAMA. Once implemented, CTOs can consider the cost versus benefit of each incentive strategy and then choose to meet desired outcomes and receive rewards, or accept the penalties for not doing so. Incentive regulatory strategies therefore offer CTOs more flexibility in how they achieve desired outcomes and to what extent. This does raise the possibility that poor performing CTOs will continue to behave undesirably and merely accept penalties, while those good performers will continue exceed expectations and receive rewards (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011).
In environmental matters where non-achievement can result in irreversible environmental damage, Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) advised failure in motivating poor performers to do better, is a weakness of incentive strategies. A detailed and effective incentive program which suitably entices desired behaviour needs to be developed. This may be especially difficult in National Parks given the variations of CTOs covered by regulations (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). Smaller firms may not be able to afford the costs of achieving high end rewards, whereas larger organisations may be able to absorb penalties (Huybers and Bennett, 1997). From the outset incentive strategies seem to offer greater benefits over command and control, the PAMA could have less ongoing responsibilities for monitoring, information sharing and negotiating with a CTO, thus lessening the use of PAMA resources and reducing the risk of capture. However setting up an effective and efficient incentive strategy requires a complex set of rules and PAMAs still need to have some level of monitoring CTO behaviour and outcomes (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011).

Incentives do give CTOs more control in how they manage their business; as a result an effective incentive program is thought to be able to support innovation of new ideas and a voluntary move by CTOs to better environmental practices than perhaps command and control strategies. Within the tourism industry, Hjalager (1996) proposed higher taxes on excess water or energy use could prove an incentive for better environmental management practices and innovation. Likewise government subsidies which cover extra cost for sustainable initiatives or innovations for efficient energy and water use or building materials, could also induce environmentally conscious behaviour from tourism organisations (Bramwell, 2005; Hjalager, 1996).

Economic incentives in the form of subsidies and taxes are common regulatory strategies. Within the National Park structure, this extends to the various National Park fees in the form of: entrance fees for individuals or coach entrance fees; public land use fees for commercial tours measured per client, per tour or per day; licence and permit fees for special activities, camping fees or fees to access to certain areas; administrative fees such as commercial application, renewal, or transfer fees (Buckley, Witting & Guest, 2001). These fees can be used as a form of economic incentives to induce desired CTO behaviour and also that of independent National Park visitors. For example cheaper fees for longer permits times aim for a higher commitment from CTOs, while higher entrance
fees for peak periods, sensitive areas, or permits for high-impact activities and lower fees for off-peak times, can work toward maintaining controllable visitor numbers (Bramwell, 2005; Eagles, McCool & Haynes, 2002). Mostly National Park entrance fees are kept low to increase visitation (Hjalager, 1996) (with Victoria going to the extreme by abolishing independent visitor entrance fees into Victorian National Parks in 2009).

As previously discussed, the economic structure of tourism in National Parks is a contentious issue and the reliance of tourism fees as PAMA income brings strong criticisms within National Park tourism literature. In the National Park scenario, it is questioned whether fees from CTOs adequately cover the true cost of administration and environmental management, how these fees are returned to the PAMA and to what extent. If a PAMA does become reliant on CTO fees, there may still be the opportunity for the PAMA to become obligated or captured by CTOs (Wyman et al., 2011). Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) indicated that the use of fees and taxes as regulatory incentives can bring strong criticisms from public and interest groups questioning how generated funds are dispersed, if they utilised back to environmental protection within the National Park and to what extent fees and taxes are simply passed onto the consumer reducing the penalty effect on the CTO itself.

Incentives for CTOs do not necessarily have to be monetary. In National Parks, good behaviour can be rewarded with longer permits; special access to restricted or sensitive areas; or CTOs may be rewarded with inclusion into marketing promotions of the area (Bramwell, 2005; Laing et al., 2008). Laing et al. (2008) posited a good incentive regime with attractive benefits can produce higher CTO standards in the quality of tourism products offered and a more successful partnership between PAMAs and CTOs. In Victoria, CTOs who gain accreditation from approved programs can apply for longer leases (Buckley, Witting & Guest, 2001). These strategies do have their place, with Russell, Lafferty and Loudoun (2008) determining in their evaluation that an effective regulatory system of CTOs in National Parks would possess a balance of both command and control regulatory strategies and incentive regulations.
Market Harnessing Controls

There are three regulatory strategies listed by Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) relevant to market-harnessing control of CTOs in National Parks: competition laws; franchising; and regulation by contract. These strategies seek to influence the market in which CTOs operate to ensure it remains fair, and encourages delivery of a quality product or service to the public. The Australian National Competition Policy amended the Trades Practices Act 1974 (Cth) in 1996, aimed to provide neutrality within markets where both public and private entities operate, such as a National Park. The policy ruled that PAMAs must provide goods and services at competitive and not discounted prices to ensure CTOs had an equal opportunity to compete (Worboys et al., 2005). Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) noted the ability for such an Act to cover all sectors is a great strength of competition laws, there is no need to individualise laws for each industry or sector. Enforcement of competition law lies within the court system and not on government agencies to enforce, making it potentially a more cost effective strategy for government. Not having the expertise of a specific industry government agency to develop suitable guidelines and deal with issues quickly can also be considered a weakness of such laws.

For tourism products and services within National Parks, often a CTO can provide a more competitive, quality and efficient service than the PAMA. This includes the utilisation of built facilities for tourism purposes. A PAMA will regulate built facilities through franchising, contracting, and leases. Built facilities can be existing heritage sites converted, such as quarantine stations or lighthouses (Darcy & Wearing, 2009; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009) or can be new purpose built facilities (Anderson, 2000). The partnership for built facilities between the PAMA and CTO can be developed in several ways. The CTO can approach the PAMA with an idea or opportunity, or the PAMA can put out a call for EOI from CTOs. A contract or lease is then agreed upon and this forms the basis of the ongoing regulatory relationship (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). The theoretical terms utilised within the industry, tourism literature and regulatory literature are inconsistent here. In a National Park setting the term ‘concession’ is often used to describe a formal and legal agreement between a PAMA or government department and a CTO, and can cover permits, leases, licences, and franchises (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) offer the following useful distinctions of such agreements:
**Competitive tendering/Contracting out:** refers to services provided by a CTO to the PAMA itself, not the public. In a National Park these services can include waste disposal, weed and pest control or building of facilities such as roads, and generally not applicable to the provision of tourism services.

**Licence:** gives permission for a number of CTOs to operate and compete within a given market. In a National Park, CTOs are given licences or permits on the basis of fulfilling certain requirements and ongoing conditions, and in return they can operate tourism services within the National Park. These licences were detailed under command and control regulatory strategies.

**Franchise:** When an existing or proposed building or facility can be utilised for tourism services within a National Park, the government will call for an EOI from CTOs to provide this service directly to the public. In these situations where there is only one facility available, competition within the market cannot exist. A franchise therefore is utilised where it is described as ‘the allocation (subject to conditions) of a protected or exclusive right to exploit or carry out an activity’ (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011:165). By calling for EOI’s, the franchising process moves the ‘competition in the market’ to ‘competition for the market’ (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011:116). The key difference here between competitive tendering and franchising is that in a tender the commercial provider services the PAMA, and therefore the PAMA assumes the operative risk. In a franchise scenario, the CTO provides services directly to the market, and therefore assumes risk.

In this process the government will accept EOI proposals from CTOs and make a decision on who can best provide the services needed by National Park visitors. This allows CTOs the flexibility and freedom to put together a bid which they believe will best meet market needs, and the opportunity to do so before they make an investment. Government can set benchmarks or specify details of services which need to be covered by a CTO proposal and future operation. Careful consideration needs to be taken in developing any requirements or guidelines placed on an EOI proposal. Too many requirements, a short franchise term, or an unfair division of risk may exclude or discourage some CTOs from
bidding and reduce competition for the franchise, effectively voiding the market-harnessing strategy. In addition, too stringent guidelines or ongoing contractual obligations may inhibit CTO innovation and ability to respond to market forces. A good set of requirements and EOI guidelines however, will better facilitate governments’ task of comparing each proposal and assist CTOs in developing proposals which meet the needs of the government. This may increase the likelihood of them putting together a proposal that will be accepted and reduce the likelihood of them wasting resources in developing a proposal that will not be suitable. For a successful franchise, a balance must exist between government conditions and CTO freedom (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011) and as Eagles, McCool and Haynes (2002) added the final decision needs to be transparent and fair to ensure the process does not become political.

**Contracts for Exploitation:** This will occur where a PAMA ‘allows a private operator to exploit a public good in return for making a capital investment and paying taxes on profits’ (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011:167). These contracts differ to franchises in that their contract length will be longer, offering a greater incentive for larger investments and more opportunity for return on that investment. The threat of non-renewal or termination control mechanism that franchises use is absent in a contract for exploitation. Terms of length have been a key issue in CTO and PAMA partnerships. Victoria was moving toward longer lease lengths in their regulatory reforms, some being offered up to 99 years, indicating a move away from franchising and toward contracts for exploitation. Longer lease terms can allow for continuity in services and an increase in quality. Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) warned longer lease terms can make it difficult for PAMAs to remove CTOs if their performance lacks and, if this occurs, can put off new entrants into the market. Encouraging a greater investment by CTOs in National Park buildings could offer benefits such as prolonging use and protection of the building; generating income for CTOs and PAMAs; improving product quality; and increasing marketing strength (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009).

The written contracts or leases developed between the PAMA and CTO, whether as a franchise or contract for exploitation, have drawn much attention in management literature and research findings. Studies have shown CTOs generally felt contract regulations and legislation were not supportive, perhaps even obstructive, to tourism
development and that they should be more flexible to allow for greater innovation by CTOs (Moore et al., 2009; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). Contracts/leases can contain administrative and operational regulations such as opening times; range and level of services to be provided; signage and marketing controls; maintenance responsibilities; pricing structures; environmental management; lease duration; and requirements for employee training and qualifications (Eagles, McCool & Haynes, 2002). Throughout research, issues from the initial application to the ongoing management of contracts have been highlighted by existing National Park tourism partnerships. The over-bureaucratic application process and time taken for decision making by PAMAs and the government is a deterrent for CTOs in applying for contracts, as is some of the ongoing contracted regulations which would control their businesses (TTF, 2007; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). Regulations such as CTOs not being able to book out a restaurant facility as National Park objectives require places available for the walk in public, highlighted in the Wilson, Nielsen and Buultjens (2009) study as deterrents by CTOs.

The written contractual/lease agreement is an opportunity to clearly define the objectives of the CTO/PAMA partnership and the roles and power division each party has. The CTO and PAMA may hold differing priorities, the CTO their business success and the PAMA conservation management. By developing clear goals and suitable regulations initially agreed upon in the contract, both outcomes could be achieved in the long-term (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). CTOs believed comprehensive and clear contract/lease regulations could better enable continuity and security for their business should there be changes in PAMA management and employee status within the National Park. It could facilitate open communication and increase opportunities for the tourism industry to take a greater role in National Park activities such as education and environment and visitor monitoring (Moore et al., 2009). Other issues listed with the ongoing management of contracts and partnership relations were the handling of day to day requests. These were again touted as being over-regulated and over-bureaucratic, with some requests for maintenance or changes held up by heritage protection and others by the lack of communication structure between CTO and PAMA (Moore et al., 2009; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). The monitoring of contract performance is an ongoing responsibility for the PAMA. Systems where contract and partnership success were determined by quantitative factors, such as paying rent on time, were believed to be too limiting, and
could be improved by adding in qualitative measures such as quality of product (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009).

**Disclosure Regulation**

Disclosure regulation refers to the government control of organisation information. These rules ‘usually prohibit the supply of false or misleading information and may also require mandatory disclosure’ (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011:119). Information such as the quality, process or price of goods and services may need to be provided by the producer directly to the consumer, or by the producer to the government or regulatory body who then pass that information on to the consumer. For disclosure regulation to be effective, the consumer needs to disseminate that information and make their purchase or action choices. Consumer information therefore needs to be timely, concise and preferably with some sort of standard to compare results to, to ascertain best practices and high performers in that market. Information or market comprehension may be beyond the scope of the consumer to understand and to make an informed decision, in which case the expertise of an industry regulator under a command and control strategy would be more beneficial (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011).

Consumers may not make choices that deliver the desired outcome government is attempting to achieve. For example if government regulates a CTO in a National Park to disclose their environmental management practices, they would hope consumers would choose the most environmental friendly CTO. Consumers however may decide other factors are more important, such as length of tour or price of accommodation, rendering the disclosure regulation ineffective. For issues as important as environmental protection, disclosure information could best be effective as a supplementary strategy to a command and control or incentive scheme. The cost of collating and delivering information in disclosure regulation needs to be considered, as does the cost of government monitoring required to ensure information is accurate. CTOs in National Parks are required to return trip information to Parks Victoria to enable the PAMA to manage their activities, this information is not passed on to consumers (Buckley, Witting & Guest, 2001).
Direct Action & Design Solutions

Direct action occurs when a government directly utilises their own resources to achieve desired outcomes, such as government building an accommodation facility within a National Park which meets a high level of environmental standards and leasing it out to a CTO. This would ensure the commercial accommodation facility would limit its environmental impact, as opposed to command and control regulations or an incentive scheme in which government would require the CTO itself to build or achieve environmental standards (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011; Bramwell, 2005). Government provision of existing facilities can be common. As Buckley (2011) explained, most built facilities within a National Park are protected heritage buildings or buildings which existed on the land before National Park status was granted to the area. When leasing these buildings, the government can choose to update the facilities and thus regulating by direct action, or require standards and upkeep by the CTO as part of their contract agreement; command and control regulations; or an incentive program. Moore et al. (2009) described scenarios whereby purpose built camping facilities were built for CTO use, however new purpose built tourism facilities within National Parks have been rare. This trend could be changing with the government desire to increase tourism in National Parks and the recent success of the purpose built accommodation huts in Tasmania’s National Parks which have been leased to a CTO.

Through direct action, government can assist those CTOs who may not have the capital to improve or provide facilities which meet the desired standards. This can prove more effective and cost efficient long-term in achieving desired outcomes than incurring costs of monitoring or implementing command and control regulations or incentive programs. Government provision must aim to remain fair and careful not to inadvertently distort competition in the market. There is risk if government takes the necessary action to avoid undesired results, innovation within the private market may be stilted. For example if government builds a water efficient system within a facility, the private firm who leases it is not required to innovate new ways of saving water as they would had the government instead imposed a tax on excess water use. A water efficient system would still need to be designed; however government becomes the customer as opposed to a private firm potentially impacting market, risk and innovation. Further to this, there are no guarantees the public sector will get it right (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011).
Design solutions refer to how the government designs and provides physical environments. They produce desired outcomes by ‘designing out’ potential problems or creating areas which enable or encourage desired behaviour and discourage undesired behaviour (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). In National Park management this is commonly referred to as ‘hardening the environment’ and is a popular strategy for controlling the behaviour of both public and private visitors. Hardening the environment can include actions such as the design and construction of roads; car parks; walking tracks; campsites; toilet facilities; fences; look outs; and any other physical changes made to the environment. Designing an area for tourists within a National Park needs deep consideration as any changes to the environment can have a strong impact on both conservation objectives and the visitor experience. For example when building a walking track it needs to be considered: where the track is going to go; how long it should be; how it affects the wildlife in the area; what impact will visitor access have to that area; water draining and potential erosion issues; what will the track be made of; how the visual aspect of the track will affect the visitor perception of the area; who are the desired users of the track; does it need to be wheelchair, horse, 4WD or bike friendly; and what signage and maps are needed. Hardening the environment in such ways needs to be a part of a long-term plan (Buckley, 2011; Cater et al., 2008; Eagles & McCool, 2002).

Zoning areas is the other more common form of design solutions within National Parks. Zoning includes spatially defined restrictions on where CTOs are allowed to go and what type of activities they can conduct where. These requirements can also be affected by seasonality, or restricted length of stays in areas (Buckley, 2011). Zoning is particularly useful in managing potential conflict, such as restricting areas for high noise activities like four wheel driving away from solitary activities such as bush walking or rock climbing, and controlling high impact activities interaction with the environment, especially in sensitive breeding times (Cater et al., 2008). Common legislated zones within Australian National Parks are ‘wilderness areas’. These are large areas of untouched natural wilderness given a higher legal protection status restricting human activities (Hill & Pickering, 2002), and are particularly contentious in the public/private tourism debate, with the decision by NSW to open up these areas to CTO tours criticised by conservation groups as incompatible with the objectives for these areas of solitude and high environmental protection. Victorian regulations remained protective of wilderness zones, not allowing any CTDNP within these areas.
Rights & Liabilities Laws

Through rights and liabilities laws, a government can give the right to a desired outcome to a group of people or individual, allowing them to sue for damages should anyone jeopardise outcomes being achieved, aiming to deter any such undesirable behaviour. The right to clean water may be awarded to those bearing a fishing permit. Should an individual or organisation pollute the water, they would be liable to pay damages or compensation, decided by the court, to the fisherman. The amount of compensation can be difficult to determine, but the threat of the cost of liability needs to be substantially more than the cost of compliance to effectively deter potential damages occurring. Issues can occur should the possible amount of damages be more than the worth of the organisation or individual in question. If a company was only worth $10 million for example, they cannot pay more. In addition the increased possibility insurance measures taken by CTOs to protect themselves against damage claims can limit the effectiveness of rights and liabilities laws in regulating behaviour. Likewise they are ineffective in the occurrence of irrational behaviour, random events or accidents (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011).

Buckley (2011) reported CTOs in Victorian National Parks were required to hold a minimum public liability insurance of $10 million per claim to protect them if they cause property damage or personal injury, but otherwise these strategies have not been specifically addressed within the National Park literature. Parfitt et al. (2006) conducted a study into public liability issues of the tourism industries of Queensland and Victoria, by identifying risk exposure and hazards and each state’s legal health and safety frameworks that apply to all CTOs. Stakeholder consultation confirmed the rising cost of public liability; the safety of employees and tourists; and risk exposure were of an increasing concern for the tourism industry, and particularly those involved in higher risk activities such as horse-riding or scuba diving. In Victorian National Parks, CTOs were required to follow the Adventure Activity Standards, which included elements of risk and health and safety management, however Parfitt et al. (2006) acknowledged there have been calls for a national tourism standard.
Public Compensation / Social Insurance

These are economic regulations in the form or ‘schemes of compensation or insurance that link premiums paid to performance records’ such as workplace health and safety programs (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011:128). Higher premiums may be paid for higher risk activities and this can encourage the employer to consider the true risks of their employee activities and attempt to reduce those risks. Australian businesses were required to have employee insurance, this would include any CTO in a National Park, however there has been no mention of these particular regulatory strategies within the literature.

Self-regulation

Self-regulation occurs ‘when a group of firms or individuals exerts control over its own membership and behaviour’ (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011:137) and can be initiated by an individual firm, the industry itself, or by the government. When self-regulation initiatives are implemented, firms and industry associations remain bound by existing government regulations, but may be given or assume extra roles in creating, monitoring and enforcing additional self-regulations to achieve their desired outcomes. There are various classifications of self-regulation:

Firm Self-regulation: A firm may choose to self-regulate itself for its own self-interest. Situations where the efficiency of processes can reduce cost, such as more efficient use of resources, may induce self-regulatory activity. Or where a firm believes their market may demand a certain behaviour or outcome and therefore self-regulation may improve their product or service image to the market. This is largely the premise for the nature-based tourism industry where it is assumed nature-based tourists desire or prefer a certain quality of environment. Firm self-regulation can be difficult to rely upon if desired outcomes are imperative. Firms may be unaware or uneducated about best practices, may not see any benefit of regulating, may accept long-term impacts for short-term gains or it may not be financially feasible, especially for smaller enterprises.

In nature-based tourism particularly, the incentive to self-regulate can be diluted as nature can be seen as a free commodity, and certain undesired outcomes, such as CTO water pollution, may not be felt directly by the firm. Where there are a multitude of CTOs
operating in the same area, it can also be the case that self-regulating behaviour, such as limiting use for wildlife protection, can be deemed useless if exploited by another non self-regulating firm. In these types of scenarios, industry self-regulation may be preferential (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011; Huybers & Bennett, 1997).

**Industry Self-regulation:** An industry association where firms become members and together can be better equipped than an individual firm acting alone in collating and distributing information and best practice guidelines, thus producing a more efficient and effective form of self-regulation. The tourism industry has a strong and long industry self-regulating component. This was largely due to the realisation toward the end of last century that the environment would be crucial to the long-term sustainability of tourism. Tourism industry associations occur on many levels from global (World Tourism Organisation); national (TTF); state wide (Victorian Tourism Industry Council (VTIC)) and local associations (Huybers & Bennett, 1997).

**Co –regulation & Meta-regulation between Governments, Firms & Industry:** Self-regulatory structures can include government action on various levels. Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) explained co-regulation between government and industry occurs when the government appoints a regulating industry agency to enforce regulations, leaving the government responsible only for auditing the efficiency of the agency. Alternatively, the government can form a set of required outcomes and then allow individual CTOs to develop and control their own tailored regulatory strategy (Herremans, Reid & Wilson, 2005) known as meta-regulation. Allowing firms to create their own regulatory strategy can have benefits over industry–wide regulations. It allows for a more tailored and informed set of rules to be created by the firm which may increase compliance, as the empowerment to set and control the firm’s own regulations can have a positive effect on the culture of the individual CTOs and the industry. This may allow for greater innovation and faster adoption of changes to regulations. A successful meta-regulation system can be more cost effective for the government (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011).
**Visitor Education Programs:** A visitor management self-regulation strategy is designed to educate and inform both independent and commercial visitors of desired behaviour. It is particularly poignant as a large component of National Park visitor regulations. The premise of this technique is that PAMAs believe most visitors are self-motivated morally to behave in a way which minimises their impact on the environment, but could be unaware of exactly what this entails. By educating visitors it is hoped they will voluntarily adopt environmentally sustainable behaviour, which can be a less certain technique than command and control strategies; however a proactive change can be more efficient and desirable in the long-term (Bramwell, 2005). Visitor codes of conduct cover such activities as camping; safety; use of fuel stoves and group sizes (Hill & Pickering, 2002); and high impact activities such as horse-riding; rock climbing and 4WDriving.

Cater et al. (2008) found visitor attitudes toward the environment, the regulations and the regulators, could affect levels of compliance. The larger issue was the lack of visitor awareness of such codes. PAMAs could educate visitors many ways through signage; pamphlets; information given with permits or licences; and information centres. With visitor self-regulation being a main strategy for management of visitor behaviour and impacts, the method of communication and the approach to designing messages for maximum compliance is a large research area for nature-based tourism (Ham et al., 2008).

Whether through government, industry or firm initiative, self-regulation of the tourism industry is desirable for a number of reasons. It can be cost effective (Swarbrooke, 1999), and if encouraged can be more motivational than other command and control government regulations such as fines or penalties (Herremans, Reid & Wilson, 2005). For the industry, showing some initiative in self-regulating to both achieve government requirements and beyond, can potentially deter governments from further stepping in, allowing CTOs some freedom to control their circumstances (Swarbrooke, 1999). In Australia, the tourism industry has been active in self-regulatory measures. Buckley’s (2011) overall view was that despite the multitude of guidelines and voluntary codes of conduct available, CTOs had not adopted them sufficiently to eliminate compulsory government regulation, which he sees as a more effective method of achieving outcomes. This has been a long-standing view, with Middleton (1993:4) stating ‘environmental considerations are far too important to be left to self-regulation. It is as naive as relying
solely on government intervention’ indicating a balance between both government and self-regulation would be most desirable.

The efficiency of self-regulation and its ability to deal with ongoing issues outside of the court system could be desirable to government. The inclusion of the expertise of the industry in creating and updating regulations allows for more relevant and technical regulations to be developed and further to this can motivate greater compliance and understanding. Caution needs to be exercised in the areas of accountability, access and fairness to ensure non-members of industry associations are not excluded from decision making processes and that the industry regulator is not ‘captured’ by the self-interest of its members, failing to uphold public concerns (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). It has been shown industry self-regulation in particular can be weak in controlling errant members. Herremans, Reid and Wilson (2005) argued when dealing with wayward firms, government controls may not fare much better, justifying if a CTO has unethical behaviour patterns, they will find a way to get around regulation. In this situation, they proposed self-regulation through education and encouragement may actually increase likelihood of adoption.

Compliance has been a theme in self-regulatory tourism research. It has been shown environmental attitudes and values of CTOs will affect the adoption level of self-regulatory action. CTOs who held strong environmental values only need to be made aware of best proactive actions in order to adopt them. However for self-regulation to be effective industry-wide, it needs to be understood some CTOs would only act in the self-interest of their business. To increase compliance of these firms, environmental action needs to be related back to commercial viability and communicated effectively by either government or industry associations (Dewhurst & Thomas, 2003; Herremans, Reid & Wilson, 2005).
2.3 Summary

Eagles, McCool and Haynes (2002:143) believed managing CTOs in National Parks was ‘one of the most important and time consuming activities for park managers,’ Eagles reiterating in 2013, that tourism licences, permits, leases and concessions in National Parks were one of the ten top issues which necessities further research and action (Eagles, 2013). Buckley (2002b) interviewed both Australian National Park managers and tourism industry representatives and found they thought the PAMA/CTO relationship needed further understanding and should indeed be a research priority. Research thus far has focused on the management of this relationship where regulation has been highlighted as a key element to both the success of these relationships and to achieving both National Park conservation and tourism objectives. With a diverse range of regulatory strategies available, determining the most effective mix of techniques to best achieve desired policy outcomes needs considerable planning. Bramwell (2005) added further research into the strengths and weaknesses of different policy instruments, such as regulation, would be valuable information for policy developers in best making these decisions.

It is generally accepted such National Park planning and policy is a value-laden activity. Eagles and McCool (2002) conceded there could be trade-offs between their given criteria, determined by stakeholder consultation of initial objectives and values. Decisions are made about what activities will be allowed within National Parks, how they will be delivered, what balance of tourism and conservation will exist and which will hold priority if conflict arises (Newsome, Moore & Dowling, 2013). It is therefore understandable, and the evidence from the literature suggested, that stakeholder opinion, support and compliance of government regulation within a National Park setting can be affected by an individual’s environmental values. If government aims to gain support and compliance for its regulatory structure or its proposed changes, it needs to be made with this in mind. Pigram (1990:5) expressed a lack of stakeholder understanding can inhibit implementation of tourism policy, especially one with a sustainability focus; ‘the target groups, the communities affected, must be receptive to change and see the policy as a constructive response to their priorities.’
Stakeholder debate occurs when groups have differing opinions and values on how the National Park is to be used and what functions it is to provide for society. Issues usually arise over the balance between conservation and an exploiting industry, such as mining or logging, or in this case tourism. Measuring stakeholders within a National Park regulatory study adds an insightful and critical dimension to the results. Eagles and McCool stated (2002:69) ‘if not understood, how can a park or protected area be managed efficiently and effectively to meet these values?’ Considering the current issue of regulating CTOs, private investment and CTDNP in Victorian National Parks; the information requirements to develop suitable policy; and the gap in the literature in assessing the performance of regulatory techniques within this area; this research aims to explore the efficacy of current, proposed and potential regulatory strategies used to control commercial tourism in the Victorian National Park system from a stakeholder perspective. The following research questions have been developed:

1. How do stakeholders’ value and perceive:
   a. The role of National Parks in Victoria; and
   b. The role of commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks?
2. How do stakeholders perceive the efficacy of existing, proposed and potential regulatory strategies controlling commercial tourism within Victorian National Parks?

This chapter has reviewed the academic literature addressing commercial tourism in National Parks, more specifically that of National Park values and development of built facilities. In addition National Park visitor management literature was analysed and reviewed in relation to regulatory theory and a theoretical framework for the study was established. The next chapter outlines the research methodology used in order to answer the research questions and fulfil the research aim. The subsequent chapters present the results from the research, discuss the findings, provide conclusions of the study and summarise its contribution to the body of knowledge.
The study explored the efficacy of current, proposed and potential regulatory strategies used to control commercial tourism in the Victorian National Park system from a stakeholder perspective. To determine stakeholder’s perceptions of efficacy, it was necessary to determine the objectives stakeholder’s believed National Parks should be fulfilling and determine their underlying values which may influence these opinions. Once this was established, the research was able to explore which regulatory strategies were perceived as best achieving their objectives. The following two research questions were therefore created for the study:

1. How do stakeholder’s value and perceive:
   a) The role of National Parks in Victoria; and
   b) The role of commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks?
2. How do stakeholders perceive the efficacy of existing, proposed and potential regulatory strategies controlling commercial tourism within Victorian National Parks?

The theoretical framework adopted for the research was developed in the literature review and is detailed in Appendix B (page 268). In this chapter, the research design and methods used to address the research questions are explained. Adopting an interpretive qualitative paradigm and case study method, the research was completed over two stages. The first comprised document analysis to develop an overview of the current situation and to identify stakeholders and their values; the second stage collected more specific data on the perceptions of stakeholders of specific regulatory strategies through semi-structured interviews.
3.1 Research Design & Methodology

Veal (2006:33) described the main approaches to research as theoretical, research that ‘seeks to draw general conclusions about the phenomena being studied’ and applied research which seeks to test or apply these theories in certain situations. This study fits into the third category of applied theory research, by first expanding and then applying the existing regulatory framework by Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) to the National Park commercial tourism context. The research can be further described as both explanatory and evaluative as the results confirmed the ability for regulatory theory to be applied in this context (explanatory research) and suggested the efficacy of the regulatory strategies (evaluative research) (Veal, 2006).

Interpretative Paradigm

It was evident from the literature review that due to the various values and objectives associated with National Parks, there may be a number of possible stakeholder realities within this context. For this reason an interpretive paradigm approach was taken, as it holds an ontological view that acknowledged people have different realities based on their own meaning systems and of what they perceive the world to be (Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2011). Allowing stakeholders to explain their perceptions of regulatory efficacy offered insight into the current debate and potential solutions to the issue of effectively regulating the commercial tourism in Victorian National Park use in Victoria and gaining stakeholder support for such a regulatory regime. Taking an interpretative paradigm, Cavana, Delahaye and Sekaran (2001) explained, the researcher is interested in what is meaningful to people in order to understand the constructs of their perceived reality.

Rather than producing general, predictive laws about human behaviour, interpretative research presents a rich and complex description of how people think, react and feel under certain contextually specific situations (Cavana, Delahaye & Sekeran, 2001:9).

Qualitative Embedded Case Study Design

The infancy of regulatory studies of National Park tourism; the small number of stakeholders involved; and the need for in-depth value based data all lent itself to this study utilising qualitative methodology (Veal, 2006). Qualitative methodology has been
the predominant methodology used in National Park stakeholder research studies to date, for example Darcy and Wearing (2009); Foster (2006); Munro, King and Polonsky (2006) and Slattery (2002). Moreover Jennings (2010) explained an interpretative paradigm best suited a qualitative methodology. As opposed to testing the relationship between variables to develop theories, the research seeks to identify emblematic themes within the chosen setting. In this way it must be clear that results of qualitative studies are not representative, but a snapshot of the current situation in the specific study setting.

The use of the case study research methodology is deemed most appropriate here for a number of reasons outlined by Yin (2009). Firstly, the study is based on a real-life scenario, the Victorian National Park regulatory system, and therefore there is no ability to control behaviour. Secondly the regulatory reform is a contemporary event, and finally the research includes ‘how’ questions with an explanatory aim. Further to this, previous literature has noted National Park research is most suited to case study methodology as each National Park system is independent, existing and adapting to its own situation (Moore et al., 2009; Russell, Lafferty & Loudoun, 2008). National Park research results resist explicit generalisations, but can offer general propositions to theory and policy (Veal, 2006).

The case study being investigated is that of the regulation of commercial tourism within Victorian National Parks, with a particular focus on legislation changes to allow private investment and CTDNP. The Victorian National Park system of Victoria contained 45 individual National Parks controlled by both state based and National Park specific regulations. To analyse each National Park was beyond the scope of this study, therefore a sample needed to be selected. An embedded case study design fit this context (Yin, 2009), with data collected from the Victorian state National Park system as the primary case study unit, and three subunits or individual local National Parks embedded to provide a rich analysis of the issue at hand (Figure 3.1). If actioned correctly the embedded case study format can strengthen the research by allowing each level to contribute information which gives depth to answering research questions and achieving the research aim. Yin (2009) warned that care must be taken to ensure the subunits do not take priority or attention from the unit of analysis, but the research must remain focused on creating a full picture of the case study unit itself.
To select the National Park sample, the population of all 45 National Parks in the Victorian system was determined by collating a sample frame from the Parks Victoria (2011) website. The target population for this study were those National Parks which have current or proposed commercial tourism activities (Jennings, 2010). A criterion sample method was completed by considering each National Park against the following three criteria based on the needs of the study, data availability and current knowledge of the scenario (Veal, 2006)(Table 3.1):

1. A high level of current or potential commercial tourism activities. This would indicate regulatory strategies would be active, and also a greater possibility of stakeholder opinion providing a greater breadth of data.
2. A high level of potential tourism infrastructure development. Previous literature identified the possibility that attitude toward tourism varies between facilitated and non-facilitated tourism.
3. A high level of current or past stakeholder interest in the National Park commercial tourism debate offering a greater likelihood of available data for analysis and past results for comparison. This was measured by the number of media articles and submissions focusing on the individual National Park.
### Table 3.1 Criteria for selecting National Parks for subunits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>VCEC</th>
<th>Previous studies</th>
<th>Current tourism</th>
<th>Potential tourism</th>
<th>Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grampians NP</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>0 (3)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Otway NP</td>
<td>11 (2)</td>
<td>9 (1)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine NP</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
<td>0 (3)</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsons Prom NP</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Nepean NP</td>
<td>23 (1)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>0 (3)</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarra Ranges NP</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>0 (5)</td>
<td>0 (3)</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Mid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Numbers represent the amount of documents available to study & ranking in parenthesis)

The three Victorian National Parks selected are highlighted in green in Table 3.1: Point Nepean National Park for its high level of existing infrastructure and potential for commercial tourism activity; Great Otway National Park for its high level of media attention and high level of existing and potential commercial tourism activities; and Wilsons Promontory National Park for its high level of attention within the literature review and media, and high level of current and potential commercial tourism activities.

The Alpine National Park was considered, but discarded due to its complexity in design. Within the Alpine National Park borders, there exists a designated and separate ski tourism area. The opinions of stakeholders could be difficult to clearly ascertain whether they are referring to the National Park or the ski resort area.

#### Case Study Principles

In order to increase reliability of case study results, Yin (2009) outlined three principles to data collection. First was to capture data of actual events by drawing on an adequate variety of information regarding the subject in question. To fulfil this criteria the method of data triangulation was employed to gather a suitable variety of data. Data triangulation involved measuring a subject from two different positions (completing a triangle) and is often utilised whereby one measure can counteract the weakness in the other or results can be enhanced by using multiple methods. Veal (2006) extended true triangulation occurs only when the two sets of data collected are used to measure the same question, and not in studies where multiple methods are used for multiple questions. Various data sources were used to deduce conclusions for both research questions within this study:
Yin’s (2009) remaining two case study principles were concerned with the management of evidence collected and the need to create a case study database to maintain a chain of evidence. Creating an organised database and chain of evidence increased the reliability of similar research conclusions being achieved should data be re-evaluated, and beneficial should external parties wish to access information. For this study, two electronic programs were used. Firstly all data sources for the literature review and research data were listed into the Endnote X6 (Thomson Reuters) program, PDF files attached where available. Secondly a research file was created using the NVivo 10 (QSR International) program, storing all research data and tracing stage one analysis and coding activity. Multiple sources of evidence and analysis documentation were collated, entered into the file and saved, including regulatory policies; media articles; VCEC submissions; stakeholder interviews; Government Hansard transcripts; field notes; case study notes; and analytical memos.
Chapter Three: Research Methodology

Figure 3.2 Research design

Research Activity

Research Context (Ch. 1)
- Develop understanding of current issue: regulatory reform allowing private investment & CTD in Victorian NP

Literature Review (Ch. 2)
- Develop theoretical framework
- Develop research aim & questions
  - National Park tourism history & values
  - Regulatory theory
  - Victorian NP Regulations

Stage One: Document Analysis (Ch. 4)
- Identify NP tourism stakeholders
- Explore their values, attitudes & NP, tourism & regulations

Stage Two: Stakeholder Interviews (Ch. 5)
- Interview NP tourism stakeholders
- Triangulate results from Stage One
- Explore perceptions of specific regulatory strategies

Drawing Conclusions (Ch. 6)
- Report research findings
- Explore result relationships
- Determine research implications & contributions

Data Sources

Stage One: Document Analysis
- Media Analysis
- VCEC Submissions

Stage Two: Stakeholder Interviews
- Govt. Hansard reports
  - CTOs
  - Tourism Industry Group
  - Recreation Groups
  - Conservation Groups
3.2 Stage One

The first stage of the research was to analyse secondary data to create a broader understanding of the case study, specifically to identify key stakeholders and their values, attitudes and beliefs of National Park commercial tourism. Previous studies into CTDNP have successfully utilised secondary data to fulfil research aims. Slattery (2002) relied upon government submissions, Darcy and Wearing (2009) on media articles, and Buckley (2011); Cater et al. (2008); Hill and Pickering (2002); Hyslop and Eagles (2007); McKercher (1993b); and Wyman et al. (2006); analysed interest group and policy documents. Secondary data is a simple and efficient method of data collection however the results can be seen as limited if further clarification or confirmation of results is not sought by another source, overcome in this study by completion of stakeholder interviews in Stage Two. Secondary data was available from submissions made to the VCEC inquiry and media articles. Despite the information being created for an alternate purpose, it was sufficient in fulfilling part of the research aim, and due to the high level of access was deemed a most suitable type of data.

Sample & Data Collection: Media Articles

Media articles were accessed on the internet using the ‘Google’ search engine with keywords; ‘National Park,’ ‘tourism,’ ‘tourism development,’ ‘commercial,’ ‘Victoria,’ and the title of the inquiry ‘unlocking Victorian tourism’ to find a relevant sample of stakeholder commentary. Data was collected across two periods (Appendix A, page 266). The first period search was performed around the release of the “Victorian Government response to the Victorian Competition and Efficiency Commission’s Final Report” (DTF, 2012) in August 2012; at the end of each month until saturation level was reached where no new information was being published, in October 2012 (Jennings, 2010). The second period revolved around the government release of the “Tourism Investment Opportunities of Significance in National Parks: Guidelines” (DSE, 2013b) in March 2013. Searches were performed again at the end of each month until saturation level was reached where no new information was being published in August 2013 (Jennings, 2010).
In total nine search sessions were completed using the various keywords. The first 200 returned results for each ‘Google’ search performed were examined for their potential to be included into the sample. All blogs, newspaper articles, reader letters and comments, industry articles, radio and news broadcasts, media releases, and Facebook comments were considered. A further refining method was utilised during this process whereby links and other keywords found in the articles brought up with the original search were followed to uncover further relevant data. The returned results were assessed by their relevance to the topic; if the article mentioned commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks, it was deemed relevant and added to the data set.

A total of 175 relevant articles were found. Of these, 33 were discarded as they were either duplicated across various media outlets or specifically related to a National Park not the focus of the case study. This left a total of 142 media articles within the final sample to be analysed. Ninety-nine articles referred to the primary case study of the Victorian National Park system, 14 for Great Otway National Park; 21 for Point Nepean National Park; and eight for Wilsons Promontory National Park. Darcy and Wearing (2009) based their study analysis on 120 media articles collected over a 13 year period. In this study, given the media articles are only one form of data, the final sample of 142 was deemed credible for further analysis (Table 3.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2: Stage One document sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Otway NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Nepean NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsons Promontory NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample & Data Collection: VCEC submissions

There were 112 submissions received by the VCEC (2011a) inquiry “Unlocking Victorian Tourism”. A physical sampling frame listing all submissions was obtained from the VCEC website and each submission downloaded. The target population was those submissions which discussed commercial tourism in National Parks, of which there were 54 submissions in total. These were further refined into National Park categories, those addressing National Parks not related to the case study were discarded, leaving a total of 39 VCEC submissions to add to the sample; 26 state based; nine for Great Otway National Park; two for Point Nepean National Park; and two for Wilsons Promontory National Park (Table 3.2).

Document Analysis

Content analysis was performed on the media articles and VCEC submissions by coding using NVivo 10 (QSR International) (Cavana, Delahaye & Sekeran, 2001). Coding qualitative data allowed the organisation of data with shared meaning into similar areas in order to establish results (Saldaña, 2009). Richards and Morse (2007:137) added coding ‘leads you from the data to the idea and from the idea to all the data pertaining to that idea’ therefore coding is not a straightforward process, but an ongoing cycle. The decision to electronically code using computer-aided qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) as opposed to manual coding was made due to the large size and complexity of the data sample (Veal, 2006). The final sample consisted of 142 media articles and 39 VCEC submissions. As these documents were not created for this research, not all information within them were relevant, yet all potentially featured opinion from several stakeholder groups over various themes. NVivo 10 (QSR International) allowed each sentence to be coded to several themes efficiently; allowed relevant information to be easily selected and highlighted and that not relevant discarded; and had the ability to keep an electronic record of all data collected for the research project (Cavana, Delahaye & Sekeran, 2001; Jennings, 2010).

Jennings (2010) and Saldaña (2009) recommended keeping analytical memos throughout the analysis stage to record any thoughts and reflections generated by coding and reading over data so as not to lose potentially important ideas. These were created in the NVivo 10 (QSR International) memo folder and included thoughts such as: potential links to
theory, literature reviewed or previous events; potential categories or emergent themes in data; future steps for the research; and problems to be overcome. An example of an analytical memo while coding the media articles is shown in Figure 3.3.

**Figure 3.3: Example of analytical memo kept during document analysis**

*Conservation groups and community comments seem to declare WAR against government on environment issues. They mention alpine grazing; clearing land; end of national environmental laws, and a return to the Kennett era which proposed the Wilsons Prom. National Park development as featured in Slattery (2002). There seems to be no faith in regulations as on the whole the govt seems anti-environment, they see Baillieu himself and the government as anthropocentric, commenting Baillieu is in bed with developers and cares only for economic gain. It is quite personal.*

Cavana, Delahaye and Sekeran (2001) explained it takes three ‘readings’ to sufficiently analyse raw data content by identifying themes, categories and placement of qualitative data, essentially completed at the discretion of the researcher based upon the evidence they follow throughout these readings. There was no strict formula to deciding exactly what method of coding to use in this process. In most instances it is appropriate to apply several methods (Saldaña, 2009). Saldaña (2009) advised conducting a pilot test to get a feel of the data and then making a final choice of method considering which fits within the theoretical framework; which answers the research question; and which returns enough specific detail of the data allowing for themes to be identified; and most importantly which method leads to new discoveries and insights of the data (Flick, 2002; Saldaña, 2009). These questions were posed throughout the content analysis and suitable coding methods chosen.

**Step One: Importing of Data & Attribute Coding**

Two separate folders were created in NVivo 10 (QSR International), media articles; and VCEC submissions. Media Articles were ‘captured’ from the internet using the NVivo 10 (QSR International) NCapture feature and imported into the NVivo 10 (QSR International) file, while VCEC submissions PDF files were imported directly. Each data
were coded using the attribute coding method, a form of grammatical coding which describes the data, suitable for content analysis and case study methodology (Saldaña, 2009). Characteristics or attributes of the data were created from the literature and out of the data and were recorded into a classification sheet on NVivo 10 (QSR International) (Cavana, Delahaye & Sekeran, 2001) under the categories: location; type of data; date of data; and date of collection. This step in the cycle created a strong foundation for record keeping.

Step Two: Values Coding

The ‘values coding method’ applies codes for each of the constructs of values, attitudes, and beliefs, but does not necessarily have to differentiate between all three as this can be difficult to determine. Values coding is useful for case studies methodology and political analysis and can either be used with pre-determined codes or those emerging from the data (Saldaña, 2009). Parent nodes were created in NVivo 10 (QSR International) for each of the stakeholder groups identified from the literature review and data, and child nodes were created using category headings from the values, attitude, and belief constructs identified in the literature review. An example of the initial coding framework is given in Figure 3.4.

Figure 3.4: First reading codes applied during document analysis

- Parent Node: State Conservation Groups (SCG):
  - Child node category: National Park values and objectives
    - Child node code: Eco-centric
    - Child node code: Anthropocentric
    - Child node code: Objectives
  - Child node category: Attitude toward tourism
    - Child node code: Support tourism
    - Child node code: Oppose tourism
  - Child node category: National Park Regulations
    - Child node code: Private vs. public
    - Child node code: Specific regulatory techniques
The first ‘reading’ was conducted as a pilot test on 10 percent of the media articles using this framework and analytical memos used to record thoughts and observations. Pertinent observations such as the large amount of data being coded to some categories and thoughts on emerging themes such as ‘specific opinions on Baillieu government’ were used to review and re-establish the categories and codes, a common part of the qualitative coding analysis cycle (Saldaña, 2009) and the flexibility of qualitative methodology (Veal, 2006).

Rubin and Rubin (1995) attest refining the data in each category is beneficial before further analysis takes place. Clear descriptive statements and criteria were created to guide what data was to be included into each category (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994) and constant comparative analysis was conducted to ensure categories did not cross over (Cavana, Delahaye & Sekeran, 2001). Categories were measured against Guba’s (1978) criteria of ‘internal homogeneity’ of data within the category and ‘external heterogeneity’ between categories, ensuring not too many codes were created having a negative effect on refining the data (Jennings, 2010). The final framework of nodes contained eight stakeholder parent nodes: CTOs; Community; Conservation Groups; Government; Tourism Industry Groups; Visitor Groups; National Park Management; and Other (mainly editorial based pinions); and three parent nodes for each of the individual National Park sites. Each parent node contained three categories and 14 codes, an example given in Figure 3.5.

To keep data organised, two sets of the analysis codes were established in the NVivo 10 (QSR International) file, for media articles and VCEC submissions. Keeping this data separated supported the triangulation method by allowing a comparison of results between data sources and improved organisation should the data need to be re-evaluated.
Parent node: State Conservation Groups (SCG):

Child node category: National Park Tourism
Inclusion statement: Data which directly mentions tourism activity; tourism infrastructure; sustainable tourism; potential or existing markets; economic support for NP; but not how tourism should be controlled. Benefits and costs of tourism, but not tourism as a National Park objective.
- Child node code: Infrastructure development
- Child node code: Costs of tourism
- Child node code: Benefits of tourism
- Child node code: Economic considerations
- Child node code: Competition and Visitor Markets for Victoria
- Child node code: Competition between public & private
- Child node code: Sustainable tourism or sensitive tourism
- Child node code: What should tourism look like

Child node category: National Park values and objectives
Inclusion statement: Data which reveals how stakeholders value National Parks, either for their intrinsic value or as a tourism product & what National Parks should be used for.
- Child node code: Eco-centric
- Child node code: Anthropocentric
- Child node code: Objectives

Child node category: Views on regulation
Inclusions statement: Data which directly mentions how tourism should be controlled within Victorian National Parks. Data which mentions attitudes toward government and Parks Victoria, & the public/private relationship.
- Child node: Regulators
- Child node: General regulations
- Child node: Specific regulatory strategies
Step Three: Values Coding with Refined Codes

A second ‘reading’ was conducted on all data and coded into the newly refined categories and codes using a ‘split’ technique where data was split or separated into smaller areas and coded. Coding smaller areas of data allowed for a more specific analysis and avoided coding larger areas of data into several codes (Saldaña, 2009). Potential relationships between categories and themes, possible sub themes and reflections of the data continued to be recorded into analytical memos (Cavana, Delahaye & Sekeran, 2001). Not all stakeholders commented on all codes created. The absence of comments within a particular code however is negative evidence and a finding in itself (Neuman, 1997). An example of coding media article text is shown in Table 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Article Text</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But green groups warn allowing private investors into National Parks could allow developers to destroy some of the state's most precious natural jewels.</td>
<td>CG: Costs of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Our parks were not created to end up as building sites for hotels and large-scale infrastructure that can only be used by a privileged few who can afford it,&quot; he said.</td>
<td>CG: Costs of tourism &amp; Visitor Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chamber's chief executive, Mark Stone - who also sits on the board of Tourism Australia - said it was inevitable there would be changes in what is permitted in Victoria's National Parks. &quot;I don't think we can expect government to cover all the costs of investment on public land,&quot; he said.</td>
<td>STIG: Economic considerations &amp; Benefits of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developments will need to be sensitive to the environment, and about one third of National Parks considered wilderness areas will not be open for development. Ninety-nine-year leases will be available to the private sector.</td>
<td>Govt.: General &amp; Specific regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Minister Louise Asher said more than one quarter of international visitors to Victoria went to a National Park. An estimated $481 million of annual economic benefit to the state comes from tourism at Wilsons Promontory, Port Campbell and the Grampians alone.</td>
<td>Govt.: Economic considerations &amp; Visitor markets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step Four: Selective Coding
A final ‘third’ reading of the data within each category and code was completed to identify any final sub themes which may have been missed internally and identification of relationships externally between each category and code (Cavana, Delahaye & Sekaran, 2001). Known as ‘selective coding’ (Neuman, 1997), this step also sought to gather specific evidence which justified the themes selected and comparisons found between themes.

3.3 Stage Two
The second stage of the research involved building on the results from Stage One to gain a deeper understanding of the stakeholder perceptions of the efficacy of existing, proposed or potential regulatory strategies controlling commercial tourism within Victorian National Parks. Primary data containing perceptions of key Victorian National Park commercial tourism stakeholders were collected through semi-structured interviews. Government Hansard transcripts containing the debate between the current State Government and Opposition State Government surrounding the legislation and regulatory reform, was also collected. The government debate contained the perceptions of the Members of Parliament, and offered a well-informed and valuable reflection of the greater public debate (as the Members of Parliament represented stakeholders within their electorate). Therefore, for the purpose of the Stage Two analysis, the interview data and Hansard transcripts were treated together.

Sample & Data Collection: Hansard Transcripts
The Victorian Government National Parks Amendment (Leasing Powers and Other Matters) Bill 2013 was first introduced to the Parliament of Victoria’s Legislative Assembly on the 29th May 2013, further debated on the 25th June, 2013, and passed on the 27th June 2013 (Victoria, Legislative Assembly, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c). It was introduced to the Parliament of Victoria’s Legislative Council on the 27th June, 2013 and passed on the 22nd August 2013 (Victoria, Legislative Council, 2013a, 2013b). The daily Hansard transcripts from these five occasions were downloaded as PDF files from the relevant government website and entered into NVivo 10 (QSR International) file for data storage. These transcripts contained the debates between government representatives over the
regulations which will control commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks. They offered the documented government opinions, both in power and opposition, of the efficacy of the existing and newly introduced regulations.

**Sample: Victorian National Park Tourism Stakeholders**

Stakeholder group categories were identified from the literature and firmly established from the results of Stage One. A ‘purposive sample method’ was adopted to find representatives from each stakeholder group to be interviewed for Stage Two of the research (Jennings, 2010). As Henderson stated (1991:132) while taking a qualitative approach sampling ‘is not concerned about adequate numbers or random selection, but in trying to present a working picture of the broader social structure from which the observations are drawn.’

Table 3.4 illustrates each stakeholder group, their location and how a sample frame of possible participants was created. The identity of the PAMA, local tourism industry groups (LTIG), local conservation groups (LCG) and some recreation groups (SRG) associated with Victorian National Parks were identified within media articles and VCEC (2011a) inquiry submissions from Stage One. Local recreation groups (LRG) associated with National Parks were gathered from the Parks Victoria (2011) website listings. There were 321 Parks Victoria Licensed Tourism Operators in 2013, (DSE, 2013a). Those that were associated with the National Park sites chosen for this case study were identified on the Parks Victoria website (2011). Finally, local CTOs (operating near to but not in the National Park) were identified by a ‘Google’ search of tourism accommodations and attractions in close proximity (20km) to each National Park research site. A limitation within this study was the ability to identify and access an adequate sample for community (SC & LC) opinions and responses. Qualitative data does not require a representative sample, yet it does need to be purposeful. The sheer size of the individuals within the community, with no official representative group, meant any opinion gathered from individuals would be arbitrary when discussing results. For this reason, the community stakeholder group was omitted from Stage Two.
Each potential stakeholder representative was sent an email with a Participant Information Sheet, clearly explaining the aim of the study; a confidentiality statement; researcher contact details; and an invitation to participate by replying to the email and organising a time and location for a face-to-face interview convenient to them (Appendix C, page 276). Parks Victoria refused an invitation to participate stating their purpose was to carry out and enforce the legislation of the government; therefore they would make no further individual comment. The Victorian State Government (SG) in power and the State Opposition Government (SOG) opinions were well documented within the government Hansard transcripts, specifically the state members for two of the local National Park sites (Great Otway National Park and Point Nepean National Park) made lengthy contributions to the parliamentary debate recorded in the Hansard transcripts. The final interview sample was one of convenience containing 26 participants representing 25 groups who responded positively to the research request. Table 3.5 shows that representatives from each stakeholder category were obtained for each of the National Park sites, except for the local tourism industry group (LTIG) from the Great Otway National Park who did not respond. There was no local recreation group (LRG) associated with Point Nepean National Park.
The response from National Park CTOs was high, a valuable response as it was this group in particular whose opinions were not well represented in Stage One. The 15 CTO groups were divided into four stakeholder categories: accommodation providers inside and in nearby areas of the National Parks (AC); licensed Parks Victoria school/outdoor education and activity camp providers (OE/A); Parks Victoria licensed tour operator providing both day tours and overnight trips (LTO); and Parks Victoria licensed tour operator providing both day tours and overnight trips who also managed accommodation facilities (AC/LTO). Ten worked within one specific National Park site, while five licensed CTOs who operated in several National Parks was listed as state-based representatives (Table 3.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTO categories</th>
<th>LTO</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>AC/LTO</th>
<th>OE/A</th>
<th>LTIG</th>
<th>(SG)(SOG)</th>
<th>LCG</th>
<th>L/SRG</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State based</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Otway NP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Nepean NP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsons Prom NP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NA) = groups not approached, their opinions were well represented in stage one of the research. In stage two, the preference was to interview local based stakeholders. – = indicates where no stakeholder group existed
(SG)(SOG) = State Government opinions were retrieved from Hansard transcripts

Yin (2009) explained social science research involves real people in real scenarios; therefore research should be conducted within good ethical practices. Ethical procedures of the University body were followed during this research and ethical clearance was obtained to carry out stakeholder interviews (Appendix D, page 279).
Data Collection: Semi-structured Interviews

Qualitative interpretative methodology acknowledges multiple realities; therefore semi-structured interviews were a suitable method of data collection as they are more like a conversation whereby the interviewer has a checklist of topics to cover with each participant, without the rigidity of a structured set of linear questions. This method allowed the interviewer to ask open-ended questions addressing each topic and further probing questions based on participant responses to get a deeper understanding (Veal, 2006). A strength in this research design was the interviewer being able to develop a thorough understanding of the theoretical framework and interview topics to be covered (Yin, 2009) by completing Stage One document analysis before moving on to Stage Two. Further to this, as recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994), each interview was transcribed when completed, and then considered before moving on to the next interview, allowing any themes identified to be further investigated in the next interview.

Semi-structured interviews were deemed effective in eliciting value based data, a key component to this research, and had the added benefit of being able to clarify participant answers at the time of the interview, beneficial for potentially complex topics such as government regulation (Jennings, 2010). Interviews were predominantly face-to-face to improve quality of data collected, with two being conducted over the phone due to the logistical location of participants. Each interview was voice recorded for transcription to allow the interviewer to concentrate on the conversation and for data to be transcribed verbatim resulting in a more methodological analysis. During the interview general notes were taken for each topic, and more detailed notes taken straight after the interview. These included documenting non-verbal responses and an overview of participant opinions (Veal, 2006; Yin, 2009). As per the research design, interview data was utilised to gain a deeper understanding of stakeholder’s perceptions of regulatory strategies and triangulation of results from Stage One.

An interview schedule was developed detailing necessary introductory elements, such as collecting consent, outlining the eight key regulatory strategy topics to be addressed from the theoretical framework, and probing questions informed by both the theoretical and empirical research and from the regulations released by government so far. A pilot study was conducted on two stakeholders of commercial tourism in National Parks who were
not part of the final sample. Each topic and probe question was tested for understanding and key terminology. As a result, the order of questioning was changed to allow a better flow of conversation and three minor modifications were made to wording of questions to be included in the final semi-structured interview schedule (Appendix E, page 281).

Data Analysis: Semi-structured Interviews & Hansard Transcripts
Semi-structured interviews were completed with 24 participants face-to-face, and two over-the-phone. The average interview length was 40 minutes, with a total of 14.71 hours and generated 117,187 words of raw data. Recorded interview data; interview notes and interview transcripts were entered into the NVivo 10 (QSR International) file for record-keeping purposes. Each interview was giving a pseudonym stakeholder code and number to protect participant identities.

From the 25 groups interviewed, there were 18 individual stakeholder categories classified by stakeholder group and location (for example there was a conservation group from each of the three National Park sites, making three potential categories). As the majority of categories were represented by only one interview, it was decided to use a manual chart method as opposed to an electronic source to better facilitate analysis. The risk with using NVivo 10 (QSR International) for this stage was the creation of too many individual nodes represented by only one interview data, which would render comparisons and drawing conclusion difficult. For example in Stage One of the research, there were 180 pieces of individual data which could be coded into each of the nodes, compared to only 1-4 possible data sources for each node for Stage Two. This decision is supported by Saldaña (2009:22) that sometimes collating paper print outs onto a large desk area enables the researcher to better identify codes and themes gaining ‘a literal perspective not always possible on a computer’s monitor screen.’

Step One: Attribute Coding & Value Coding
Each stakeholder interview was given a column on the analysis chart, and their attributes (location and stakeholder group) recorded at the top of the column in the chart (example in Table 3.6)(Saldaña, 2009). In addition, a column for each ‘State Government’ and ‘Opposition State Government’ were created to code and analyse data from the Hansard
transcripts. Major categories and codes were placed down the side of the chart. Themed codes regarding stakeholder National Park values and tourism beliefs were determined during Stage One. Therefore, for consistency and comparison purposes, an initial category was created with the same primary themed codes (National Park values; Issues identified; and Benefits of CTOs/CTDNP). In addition a code for ‘awareness of changes’ was created to record the level of knowledge and involvement each participant had with the research topic (example in Table 3.6).

**Step Two: Elaborative Coding**

Elaborative coding is a ‘top-down’ method of coding, using theoretical constructs from previous studies to analyse new data. Baldwin Cave and Lodge’s (2011) theory of regulatory strategies was used as the framework for the semi-structured interviews and therefore primary categories were created for each of the regulatory strategies addressed chart and placed down the side of the analysis chart (categories 2-8 in Table 3.6). A final category (9) for conclusions and other information was added. Interview data and Hansard transcripts were then entered into each of these categories as an initial step of analysis. A second reading was completed to search for themes within each category, and the strongest of these given thematic codes. The themes were partially informed by the regulatory framework developed from both regulatory and National Park visitor management theories (for example the code for ‘lease conditions’) and partially from the data itself (for example the code for CTD ‘inside or outside’ the National Park was first identified in Stage One of the research and came out again in the interview data) (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). In total nine categories were created down the side of the chart, with 25 thematic codes (Table 3.6).
## Table 3.6: Example of chart codes & analysis of stakeholder interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Outdoor Education/Activity Licensed Tour Operators (OE/A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location / Interview</td>
<td>Stakeholder National Park values and tourism beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (10)</td>
<td>Great Otway NP (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category 1: Stakeholder National Park values and tourism beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code 1: Awareness of changes</th>
<th>Put in a submission, followed closely for a while, did not know dates of legislation, involved in previous Hands of Prom campaign &amp; next one</th>
<th>Had no idea about the legislation changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code 2: NP objectives &amp; values</td>
<td>I guess there’s a few really, to conserve the biologically diversity, but there is also a lot of cultural heritage issues</td>
<td>I think primarily conservation and where ... where that can be complemented and supported with eco-tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 3: Issues identified</td>
<td>May mean that PV stop doing anything now, because they are looking to get investment and development in the future</td>
<td>I think perhaps setting aside areas for private development means that other people can’t then use those areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 4: Benefits of CTO/CTDNP</td>
<td>Could see no benefits</td>
<td>With those sorts of things available, everyone knows about the overland track, and it’s become more popular since they’ve got those things in, so it would really increase the awareness of going to National Parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category 2: Command and Control Regulatory Strategies

<p>| Code 5: Inside or outside | The other thing I’d say probably digressing a little bit is people think that National Parks are somehow this pristine wilderness that has never been touched, and there’s nothing wrong with them and they’re in perfect environmental order. The reality is that parks are nothing like that. | It is a really interesting one, because I maintain that the majority of development should take place outside of the park. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code 6: Parks Vic.</th>
<th>Not only was it not on their website, not on VNP website, but not communicated to us either, directly, even though we’ve got our trip intentions in.</th>
<th>Funding is an issue because they don’t have the resources to do anything, maintenance, build, capitol works.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code 7: Compliance</td>
<td>Family groups who just wander through there and do what they like, no one’s giving them checks and balances</td>
<td>What we have translated for us is that licence that picks out the relevant controls that we need to adhere to in terms of how we operate the NP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 8: Licences and Permits</td>
<td>I guess I know from our point of view we’re licensed to be in the National Park and there are conditions set down for us as an operator in National Parks</td>
<td>I think the operators who are licensed to use the National Park are by definition, good park users and good operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 9: Specific activity &amp; zoning NP recreation</td>
<td>Again where their activities are in line with the values of the park. You can’t not say, &quot;Oh well, you can come in to the park but you can’t see or touch anything.</td>
<td>Horses are a different thing. I don’t believe that horses should be in the National Park, full stop because ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category 3: Incentive Based Regulatory strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code 10: Current</th>
<th>Yeah I do, particularly with the tour operator licence linking in with the eco certification and being able to get a longer licence.</th>
<th>Ok it means it less paperwork and it’s a saving of $250 but it is not sufficient it is not a huge incentive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code 11: Potential</td>
<td>Monetary incentives would work for us, we pay three times, once for the campsite, for the ground passes, pay for the students, and then to do the activity, fees are needed but PV don’t have enough as it is</td>
<td>If they are prepared to take your products to the Australian Travel Exchange,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category 4: Market Harnessing Controls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code 12: Tourism Market</th>
<th>You might have what we do at another level. You may offer different levels so it depends upon the size of the market and how many people are coming. It’s not one operator necessarily.</th>
<th>The Chinese are tight arses, they don’t spend money. An aspiration for the Chinese is to say to their work mates when they get back home is ‘I went to Australia for my holiday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code 13: Competition for the market- EOI</td>
<td>Oh yes, I think that it’s far better if you’ve people with energy, with design. Governments will make the wrong decision</td>
<td>Interested parties will comment, no doubt. I think it’s fair to say a lot of those high profile people in Portsea don’t want any development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 14: Economics – Net community benefit</td>
<td>“The fact now that they are trying to put a monetary value on everything they do is arguably not necessarily the conservation way to go.</td>
<td>And an increase in usage of the park is going to place enormous pressure on the roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 14: Competition – public vs. private</td>
<td>With that principle in mind I don’t necessarily agree with government funding development unless it’s equitable</td>
<td>PV does not have a commercial mandate, they are NFP, and so it has to be a commercial operator that comes in to do development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 15: Competition – inside vs. outside NP</td>
<td>I don’t think that they would want to have a development inside the park, because that takes away a lot of what they have to offer.</td>
<td>Then you price it so that it’s not cheaper than private land. We’re a little operator. We will pick up the crumbs, and there will be crumbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5: Disclosure</td>
<td>A clear cut example I have not done my trip returns this year, CTO trip returns, it is in my licence conditions that I have to do it, but I have been away and no one has pulled up on it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6: Direct Action &amp; Design Solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 17: Govt. Building</td>
<td>I think that government building and operating it is probably not the ideal.</td>
<td>No. The government shouldn't do business. They shouldn't do those sorts of things, no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 18: Leasing out existing</td>
<td>Parks are incredibly stretched as an organization to manage, and DSC a huge volume or size of National Park and crown land, they can’t get there and do all</td>
<td>That would be very expensive to do with the plumbing. I think that to me destroys what's there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 19: Location &amp; zoning</td>
<td>There's only one road in, one road out. I don’t know how a five star hotel would appreciate a one road in, one road out situation.</td>
<td>You could have something on the bay side or on the ocean view side, the size I think that they should build without upsetting any of the history of this city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 20: Building design</td>
<td>I suppose you have to have style of building, type of building, height of building, materials because there are rules about the material.</td>
<td>Historically anything that is too large will automatically have a lot negativity directed towards it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Category 7: Rights & Liabilities, Public compliance & Insurance

| Code 21: Access | The public access would have to be maintained, it's of historic interest. | Yeah, and I’m just wondering if it’s going to become like the private beach in Asia versus the public beach. Are they going to have the private part of the National Parks versus what the public can go in? |

### Category 8: Self-regulation

| Code 22: Firm | Self-regulation is no I wouldn’t trust anybody. We can’t afford to trust anybody to be honest with you | Self-regulation can be higher, provided that there has been a minimum standard set |
| Code 23: Industry | While it’s good to go through the process, do visitors really understand what it means? | We already had it, we actually had it because it was more in line with our ethos of our business. |
| Code 24: Co-regulation | But as an organization, then, we actually have of more an input again to lobby those places and either make things more conservative if we think there’s a risk issue, or relax if we think that it’s just ridiculously conservative. | |
| Code 25: Visitor education | Some of our guys have passions in areas and that’s fine. I think you are educating people. | There is room for education of the public as to how to behave in a National Park and we do what we can, I’ll give you various brochures to take with you, |
Step Three: Evaluation Coding
Finally, evaluation coding was conducted across the data. The aim of the research was to assess the efficacy of the regulatory strategies. During the elaborative coding, the regulatory strategies identified by stakeholders were analysed. During evaluation coding, how well stakeholders believed each of these regulatory strategies would perform in delivering National Park outcomes was determined. Patton (2002) explained evaluation coding allows for judgements to be made generating recommendations on how well policies may perform, and if they can be improved. Rallis and Rossman (2003) further explained evaluation coding describes desired outcomes, compares if the program will deliver these and predicts if and how change can be implemented.

Drawing Conclusions
After completion of both stages of data collection and analysis, conclusions were drawn, collated and compared, completing the triangulation process and fulfilling the research aim by answering the research questions. Saldaña (2009:186) outlined several strategies to focus and rise ‘above the data.’ By reading through the coded data, analytical memos, results and discussion notes, it was possible to transcend the data to develop a broad, deep understanding of stakeholder perceptions and their foundations. By taking this approach, it was possible to then ‘code weave’ the key findings for each concept and explore how these may interrelate. This process allowed for potential conclusions and recommendations to develop out of the data regarding the influences that most impact stakeholder perceptions and how these may be better managed for improved National Park commercial tourism outcomes (Saldaña, 2009).

3.4 Research Validity & Reliability
The validity and reliability of a study can determine the quality of the final research output. Research validity ‘is the extent to which the information collected by the researcher truly reflects the phenomenon being studied’ (Veal, 2006:41) and reliability refers to ‘the extent to which research findings would be the same if the research were to be repeated at a later date or with a different sample of subjects’ (Veal, 2006:41). To determine the quality of qualitative case study research, Yin (2009) outlined four criteria of validity and reliability which were addressed within this study.
Firstly *construct validity* reflects how well the research measured what it set out to. By utilising two existing theoretical frameworks, anthropocentric/eco-centric values and regulatory strategies (Baldwin, Cave and Lodge, 2011), terms measured were more easily defined during data collection and analysis. The research was further validated by the results fitting within these theories. Multiple sources of evidence were gathered to determine these results and a comprehensive chain of evidence kept, proving the findings from the document analysis were consistent with those found in stakeholder interviews (Yin, 2009).

Secondly *internal validity*, which reflects how well the research considered all possible constructs and their relationships within the study, was strengthened by measuring the values, attitudes and beliefs of Victorian National Parks stakeholders in addition to their perceptions of regulatory efficacy. Had the perceptions of regulatory efficacy been considered alone, the deeper causes for these may not have been discovered.

Thirdly the ability for the research results to be generalised suggests its *external validity*. This is challenging in case study research, and particularly National Park research, as each National Park system is unique. The results from this study offered valuable theoretical findings and recommendations for further policy and regulatory design within the Victorian National Park system. These implications cannot be confidently generalised, but do offer areas for consideration to both theory and practice, suggesting the case study has added value to the body of tourism knowledge (Yin, 2009).

Finally, *reliability* of the study was improved with a strong theoretical framework, and a well-documented data collection; chain of evidence; and analysis process, increasing the likelihood if the case study was repeated similar results would be obtained (Yin, 2009). Potential researcher bias was minimised by paying respect to all opinions within the case study with an objective mindset (Cavana, Delahaye & Sekeran, 2001).
3.5 Summary

Throughout this chapter the research design developed to fulfil the research aim and answer research questions has been explained and justified. Validity and reliability have been addressed, indicating the quality of the research. The following two chapters will present the results from both stages of data collection, before the final chapter draws together conclusions and outlines the contribution of the research.
Chapter Four: Stage One Results & Discussion

Stage One of the research involved a document analysis of submissions made to the VCEC (2011a) inquiry “Unlocking Victorian Tourism”, and the subsequent media articles. These data sources contained stakeholder opinions, commentary and recommendations for the regulatory reform of Victoria’s tourism industry as a whole, and specifically addressed the issue of private investment and CTDNP. Stakeholder groups, their values and attitudes were identified. The results are presented here by stakeholder category; first each state based stakeholder group’s perception of the role and value of National Parks and their perception of National Park tourism is offered; followed by the results for each of the individual National Park sites selected as part of the case study; and finally a brief discussion of the key issues found.

4.1 State-based Stakeholders

State Government (SG)

State Government: Role of National Parks

In September 2010, the Labour State Government commissioned the VCEC to complete an inquiry into “Unlocking Victorian Tourism”. In November 2010 the Liberal Coalition came to power in Victoria with Ted Baillieu as Premier. VCEC released a draft report in March 2011(b), with the final report released in June 2011(a). Over one year later, the Coalition Government released its official government response in August 2012 (DTF, 2012) stating the time taken to write their response was needed to ensure a considered response was given. They responded to the VCEC’s (2011a) “Unlocking Victorian Tourism: An Inquiry into Victoria’s Tourism Industry” by supporting all five recommendations in relation to public land regulations, agreeing to:

1. Remove regulatory obstacles to private sector investment in tourism infrastructure in Victoria’s National Parks so that from 1 January 2012 private sector investment is permitted and businesses are allowed to:
   a. Propose sensible and sensitive developments in National Parks provided they complement environmental, heritage and other values and generate a net public benefit; and
b. Lease land within a National Park for this development, provided they meet a set of guidelines and agree to a standard operating contract that includes incentives for the conservation and biodiversity protection of the National Park.

2. Increase the possible lease periods to be granted to up to 99 years.

3. Revise and streamline processes and guidelines for tourism development on public land.

4. The Department of Sustainability and Environment being responsible for policy and strategy of tourism on public land.

5. Parks Victoria to identify possible tourism opportunities within National Parks for private investment and continue to regulate private tourism activities on public land.

DTF (2012:4-6).

By accepting these recommendations, the Victorian Government acknowledged they perceived the role of National Parks was to provide conservation of the state’s environment and heritage assets, and as a natural attraction for the tourism industry.

Tourism Minister Louise Asher and the Treasurer Kim Wells defended the shift in government policy toward allowing CTOs to invest and develop tourism infrastructure within National Parks in various forms of media, by assuring the community government regulations would ensure a balance between conservation and tourism activities.

The government would strike the right balance between boosting tourism and protecting the environment (Wells, cited in Jenkins, 2012).

The shift toward unlocking National Parks as a tourism asset suggested an anthropocentric view from the Victorian Government. Their value of these areas was situated in the ability of National Parks to be exploited by the tourism industry to provide benefits such as economic stimulation and employment for regional areas, and to provide an attraction for the growing Asian markets. This focus on human centred needs and use is indicative of anthropocentric values. The August 2012 commentary was economically focused, with comments based around the: $16billion tourism industry; its 200,000
employees; the forecast of 500,000 Chinese visitors in by 2020 spending $1.5billion; and the importance of capitalising on the opportunities for growth.

We need those high-spending, international visitors to go into regional Victoria for economic development purposes. Nature-based tourism is huge. It’s growing worldwide and Victoria needs to keep up (Asher, cited in Jenkins, 2012).

Citing best practice developments in other National Park systems, such as Tasmania and New Zealand, the government argued sustainable tourism was achievable and desirable for the Victorian National Park system. They explained only developments which provide a ‘net community benefit’ would be allowed, but were not implicit on how this would be calculated. Development would not be allowed in areas classified as ‘wilderness parks’, ‘wilderness zones’, ‘reference areas’ and ‘remote and natural areas’ under the National Parks Act 1975 (Vic), and an approval process for investment and infrastructure would include strict guidelines determined by the Minister for the Environment.

The “Tourism Investment Opportunities of Significance in National Parks: Guidelines” (DSE, 2013b) were released in March 2013, by which time Dennis Napthine had become the leader of the Liberal Party and Premier of Victoria. Similar economic driven comments were delivered, however the majority of communication was delivered by the Minister for Climate Change and the Environment who focused mainly on the human needs of the Victorian community to have better access to their National Parks for recreation purposes. He strenuously stated that any development would be conditioned to strict environmental assessment to ensure National Park conservation values would be upheld.

We want to make sure that we can open up those natural assets for people to come and visit so they can enjoy them in a variety of different ways. Proposals for major new tourism projects will require a detailed environmental management plan supported by an independent environmental risk assessment and auditing of the plan. There must also be proper community consultation and projects will be asked to generate a net public benefit for the community use of the park (Smith, cited in Australasian Leisure Management, 2013).
The government’s motivation for tourism development, economic and recreation, were both anthropocentric and a significant shift from the comments made by the Environment Minister in 2011 in response to the initial draft report released by VCEC saying:

“It's not on our agenda”, he told The Sunday Age when asked if he was interested in opening up National Parks to more private development. “I’m happy to see what people have to say, but I’m not about to encroach on what is an absolutely fantastic range of natural assets that Victoria has. People can enjoy them for what they are. I want to see our natural assets developed, but that doesn’t mean 'developments’. It just means appropriate access to tracks, toilet blocks, amenities, that sort of thing (Smith, cited in Tomazin, 2011).

These comments dismissing CTDNP and encouraging visitors to “enjoy them for what they are” indicated an eco-centric standpoint from the Environment Minister in 2011. An indication of how the Environment Minister justified his shift in values from eco-centric in 2011 to anthropocentric in 2013 could be found in his comment:

The more that people have access to their natural environment the more they will come to appreciate, respect and care for it (Smith, cited in Australasian Leisure Management, 2013).

Suggesting he perceived the most effective way to conserve the natural environment was to encourage the Victorian community to connect with it.

**State Government (SG): National Park Tourism**

The Australian national tourism industry was in need of re-positioning itself within the international tourism market, largely led by the market shifting from American, British and European visitors to those from the prospering Asian countries, mainly India and China. According to the Victorian Government, National Parks were a key asset to this re-positioning and the development of National Park tourism within the state of Victoria was therefore important to the success of the tourism industry at both a national and state level. The State Government supported sensitive and appropriate CTDNP within the borders of publicly owned National Parks in order for Victoria to keep up with the competition from other Australian states who already allowed such development. They expressed this support by committing to regulatory reform to remove the barriers that previously barred CTOs from investing and building inside National Park borders.
Benefits associated with allowing CTOs to do so were listed as: increasing economic generation for National Park management; increased appreciation and protection for the environment; economic generation and employment for regional areas; increasing pride and exposure of Victoria’s natural icons; increasing access and quality of experience; diversifying the visitor experiences available in Victoria; and attracting new high end markets.

Regulatory impediments to the supply of tourism services can inhibit the industry’s capacity to respond and adapt to this highly competitive market. Increasing Victoria’s competitiveness and economic prosperity will require an ongoing effort to ensure that regulation is not unnecessarily stifling the sector (DTF, 2012:ii).

The National Park Advisory Council (NPAC)(2012) advised the government they had significant reservations in supporting the recommendations made in the VCEC final report. They re-iterated the legislated purpose of a National Park was to provide conservation, and where compatible recreation and education, and tourism development of any kind should be approached with this in mind. The NPAC were concerned public consultation had not been sufficient, and that ‘without broader discussion the ultimate result might be a lack of consensus on, and little community support for, the report’s recommendations (NPAC, 2012:7).

**State Tourism Industry Groups (STIG)**

STIGs were organisations representing the tourism industry in Victoria. They were strong voices in both the media and VCEC submissions, with comments and submissions made from the peak tourism body, the Victorian Tourism Industry Council (VTIC), Tourism and Transport Forum (TTF), Tourism Victoria, and the Victorian Employers’ Chamber of Commerce and Industry (VECCI).

**State Tourism Industry Groups (STIG): Role of National Parks**

To these groups, National Parks were an environmental asset to be used by and benefit the community. Conservation was acknowledged as a key priority, however, tourism was
seen to enhance conservation objectives through protection, education and economic generation, and therefore essential to National Parks as a compatible and legitimate use. STIGs supported the move by State Government to allow CTOs to become partners with Parks Victoria and to take advantage of the possible opportunities and settings National Parks provide for visitor experiences. To STIGs this was the inevitable and responsible way to progress. They maintained the previous regulatory system, locking out CTO investment and infrastructure, was conceived before the tourism industry had developed sustainable tourism management strategies and before tourism became an economic driver for the state. Now that tourism could be provided sensitive to its surroundings, and had the opportunity to provide Victoria with greater economic generation, regulatory barriers needed to be removed.

Tourism is a compatible industry that is well aligned with the needs of the natural environment (Mariani, cited in ATEC, 2012).

We welcome the policy reforms for the private sector provision of sensible and appropriate infrastructure that compliments natural and cultural assets, to enhance the experience of visitors to National Parks (VECCI, 2012).

A common argument was that Victoria received the highest number of National Park visitors than any other Australian state, but received the lowest yield from these visitors. Such comments indicated STIGs see generating income as an important National Park role. This included income for the surrounding community and for Parks Victoria to lessen their reliance on government funding. STIGs saw CTOs as integral to improving the economic structure of Victoria’s National Park system. They requested the State Government to shift their philosophy to embrace and encourage CTDNP and to recognise Victoria’s future was based in service industries, such as tourism, as opposed to those of manufacturing.

I don’t think we can expect government to cover all the costs of investment on public land (Stone, cited in Dowling, 2011)

Victoria has the highest National Park visitation in the country, yet the economic yield from this visitation is the nation’s lowest. This is largely due to the lack of appropriate infrastructure and experiences available to visitors. By allowing appropriate investment, these guidelines will make our National Parks more accessible for locals and visitors to appreciate the natural beauty
that Victoria has to offer, and ease the economic burden currently on
government to maintain and develop these places (Smith, cited in VTIC, 2013a).

The focus of STIGs on the human use of National Parks through tourism was undeniably
anthropocentric. Terminology such as ‘competitive advantage,’ ‘points of difference’,
tourism asset,’ and ‘economic stimulator’ were all identified within STIG commentary.
There were three main themes to their comments which indicated their anthropocentric value:

1. National Parks are tourism attractions: STIGs acknowledged conservation and
   protection of the environment as part of the National Park role, but essentially they
   viewed National Parks as a natural setting for tourism activities.

2. Tourism is essential for National Parks: STIGs perceived tourism as an essential
   component of the National Park system in order to achieve the objectives of
   conservation; education; economic generation; and recreation. Tourism increased
   access, opportunities for education, and generated income.

3. The symbiotic relationship: As both sustainable National Park tourism and National
   Parks benefit each other, their relationship was seen as compatible and positive.
   National Park CTOs relied upon National Parks as a tourism setting and therefore
   would not jeopardise environmental damage. Further National Parks relied upon
   tourism to attract visitors, increase appreciation and generate income. The key to
   achieving successful outcomes is effective and efficient government regulation and
   sustainable tourism management.

The stipulation for proper and stringent controls allowing only sensitive and
sensible investments is paramount. It is in the interest of the tourism industry

to ensure our parks remain protected and preserved, and we are confident
there will be significant development limits imposed (Smith, 2012).

This means sensitive investment that is sympathetic to natural surroundings.
Letting people in will increase support for our natural wonders, compared
with the ‘lock up and leave’ approach (Stone, 2011).
State Tourism Industry Groups (STIG): National Park Tourism

STIGs believed Victoria needed to re-position itself to appeal and take advantage of the growing nature-based tourism markets, and the shift toward Asian visitors. CTDNP was essential to this strategy. The increasing competition from other state destinations was a strong motive, with continuous mention that all other Australian states allowed such activity and were developing quality nature-based tourism products ahead of Victoria. These comments were coupled with a sense of urgency regulatory changes needed to be made before Victoria fell further behind the market. Tasmania, Western Australia, New Zealand, San Francisco, and Canada were held up as best practice sustainable CTDNP to be followed. There was evidence of the intense competition for nature-based tourism across Australia. When the regulatory reforms were announced, CEO of Tourism Tasmania acknowledged Victorian National Parks as a potential new threat in the market and pushed his state to create new National Park experiences to retain a leading market position.

“Some of these unnecessary barriers are founded in the outdated assumption that environmental outcomes, community aspirations, agricultural production and tourism development cannot co-exist in a balanced and sustainable manner” Mr Blake said. “These barriers must be broken down if Victoria's tourism industry is to adapt to new markets, remain vibrant, competitive and a major economic contributor to the state.” (Blake, cited in Gordon, 2011).

In tourism we are transiting from the old world to the new Asian century (Dixon, cited in Stewart, 2012).

STIGs were confident government regulations, including accreditation, incentives, and self-regulation, would lead to a balance of both National Park tourism and conservation objectives. To this end, STIGs were vocal in their VCEC submissions calling for State Government to remove regulatory barriers to attract and support investment. Developing infrastructure such as building accommodation, activity facilities for boating, and visitor centres was deemed essential to creating quality National Park tourism experiences and in keeping visitors in regional areas longer as opposed to them travelling back to Melbourne. Victorian STIGs argued, the industry now had the ability to develop tourism sustainably. They acknowledged the previous 1996 development plans for Wilsons Promontory National Park were misguided and overzealous, arguing the industry has since matured.
The proposals were of a ‘different scale’ to the hotel accommodation proposed for Wilsons Promontory during the Kennett government. All of what I am talking about could occur within the current footprint with some minor use of some of the current facilities (Stone, cited in Dowling, 2011).

It is in the tourism industry’s best interests to preserve the natural environment – tourism operators are not going to propose development that detracts from the surroundings (Stone, 2011).

STIGs did not acknowledge potential negative impacts, focusing instead on potential National Park tourism benefits. Attention was paid to the economic benefits, particularly to regional Victoria, and potential employment opportunities. For National Park management the benefit would be two-fold: firstly an increase in economic generation; and secondly if CTOs were to provide visitor facilities Parks Victoria work load would be reduced leaving more time and resources for environmental management. In addition the improvement of visitor infrastructure would improve access for a more diverse group and increase visitor numbers. As a result of greater visitation from a more diverse range of the society, community pride and environmental knowledge of National Parks would be enhanced. STIGs believed the industry could adequately prove tourism’s ‘net community benefit’ necessary for development approval.

The fact is tourism is a major employer and economic stimulator in regional Victoria and strategic, sensitive investment in National Parks would only increase the net benefit to the community (Stone, 2011).

Tourism can do so much for community, not just by employing people and generating money, but by providing access to wonderful experiences. These are often places for which they are deeply connected and may instil a great sense of pride in communities (Smith, 2012).

**State Conservation Groups (SCG)**

The VNPA was the only state based conservation group featured in media articles with comments from their executive director Matt Ruchel prevalent. The VNPA (2011a) submitted an extensive 23 page VCEC submission. The Green Wedge group and the Friends of the Koala (FOK) group also made submissions to the VCEC enquiry.
State Conservation Groups (SCG): Role of National Parks

The VNPA and FOK held a strong stance National Parks were created to conserve the natural environment for future generations. Non-facilitated recreation and tourism was an acceptable use, and access for all of the community to use National Parks in this way was important.

“Commercial developments should be outside National Parks, not inside,” he said. “They're for nature conservation, recreation and respite, not property development” (Ruchel, cited in Jenkins, 2013).

Any built tourism infrastructure inside National Park borders was deemed incompatible, for its risk of environmental damage; jeopardising access for the community; the inappropriate situation where CTOs would gain off a public good; and the risk of Parks Victoria’s priorities shifting from environmental protection to private economic gain. The VNPA agreed government regulations were a barrier to entry, but a necessary barrier to protect National Parks from CTOs building inappropriate CTDNP and therefore the regulatory barriers should remain.

The value of National Parks to the community is surely in the sense of escape and the enjoyment of nature without the intrusion of manmade structures. Also, the preservation of flora and fauna for future generations is of enormous community value and would be under threat if private investment of tourist facilities were permitted in National Parks. This would be a money making exercise for a few companies which would be of little benefit to the wider community (FOK, 2011:1-2).

The VNPA reflected on what a crucial time it was for environmental protection in Victoria, and recognised for both conservation and recreation to exist within National Parks, effective management was needed to create a balance with environment as priority. Allowing CTOs to become involved with this management, or allowing them to build within National Park borders, was seen by the VNPA as tipping the balance in favour of tourism and commercial interests and a direct threat to conservation. The VNPA saw the National Park role as conserving Victoria’s cultural and environmental assets for the community, now and into the future, and in no way to be regarded as a tourism asset for CTOs.
They (National Parks) are popular and much loved, but now private companies want a piece of the action in a public asset designed to protect nature for the future (Ruchel, cited in VNPA, 2011b).

The primary role of National Parks is conservation of nature on behalf of all Victorians. Our parks were not created to end up as building sites for hotels and large-scale infrastructure that can only be used by a privileged few who can afford it (VNPA, 2012b).

Experience shows that the people who benefit from private investment in parks are investors, not park visitors, or the parks themselves (Ruchel, cited in Mirror News, 2013:1).

The VNPA judged all National Park activities by their ability to assist in achieving conservation objectives, demonstrating their strong eco-centric view. The value of National Parks was their intrinsic environmental qualities, to conserve and protect Victoria’s natural and cultural assets. For the FOK, protection was important, as was the value of the National Park as an area free from infrastructure for recreation. The VNPA criticised the current government measuring National Park value and success by “visitor numbers,” recommending some form of measurement of the environmental condition would serve as a better indicator.

The type of visitor infrastructure Victorian governments have placed in parks has overwhelmingly been designed to blend in with the natural environment and have a minimal impact on environmental values. These developments have not had a commercial (i.e. profit making) focus but have been constructed to meet the public enjoyment and education requirements (VNPA, 2011a:8).

The SCG’s perceived a divide between their values and those of State Government and the VCEC inquiry itself. In particular the Baillieu Liberal Government’s decisions to re-introduce cattle grazing; firewood collecting; mining and commercial tourism into National Parks was perceived as an indication the current government was anthropocentric and SCG’s criticised this as a threat to environmental values.
The Victorian National Park Association is critical of the Baillieu Government’s conservation record, and has called on it to release a detailed conservation and environment policy (Mirror News, 2012:1).

The VCEC report was criticised for its anthropocentric values. Economically focused, the report did not adequately consider Victoria National Park’s environmental values; landscape protection value; or the potential long-term costs to National Park management and the tourism industry as a whole if tourism development were allowed within National Park borders. The VNPA alleged the VCEC report did not adequately consider the overall condition of Victoria’s environment and its protection system. Victoria has a high level of cleared land, and National Parks are therefore a highly valued cornerstone to Victoria’s conservation in protecting the little natural environment left.

If we lost their ecological integrity, we lose the battle (VNPA, 2011a:4).

The VNPA is not aware of any development in a high conservation value area which has a net benefit in ecological or environmental terms. Generally such benefits are grossly over-stated for commonly cited example. Any benefits have largely been economic or social (VNPA, 2011a:16).

State Conservation Groups (SCG): National Park Tourism

The VNPA recognised benefits of National Park tourism and aligned itself with Tourism Victoria’s (2008) “Nature-based Tourism Strategy (2008-2012, ”, which planned for all infrastructure to be built outside National Park borders, and CTOs restricted to tours and activities through permit control and leases of existing facilities within borders. In Victoria, where National Parks were smaller than those in other States and all relatively close to nearby towns, this was seen as a viable plan. It supported regional Victoria by generating employment and income opportunities and provided opportunities for visitor education and environmental appreciation, without jeopardising conservation objectives. The VNPA added the structure and size of the National Park system in Victoria created a crucial difference between those in other states and countries listed as best practice. In Victoria developing tourism infrastructure in surrounding towns had worked in both the Alpine area, serving the Alpine National Park, in Wilsons Promontory National Park, and
in Halls Gap near Grampians National Park, the VNPA saw these as best practice models acceptable for future development.

Note that there are opportunities for development outside parks in sites of low conservation value to actually improve both the conservation value, and the ambience for tourism, of the area. This should be encouraged (VNPA, 2011a:4)

The VNPA declared there was no evidence that proved allowing CTOs within National Park borders would increase economic yield, for National Park management or the surrounding areas. In fact they believed it could cost both groups by having a detrimental effect of destroying the natural setting for the National Park visitor experience, thus weakening the tourism setting in the long-term. Further they believed it may create unfair competition between CTOs outside and those within the National Park. An increase in CTO involvement and building tourism infrastructure would also increase the cost and resources required by Parks Victoria to manage National Park visitors and the increased activity of CTOs, taking away from resources for conservation.

People visit National Parks for experiences they can’t get elsewhere. They want the opportunity to see the natural world at its best, not hotels and shopping malls (Ruchel, cited in Jenkins, 2012).

The Green Wedge group and FOK agreed that no private tourism investment or infrastructure should be allowed within National Park borders, and visitor facilities should remain in the control of Parks Victoria. Their main apprehension was the likelihood CTOs would prioritise their economic business needs over those of the environment and would not produce any long-term environmental benefit.

**State Recreational Visitors (SRV)**

No recreational visitor group made a VCEC submission, all commentary was made after the government response to the VCEC report was released. Comments were obtained from bushwalkers, surfers, four wheel drive users, skiers, and caravaners through their respective blog sites and media comments.
State Recreational Visitors (SRV): Role of National Parks

SRV comments indicated they perceived the National Park role was to firstly conserve and protect natural and cultural assets, and secondly to provide a natural and unspoilt setting for recreation. There was a large amount of commentary on the type of recreation National Parks should provide. This group saw National Parks as a setting for ‘reflective recreation,’ low impact activities requiring little to no infrastructure, with environmental appreciation the foundation of the visitor experience. SRV feared potential CTDNP targeting the high end ecotourism market would turn National Parks into “playgrounds for the rich”, restricting access for low income earners; destroying the natural setting for other recreational users; and shifting the focus of the visitor experience from environmental appreciation to consumerism and comfort. This argument was heard from all recreational visitor groups.

Load of codswallop. It is about conservation, not about a holiday resort for the rich to enjoy. If you can’t handle camping and low impact tourism (none of the proposed developments are low impact as they involve massive constructions and an inundation of people) then National Parks are not for you (Drbuc, 2012).

As long as they don’t close the parks to other users. For too long Parks Victoria have shut motorbike, 4x4 and campers out of parks and provided access to the minority. They need to remember that they are our parks and there are a lot of people that enjoy these activities (Peter, cited in Seedy, 2012).

Valuing the National Park as a natural setting for human recreation use indicated an anthropocentric value system by the SRV. However, this group’s strong belief all National Park activities should be conducive to conservation, suggested they also held eco-centric values. SRV were concerned CTOs, eco-tourists and the State Government would not uphold conservation as priority, or value National Parks for their intrinsic worth, rather what they can provide to tourist markets. In many remarks there was a perceived divide between the SRV’s eco-centric values and those perceived as anthropocentric of the CTO, eco-tourists and government as ‘the rich.’

It will (be) trashing nature by the rich for the rich (paidal_chalne_vala, 2012).
(National Parks) Are for conservation and are not about making a dime, or providing luxuries for the rich (Drbuc, 2012).

The more I read the more it seems this is purely a money-making scheme that will do nothing to enhance the natural values of our parks (Sinclair, 2012).

So much for the people owning the land my Dad fought for…..The Developers and the crooked Governments are going for big Dollars…..We won’t have a National Park at all in a couple of Generations (Jimbo, 2013).

One comment added developers would take advantage of or make redundant the need for volunteers, believing they would shun out the community.

Victoria’s then Premier Ted Baillieu was often identified as being ‘one of the rich’ collaborating with developers. Several references were made to the similarities between Premier Baillieu and former Liberal Premier Jeff Kennett whose government proposed to develop Wilsons Promontory National Park in the 1990’s. SRV made calls to “war” and a re-ignition of the “fight” against the government to stop CTDNP and to uphold National Park value.

Big Ted’s plans to put a Golf course, a 5 star hotel and a KFC in every National Park is just wrong and I will be joining the fight with the VNPA to stop this rock ape trashing these places of unspoiled beauty in the name of a $$ (paidal_chalne_vala, 2012).

Kennett made the mistake of attempting something similar. I doubt Baillieu realises how much of the community will be galvanised by this (Go Native, 2012).

State Recreational Visitors (SRV): National Park Tourism

It was the potential for inappropriate CTDNP and the involvement of the private sector that generated the most opposition toward National Park tourism from SRV. Private sector CTOs were seen as incompatible with National Park values, believing their commitment would be to business objectives over conservation, and would not have sufficient expertise to adequately manage natural, cultural or indigenous assets. SRV believed CTDNP would be mismanaged by both CTOs and government, resulting in
displeasing CTDNP which could endanger the natural setting SRV’s utilised for their recreational pursuits. There was little faith in the State Government’s ability to balance conservation and tourism through regulation and management, deeming the recent and previous decisions by the Liberal Government pointed to economic gains at any cost, including environmental degradation.

I am in two minds on this. On one hand, there would be many opportunities for quality developments that wouldn't impact on the environment in a negative fashion, but on the other hand, it seems open for abuse over time (mx_boarder, 2012).

None of their decisions will be made in terms of the benefit to the parks or the environment. They will be purely commercial considerations in terms of financial benefit (Go Native, 2012).

SRV recognised there was a possibility for appropriate commercial development to be built outside of National Park borders in nearby towns. Nearby towns were seen as a suitable setting for infrastructure as they already had the necessary facilities (such as water supply, electricity, and sewage) and in some cases already had existing accommodation and hospitality infrastructure to build upon. This was seen as a viable option with tourists then travelling into the National Park each day, leaving it with an undeveloped natural setting and ensuring regional Victoria received the maximum economic benefit. SRV dismissed the argument that infrastructure within the National Park would increase access, as they believed visitors could already come and stay in these nearby towns, or choose to camp within the National Park borders.

Building publicly owned, small, low-impact hiker huts would be acceptable tourism development within National Park borders to SRV. Huts could provide an option for developing multi-day trails for both horse riders and walkers as quality visitor experiences and, owned by Parks Victoria, economic benefit would go directly to National Park management. As long as the huts were sensitive to the surrounding environment, they were considered reflective recreation and would fulfil this groups’ perception of acceptable National Park tourism.
Huts for walking and guided horse trails perhaps with nil extra vehicle access to huts. It would have to be lightly controlled with huts and development out of wilderness areas (Dawoodduck, 2012).

Small, well managed and environmentally sensitive private enterprise is great with strict limitations on expansion or development. Large, laissez-faire, environmentally threatening private enterprise is bad news from any angle the government takes (TerraMer, 2012).

There was no mention of the need for Victoria to be competitive or target the growing Asian markets from this group, but the new eco-tourist market was mentioned several times with negative connotations. SRV did not associate themselves as eco-tourists or nature-based tourists, but saw these markets as high end consumerists, not necessarily in line with their National Park values.

This will result in more high priced ‘eco-villages’ chasing the ‘eco tourist’ dollar at $300 a night (Dawoodduck, 2012).

During these discussions, benefits of tourism were mentioned by some SRV. The possibility of commercial tourism increasing income for Parks Victoria was acknowledged, although SRV believed the mismanagement and lack of government funding would remain, rendering the benefit from increased income as minimal. Increasing visitation and access for a more diverse group of visitors, was seen as a positive to increasing support for National Parks within the community and generating environmental education.

If we allow ‘family friendly’ developments on a modest scale, they will encourage more of the ordinary people to venture into the hills that we love. For people who have never camped out, the barriers (emotional and financial) can be off putting. A gentle introduction via a small 3½ star hotel with friendly, easy accessed activities is a gently introduction to the outdoors that doesn’t require investment in camping gear or apprehension about roughing it (Bogong, 2012).
**State Community (SC)**

Fourteen VCEC submissions were made by members of the community relating to the state based National Park regulatory system. This was significantly less than the approximate 3500 made to the Government in regards to the development of Wilsons Promontory National Park. The Herald-Sun and The Age both ran polls on the day the government response was released, and here numbers increased with 4716 people voting in The Age poll, 81 percent against private tourism development, 16 percent would support it as long as it was sensitive development, and 3 percent supported the potential tourism development proposals (Arup, 2012). In the Herald-Sun readers voted on the question “Should Victoria's National Parks be off-limits to developers?” with 2730 readers voting, 88.17 percent ‘yes’ and 11.83 percent ‘no’ (Rolfe, 2012). These figures support the findings made of the SC comments, where it was evident the majority were opposed to private infrastructure within National Parks, with a small group who supported the plans. It was important to realise this was not a true representation of the entire Victorian community, but an indication of the opinions and perceptions of those who had chosen to make comment upon the issue, consistent with qualitative methodology.

**State Community (SC): Role of National Parks**

Within SC comments, National Parks were seen to play an essential role in the environmental health of the state and in conservation for future generations. SC members mentioned issues such as climate change, pollution, and global warming, and argued allowing CTDNP would add unnecessary pressure at an already sensitive time to the little protected natural environment which was left. Many felt this would mark a significant and harmful turning point in the future environmental quality of Victorian National Parks. Community needs in terms of recreation were also important, having access to National Parks as public areas and spending time in a natural environment were key roles. Access for all was considered unreasonable, for example wheelchair access to wilderness areas unrealistic. The SC believed conservation groups had a ‘no access’ preservation policy, perceived as too extreme. National Parks role in society was to provide conservation and recreation, pursuits not seen as having an economic value but an essential social and environmental value. Utilising National Parks as an economic asset for CTOs was therefore perceived as contradictory to the role National Parks should play in society.
And what has funding got to do with the principle objective of a National Park which is to ‘conserve the environment for current and future generations’? (Owens, cited in Beeton, 2012).

Our parks are there to preserve our wild places and natural wonders for future generations. Their purpose is not to maximise tourist income (Down, cited in Dowling, 2011).

The type of recreation and National Park setting was of most concern to the SC. National Parks were considered natural, untouched areas for escaping city life and for reflective recreation. CTDNP of any kind would threaten this. Some comments vented frustration the tourism industry and potential developments were aimed at attracting an international and Asian market, when the National Parks role was for the future of “Victorian” generations. In addition the new type of tourist the government was aiming to attract was seen as more interested in souvenirs and commercialisation, not in line with the type of recreation National Parks should be providing. Opposing the government argument that every other state allows CTDNP, one comment added there was no need to follow the trends in the market or try to compete with best practice, but to do what was right for the Victorian community and its National Park system.

Of course there is a whole suite of wants from potential visitors, but personally I think the attraction of visiting a National Park should be seeing those things that represent a National Park its naturalness, its ‘otherness’ from built-up areas. I don’t know whether more chalets or B’n’B’s wedged between eucalyptus really represent that. Well maintained trails, campsites and toilets catering to everyone from car campers to day-hikers to backpackers is what should be provided (Fairman, cited in Beeton, 2012:1).

No need to keep up with anybody unless we’re sure we’re doing it right (Jago, 2012).

There is no sound reason to turn over precious public land to private interests. Access is already readily available, as is nearby accommodation in areas such as Wilsons Promontory, Port Campbell and Point Nepean. The government should stop pandering to private interests and do what is necessary to protect our precious resources for future generations (Aide, 2013).
There was acknowledgment of the high and increasing cost of managing National Parks, but ideas on how they should be funded varied. Many argued there should be an increase in government funding, and in taxes if need be, for conservation management as opposed to turning to private investors. There was an increased concern from SC if investors were international, believing they would care less for Victorian National Park assets than local CTOs. In no way was it deemed acceptable for any private enterprise to be profiting from a tax funded public good. It was clear SC did not see National Parks as an asset to be exploited by the tourism industry. Some felt a user pays system would be fairer to all of society, however others noted this would pose a threat that access would only be for those who could pay the high price, not conducive to the community role of National Parks.

The government has withdrawn funding so that National Parks are suffering from a desperate lack of rangers. Now that it has run them down it brings up the outrageous proposition of private developments. This is a dire threat to our natural heritage (Sitka, 2013).

Importantly, this wonder of nature belongs to people. Ms Smith notes that “Victoria has the highest National Park visitation in the country”. Further, she notes that Victorian National Parks are the most development-free in the nation. She has made an excellent case for leaving parks well alone (Becket, 2013).

There was a lack of confidence in the government’s ability to regulate and control tourism to ensure it remains sensitive and sustainable over the long-term. Strong regulations may be put in place initially, but over time the SC saw the potential for constant CTO lobbying to weaken these controls. Current barriers to entry existed to protect the National Park, and any “fast tracking” through this process was considered adverse to the necessary management for achieving the conservation and recreation balance. Several SC submissions noted the lack of detail in the new regulatory system, a critical weakness which posed the potential for regulatory failure. Labouring Parks Victoria with extra responsibilities to find CTO investment opportunities was perceived as moving their role from conservation to business endeavours, not where their expertise or priority should lie. SC members questioned the appropriateness of a National Park inquiry being run by an efficiency committee of economists, whereas National Parks hold environmental and social value which could not be measured by economic terms.
They only refer to economic issues. This is not an acceptable way to assess whether regulation should be amended? (Terry, 2011)

See them for the value, the real value, in non-financial terms, that’s already there, rather than just wanting to destroy the very things that make these places special in the first place (Mr E, cited in Dowling, 2011).

I was also disappointed to see that despite National Parks being so central to your recommendations the words biodiversity, conservation, nature conservation etc. Do not appear (Westcott, 2011).

The SC comments indicated largely eco-centric views, valuing National Parks for their intrinsic significance. Further to this the SC perceived a divide between their values and those of the CTOs, the State Government and eco-tourists, who they considered to be anthropocentric placing human economic needs above that of the environment. Given the government response and the recent decisions of allowing cattle grazing into National Parks, the SC perceived the Baillieu government was in cohort with the tourism industry, and waged a fight between the two sides:

You have seriously misread the Victorian polity. We are very protective of our National Parks are won’t sit back and be told they are “open for business” (DrinMelb cited in Bowe, 2012).

This is the ultimate triumph of an insane ideology that says making money trumps the environment, public health, national security and our communities (Les M, cited in Beeton & Frost 2011).

DO NOT UNDERESTIMATE THE PASSION VICTORIANS HAVE FOR OUR PARKS! MESS WITH THEM AT YOUR PERIL! (Down, cited in Dowling, 2011).

We love or parks and we’ll do what it takes to protect them from people who, when they see a tree, only think of how to convert it into dollar notes (AK, cited in Dowling, 2011).
The SC saw National Parks as a setting for recreation which reflected and appreciated nature, any development by anthropocentric CTOs or government would be detrimental to this and would attract visitors incompatible to National Park values. They saw the type of tourist the government and tourism industry was focusing on as being ‘rich’ and incompatible.

Development changes the relationship to the environment, it says ‘the beauty of nature is not enough you must be pampered at great expense so you can look at nature through a window from an air conditioned bar.’ People go to National Parks to get away from hotels, car parks, concrete and glass. Development in National Parks should be limited to the minimum required to give people access. Walking tracks, camping grounds, it’s more than enough and it doesn’t detract from the whole point of the National Parks which is to preserve nature and allow people access to enjoy it (Andrew, cited in Beeton & Frost, 2011).

**State Community (SC): National Park Tourism**

It was the infrastructure and private involvement of CTOs which gained most opposition toward CTDNP from the SC, and its threat to the long-term quality of National Parks. CTDNP of any kind would require some land clearing and buildings which would disturb the surrounding area and increase ongoing threats such as noise and trampling of habitat. Infrastructure would increase Parks Victoria costs with upkeep and maintenance, and therefore development would be at both an environmental and economic cost to the community and not a ‘net benefit.’ Mt. Buffalo chalet was used as an example of previous bad management by the Victorian Government. The only stakeholders SC could see benefiting from CTDNP was the CTOs themselves. One person asked “why is it necessary to continually expand the tourist industry?”

Any increase in the numbers of tourists depletes natural resources. I have never once seen the opposite occur (Bloom, cited in Beeton, 2012).

Should commercial investment be allowed, the potential for Parks Victoria to become answerable to the tourism industry and shift their focus from conservation to visitor services was a perceived threat. Therefore, SC commented any development built within
the National Park should be owned by Parks Victoria in order for them to receive the full benefits and remain in control. SC criticised the mismanagement of the tourism industry and showed little support for the industry as a whole.

My question is who is going to maintain the parks with the increased visitation from the thousands of international tourists that are going to flock to the parks with these new developments. Certainly not Parks Victoria which is barely able to manage the maintenance of the parks at present with the cutbacks that have been imposed on them. Once again I see this as the governments giving private enterprise free access to our natural assets without appropriate returns to the state for their use. Why not develop the attractions on private land and keep the values of the parks for what they were meant for. Natural values (Paul, cited in Seedy, 2012).

One commenter observed land adjacent to National Parks valuable as potential tourism sites, would lower in value should the area inside the National Park become available for CTDNP. In addition there were several comments arguing that allowing commercial tourism development within National Park borders would only create unfair competition with those in surrounding areas, and as opposed to the VCEC claims of supporting regional areas, it will hinder local businesses. Building infrastructure outside the National Parks was therefore seen as a more productive solution, and the SC added the State Government should be working with local councils and communities to achieve this growth together, adding CTO innovation was vital to a successful industry.

The small group of SC who supported CTDNP saw the possibility CTOs were able to hold eco-centric values and manage tourism sustainably, providing the state with benefits of improved access.

Victoria has world class National Parks with 3rd world infrastructure, because a very noisy minority want to keep things as they were in the 1950’s – Tidal River at Wilsons Prom is a case in point. Sustainable tourism development is possible if people take a constructive approach. Enough of the ‘four legs good, two legs bad’ mantra – It is time for a mature discussion about how we provide quality visitor services in our National Parks (Buckingham, cited in Stone, 2011).
The sub-group of supporters was the minority, and featured only in media commentary. They believed the economic generation and improved access tourism infrastructure would bring justified private involvement and a more sustainable long term plan than the “tree-huggers” ideas that National Parks should be “locked up.” Supporting a user pays system, they considered the plan to attract the high end eco-tourist market was advantageous. This sub-group clearly identified that visitation leads to appreciation and support of the National Park system and believed sustainable National Park tourism would increase access for all types of visitors. They had faith only sensitive and sustainable CTDNP would be allowed, listing examples such as Tasmania, Yosemite and New Zealand of where this had been successful.

Even National Parks have to 'pay' for themselves somehow. People are less inclined to conserve/protect important areas if they can't access or view at least some of what is being preserved. If this means some low impact best practice eco-accommodation needs to be built in a National Park then so be it (AndyGM, 2013).

The more people caring for an area – including enviro-tourists, the better off it will be. Lock up and leave is a bad policy (VJB, cited in Ristevski, 2011).

These partnerships have been increasing dramatically in countries other than Australia with benefits like further income available for parks management and scientific study, empowerment of local identity surrounding the park itself (the partnership of indigenous groups and traditionally conflicting land management strategies like parks). These partnerships have been shown to have positive results I hope we can see these benefits here too (Richie, cited in Seedy, 2012).

**State Commercial Tourism Operators (SCTO)**

No state based CTO made a VCEC submission, and there were only three comments in the media (one from a Victorian CTO, and two from interstate CTOs). The Victorian CTO acknowledged the undesired regulatory barriers to operating within Victorian National Park borders, and supported regulatory reform. Both interstate CTOs explained they were concerned with the quality of the environment as it was the basis of their nature-based tourism product and they therefore ensured all activities were environmentally sound, making them the ideal National Park partner. One further argued
CTOs were more concerned about conservation than the average casual National Park visitor. In addition, CTOs offered education and increased access for visitors, adding the community must visit and appreciate National Parks if they were to foster social environmental awareness and support. The high cost to entry and government regulations of other states had been effective in reaching a balance between conservation and tourism, with the CTOs there regularly participating in conservation activities within the National Park.

Because when you’re in there every day, it’s in the interest of the operator to protect and conserve (Hunt, cited in Wilkins & Tomazin, 2012).

There is little point in locking parks up; better to work towards having amazing iconic experiences at every level (Baillie, cited in Wilkins & Tomazin, 2012).

**Summary of Results for State-based Stakeholders**

As expected, the two significant Victorian National Park objectives perceived by state stakeholders were to conserve Victoria’s natural and cultural assets, and to provide a natural setting for recreation and tourism. The difficulty in managing to balance both objectives had been present throughout the history of the Victorian National Park system as detailed in Anderson (2000); however all stakeholders saw the 2012/13 regulatory reform as potentially the greatest decision in the Victorian systems history. Allowing private investment and CTDNP in Victorian National Parks was a significant change and would have a large, and possibly irreversible, impact on all facets of the National Parks.

In addition, stakeholders perceived this as a time of urgency for their own interests. For the SG and the STIGs, the recent shift in the tourism market toward nature-based experiences and the Asian tourist required swift and calculated change. National Park tourism needed to take priority if Victoria was to remain competitive against other Australian states and on the international stage. SCG and the SC saw this as a critical time for conservation listing environmental concerns such as climate change, land clearing, and biodiversity protection as key issues which needed to be addressed with more focus on National Park protection rather than jeopardising conservation with CTDNP.
Table 4.1 outlines each stakeholder group perceptions and beliefs of National Park tourism benefits and costs, along with their main arguments in support or opposition to CTDNP and investment in Victorian National Parks. All groups acknowledged National Park tourism had a legitimate place within the Victorian National Park system, and as illustrated, all groups could see benefits of National Park tourism, but not all groups identified potential negative impacts.
Table 4.1: Victorian National Park commercial tourism stakeholders

1. **State Government (SG):**
   Anthropocentric, supports private tourism investment & infrastructure within National Park borders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits &amp; support for National Park tourism:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Economic generation &amp; employment for regional Victoria;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a competitive destination based on sustainable nature-based tourism;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capture growing Asian markets;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increases pride in community &amp; exposure of Victoria’s natural icons;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increases access &amp; quality of visitor experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Did not list any costs of National Park tourism, acknowledged damage could be caused but would be controlled through regulation.**

**Key argument:**
• Government regulation will ensure conservation & tourism will be balanced Victoria is catching up with other States & destinations.

2. **State Tourism Industry Groups (STIG):**
   Anthropocentric, supports private tourism investment & infrastructure within National Park borders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits &amp; support for private National Park tourism investment &amp; infrastructure:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Leaves management to focus on conservation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CTOs have expertise, resources, &amp; knowledge to provide quality visitor experiences;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic generation &amp; employment for regional Victoria;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Income generation for National Park maintenance &amp; environmental management;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will increase access &amp; visitation by a more diverse group of visitors;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase community education &amp; appreciation for National Park system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Did not list any costs of National Park tourism, acknowledged damage could be caused but would be managed through sustainable tourism initiatives.**

**Key arguments:**
• Critical time for Victoria to re-position itself as nature-based tourism destination & take advantage of growing Indian & Chinese markets;
• Industry is now based on sustainable tourism management & innovations
### 3. State Commercial Tourism Operators (SCTO): Anthropocentric, support private tourism investment & infrastructure within National Park borders

**Benefits of National Park tourism:**
- Assists in environmental protection & management to ensure quality setting;
- Increases access & quality visitor experiences;
- Income for management.

**Costs of National Park tourism:**
- Need consideration of competition.

**Key argument:**
- Tourism industry can achieve sensitive & sustainable tourism inside National Parks, but is there really a need to?

### 4. State Community (SC):
Mainly eco-centric who support infrastructure in surrounding areas & small group of anthropocentric who support private investment & infrastructure inside.

**Benefits of National Park tourism:**
- Spending time in nature;
- User pays system reduces reliance on government;
- Able to generate income for National Park management & regional areas;
- Increased visitation expands environmental education & appreciation;
- Improved access & visitor experiences.

**Costs of private National Park tourism infrastructure inside borders:**
- Jeopardises long-term protection of environment for future generations at a critical time;
- Development will threaten natural setting for recreation;
- Focus & priority for international visitors as opposed to Victorians future;
- Attracting visitors who do not share National Park values;
- Direct short & long term damage to the environment;
- Parks Victoria will use vital resources for private tourism, weakening conservation focus;
- Land adjacent to National Parks will lower in value;
- CTOs inside borders will create unfair competition to those CTOs outside borders.

**Key argument:**
- Should not follow other states, but make decisions in the best interest of Victoria;
- National Parks are to protect environment for future generations.
5. **State Recreational Visitors (SRV):**  
Eco-centric/Anthropocentric, supports sustainable/low impact infrastructure within National Park borders & larger infrastructure outside. Small group support private infrastructure within National Park borders.

**Benefits of National Park tourism:**  
- Spend quality time in nature to escape city life;  
- Able to generate income for National Park management & regional areas;  
- Increased visitation expands environmental education & appreciation;  
- Improved access & visitor experiences.

**Costs of private National Park tourism infrastructure inside borders:**  
- Threatens the natural setting for reflective recreation & may limit access;  
- Attract high end ‘rich’ visitors who conflict with National Park values;  
- Decisions will be made for economic benefits rather than environmental protection;  
- Government will make decisions in favour of business over environment.

**Key arguments:**  
- National Parks are for low impact recreation, & visitors who share those values  
- CTOs & tourism industry should grow tourism in nearby areas through innovation

6. **State Conservation Groups (SCG):**  
Eco-centric, supports commercial eco-tours inside National Park borders & tourism infrastructure in surrounding areas.

**Benefits of National Park tourism:**  
- Economic generation & employment for regional Victoria;  
- Can provide educational experiences & increase conservation awareness;  
- Increases value of area, increasing protection status.

**Costs of private National Park tourism infrastructure inside borders:**  
- Can destroy the quality of National Park setting;  
- Environmental damage;  
- Shifts priorities from environment to business;  
- Possibility will grow out of public management control over time;  
- Increase costs of environmental management & maintenance;  
- Unfair competition to CTOs outside National Park borders;  
- Profits a few private companies at a cost to the community.

**Key arguments:**  
- Conservation is the principle National Park objective, private tourism investment & infrastructure will jeopardise environmental values;  
- Victorian National Parks are small & close to regional centres.
The perceptions of stakeholders were explored using the anthropocentric and eco-centric values set. McKercher (1997) explained determining the values of each group did not necessarily verify their support or opposition for tourism, but added a depth to understanding how stakeholder’s attitudes and beliefs are founded. Crowley (1997), Darcy and Wearing (2009) and McKercher (1997) found each stakeholder could hold a mix of both value sets, and this was true for state based stakeholders in this case study. For example similar to the public values in Crowley’s (1997) Tasmanian study, SRV displayed an anthropocentric view that National Parks were protected to provide a natural setting for community recreation; however their over-riding values were eco-centric, as they believed any recreational activities needed to be compatible with conservation and should be focused on the intrinsic qualities of the natural environment.

**Table 4.2 Examples of value messages expressed by stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropocentric messages</th>
<th>Eco-centric messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Government (SG)</strong></td>
<td><strong>State Conservation Groups (SCG)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Tourism Industry Groups (STIGs)</strong></td>
<td><strong>State Recreational Visitors (SRV)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minority of SRV &amp; SC</strong></td>
<td><strong>State Community (SC)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is potential in National Parks for development, and it should therefore be ‘unlocked’ and realised</td>
<td>• Nature has its own intrinsic value, more important than economic value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Parks are assets for the tourism industry to exploit</td>
<td>• National Parks should be for all community, and not excluded for ‘rich’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Parks are responsible for generating income for their own management and for the community</td>
<td>• National Parks should provide ‘reflective recreation’ setting, little to no infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tourism infrastructure should be built outside National Park borders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The views of SCTOs were sought during this analysis, however a lack of sufficient evidence to determine their value set meant further data needed to be ascertained.*

Table 4.2 lists the predominant value messages displayed by stakeholders. The anthropocentric messages supported by the SG and STIGs included valuing National Parks as tourist attractions in competition with other states, and being responsible for generating income for National Park management and regional areas. Both these groups ‘supported’ private investment and CTDNP. Eco-centric stakeholder messages valued
National Parks for their intrinsic environmental worth and were supported by SCG’s, SRV and SC. The majority of commentary by SRV and the SC ‘opposed’ private investment and large CTDNP, while a minority group in each presented some ‘support’ for commercial tourism; however their values appeared to remain eco-centric supporting tourism for its ability to improve conservation awareness to visitors and increase resources for Parks Victoria.

4.2 Local Stakeholders

The state based results explored state based stakeholder perceptions, focusing on the impact of the regulatory reforms at a state level. The Victorian National Park system contained 45 individual National Parks, each with a management plan and tourist region, the perceptions of their local stakeholders could be different to that of the state based. For example, the STIGs represented regional tourism groups and tourism businesses across Victoria, but comments by these localised groups and individual CTOs were not present in the state based data. Turner’s (1981) findings indicated lead opinion holders and individual members may hold differing beliefs within interest groups, making it important to consider both within a research study. The findings from each of the three National Park sites are presented here with consideration for their local stakeholder categories.

Great Otway National Park

Great Otway National Park was created in 1950 protecting land along the foreshore of the Great Ocean Road and the forested area behind. An iconic Australian tourist attraction, the development of the Great Ocean Road region has had a high profile as the area attempted to shift economically from forest logging and agriculture, to National Parks and tourism. The development of tourism products such as the Great Ocean Walk which goes through the Great Otway National Park, and the Otway Fly attraction which is adjacent, have attempted to attract a diversity of visitors and to increase the length of visitor stays in the area.
Government regulatory barriers and investment frameworks have been criticised as impeding the shift and restricting opportunities by not allowing for high end accommodation and tourism infrastructure to be built on private land due to planning regulations of rural and farming zones. This results in international visitors to this area to remain mainly day-trippers from Melbourne not staying overnight, limiting tourist yield. Ambitious in their task to build tourism in the area, local stakeholders perceived the quality and iconic nature of their environment as their competitive advantage. They aimed to both protect and utilise it for tourism purposes, presenting the familiar National Park duality of conservation and use. Comments from every stakeholder group were recorded, with this region receiving the highest number of VCEC submissions and a high level of media article commentary.

The local council members of the region were mixed in their responses. They were supportive of creating high end four to five star accommodation facilities. Colac Otway Shire Mayor acknowledged public consultation of any National Park development would be vital to success. She believed government environmental controls would ensure development balanced economic needs with conservation objectives. Local Greens members were however cautious of the Liberal government’s ability to create sustainable development.

“When it comes to National Parks this government can’t be trusted, they’re responsible for cattle grazing in the Alpine National Park and I’d be concerned with what they conserved environmentally appropriate,” he said. “I’d be sceptical and I’d be worried.” (Northeast, cited in Lannen, 2012).

Roger Grant, head of regional tourism industry organisation Geelong Otway Tourism was a long-term lead opinion holder within this area and supported legislation changes. He had expressed frustration over bureaucratic processes for tourism infrastructure planning approvals and the hampering regulations which restricted growth in the region. He proposed private investment was necessary to bring visitor experiences and tourism facilities within the area to a world standard. The aim was to create experiences and facilities which encouraged visitors to stay within the area, such as sustainable high end eco-lodges. Geelong Otway Tourism was explicit in their desire to protect the environment and local lifestyle as the basis of the Great Ocean Road tourism product,
adding their extensive efforts in research, market analysis, and tourism plans could now be acted upon allowing the regions tourism industry to be more proactive in their success.

It is one of the most amazing sights in Australia and yet the facility there for tourists is little more than a big toilet block. People get off the coaches, scratch their heads and wonder why there is nothing else to do. Compare that to the infrastructure at the Grand Canyon or Yosemite. Environmental lobby groups have held the government to ransom over stopping private development and the result is that they Great Ocean Road does not give the experience which international visitors expect. We can’t compete (Grant, cited in Stewart, 2012).

Local Tourism Industry Group Otway Scenic Circle Association head, Helen Chambers, said her personal opinion was, tourism development would be more effective outside of National Park borders, in nearby towns where employment and economic generation would benefit the local region. This sentiment was echoed by local CTOs. Out of all the regions the Great Ocean Road CTOs were the most active, with four submitting to the VCEC inquiry and one appearing in media highlighting the difficulty he had had, due to zoning restrictions, trying to develop a five star accommodation facility on private land. The regulatory reform included recommendations to deregulate farm and rural zones, supported in anticipation that it could improve the tourist product in the area.

Whilst we are not opposed to private investment in tourism facilities on public land, we would argue strongly that this outcome should be of secondary consideration only with a far greater benefit to the Victorian tourism industry to be gained through the facilitation of private investment on private land (Johanna Seaside Cottages, 2011:3).

An accommodation provider further argued all tourism infrastructures should be provided by private enterprise, outside of National Park borders, to ensure fair competition between public and private providers. In addition, they argued private land near National Parks was often more suited to development and would ensure conservation of the assets visitors came to see within the National Park.
The suggestion that nature based tourism should be developed inside National Parks needs careful consideration. If private land outside the parks is suitable then it should be considered first before any development is proposed inside National Parks. This would have numerous benefits – it would protect the parks, support private enterprise to develop and manage tourism product, and show that government supports local enterprise and is not in competition with it” (Lone Bush House Cottages, 2011:1).

Recreational visitors valued National Parks as a natural setting for recreation, with one visitor arguing the fact Victoria receives more National Park visitors than any other state, illustrated the National Park system was working and should not be converted into a tourist attraction for visitors to spend money in. Costs of tourism, such as littering, were highlighted, with the potential for this to increase if more visitors were able to gain access to more areas and if they did not share environmental values.

How do we escape to the wilderness? Will be a distant memory if this goes ahead. I just had a great few days walk down the Great Ocean Walk the other week, what’s ‘great’ about it, is that there is no places to stay apart from camping. Can’t believe they want to change that! There are accommodation options on the edge of parks if you want to do that! (Troy, cited in Lannen, 2012).

The local community were concerned of long-term impacts on the natural landscape and within National Parks. Eco-centric in their values, they believed the National Parks should remain untouched as a valuable natural asset now and into the future, and were concerned commercial investors would conflict with these values. There was a perceived divide in values between community, State Government and Ted Baillieu, he being seen as supporting commercial interests, not to be trusted. This community was in support of increasing tourism numbers and infrastructure, supporting suitable development in areas outside National Park borders, and suggesting marketing small towns to spread benefits throughout the region. Some community comments criticised Roger Grant for focusing on elite tourist and developer needs and not the needs of the local community and natural values.
Cr Lyn Russell says the decision “brings Victoria into line with other States”. What she doesn’t get, is that is what makes our National Parks unique and why they are generally regarded to be the best in Australia. What Cr. Russell and The Liberal Party need to understand that you don’t necessarily need to make a buck out of something for it to be good! (Alexander, cited in Barnes, 2013).

There was a small group of local recreational visitors and community who supported the regulatory changes. One Great Ocean Road walker thought the idea of better accommodation and food availability along the track would improve the experience, while others felt the underdeveloped natural area was part of the experience. One community member recognised the potential to create employment and that development could be sustainably designed. The local editorial opinion piece argued sustainable development would be compatible with National Park values, as seen in other states. If the Great Ocean Road was to compete for the new Asian market, the article argued, it needed to be aggressive and innovative in generating income for National Park management and improving the quality of the visitor experience.

Eco-centric in their values, local conservation groups were supportive of increasing visitor access to National Parks but were wary of what development would be allowed with the new regulations and guidelines. One added environmental guidelines did not necessarily ensure sustainable development, warning government and developers the Otway community had a long history of protesting to protect their values and would do so again.

If they think they’re going to waltz in there and build a Gold Coast in the Otways just because the government gives them the green light, they’ve got to seek a mandate from the community... If people don’t like what they’re going to do then it won’t happen (Birrell, cited in Barnes, 2013).

The Geelong Environment Council, who lobbied to create the Great Otway National Park, wrote an open letter to the Minster for Environment and Climate Change noting the shrinking in National Park management resources as an issue to environmental protection, and acknowledged the long history of community protest against inappropriate development. They advocated National Parks were created for environmental protection.
and this should remain priority, with tourism development to be built in adjacent towns, noting Halls Gap near Grampians National Park and the lodge near Freycinet National Park in Tasmania as successful examples.

To place high class facilities in what has been set aside as a natural area for the total protection of the environmental values will inevitably undermine the intrinsic values of the park and impact on the ecological values. To compromise the system of Parks by the creation of impacting tourist facilities will be an irretrievable change and a sad loss of the integrity of the parks system in Victoria (Lindros, 2013).

Overall, National Parks in this area were valued as world class environment and cultural assets and tourism assets. All stakeholders were motivated by this to protect their environmental quality and the quality of the visitor experience. Most saw the potential benefits of tourism and supportive of further development, as government constraints and lack of support had meant so far the area has yet to meet its potential. Competition between commercial and public tourism operators was a concern, and developing infrastructure inside or outside National Park borders was debated.

It is easy to see that the walk is significantly under-achieving its potential. Tourism as a whole just doesn’t get the profile in government it needs which is failing this state, and especially the regions (Bothfeet, 2011:4).

Point Nepean National Park

Point Nepean National Park covered 560 hectares at the tip of the Mornington Peninsula, south east of Melbourne. An old quarantine centre covering 17ha within the National Park contained extensive existing infrastructure which had been utilised by the army as a training centre and hospital in previous years. Established in 2005 after the local community petitioned the government to protect the area as opposed to selling it, the Point Nepean National Park has since had $13.8 million worth of maintenance and visitor facility upgrades. It attracted 180,000 visitors in 2012, only a small percentage of total visitors to the Mornington Peninsula. There were minimal comments from local stakeholders during the VCEC inquiry phase, with only one official submission from the Mornington Peninsula Shire. On April 14th, 2013, the Minister for Environment and
Climate Change released a new Master Plan for the Point Nepean National Park which included plans to release an EOI to invite private investment to propose CTDNP to utilise the area (DEPI, 2014). As this process progressed, stakeholder comments increased.

Environment Minister Ryan Smith released the plan stating the maintenance and management of the existing buildings was costing the Victorian public hundreds of thousands a year and private investment was therefore critical in protecting the long term heritage values of the site, reinforcing the government view National Parks need to generate their own income for continued existence. The government envisioned long term use by locals and international visitors which would generate jobs and income for the local region. They stated Point Nepean National Park was unique in its large amount of buildings, which have been closed to the public. The plan included potential development such as: a boutique hotel; high end restaurant; jetty to receive tourists from around the bay and to facilitate scuba diving trips and water cruises; potential tertiary educating facility; and a day spa.

“Due to the site’s former use as a military barracks, many of its 50 plus buildings have been locked up from public access over many decades,” Mr Smith said. Appropriate and sensitive private investment is critical in ensuring the long-term survival of the site’s historic and culturally significant buildings. The release today of the Point Nepean Master Plan, and Sustainable Use and Tourism Framework for the 17 hectare site is a key step in securing private sector investment to help preserve this important part of our history, ensuring it is cared for and accessible to the Victorian public (Smith, cited in Liberal Party Victoria, 2013).

The local Mornington Peninsula Shire (MPS) was the only stakeholder to make an official VCEC Submission from this region. Their position strongly opposed any CTDNP, citing the National Parks Act 1975 (Vic), which clearly stated the role of a National Park is:

For the preservation, protection and study of the natural environment, indigenous flora and fauna, features of scenic or archaeological, ecological, geological, historic or other scientific interest (MPS, 2011:7).
They saw CTDNP and investment contradictory to this objective, but supported utilising the existing facilities at Point Nepean National Park for accommodation and a conference centre. The council explained within their jurisdiction, National Parks were small and extremely close to nearby towns. They therefore believed it would be more advantageous to build tourism infrastructure on freehold land as opposed to inside the National Park, to both protect National Park assets and increase opportunity for private investment. In contrast to seeing Victoria as ‘behind’ other states, MPS considered the regulatory barriers as ‘ahead’ of the field in terms of protecting the environment and tourism assets.

An integrated approvals process has some advantages but it should not come at the cost of removing checks and balances and inviting bad decisions because of unrealistic time constraints that do not match available resources (MPS, 2011:8).

Questions over the administration of the new proposals were raised. Firstly the conflict of development on public land with existing National Park management plans and the resultant unfair competition between public and private facilities. How the ‘net community benefit’ would be measured, and how would conflict be managed if Parks Victoria were given the responsibility of finding tourism opportunities, and then to facilitate the approval process. The added cost of processing CTDNP proposals would take away from State Government resources available for National Park environmental management. In addition, the responsibility of monitoring regulations was unclear, and MPS were apprehensive such duties would be passed onto the council or Committees of Management who would be under resourced.

In 2013, when the new management plan was released, local Nepean ward councillors Tim Rodgers and Hugh Fraser supported the government plan for sensitive development on the Point Nepean Quarantine site. They were confident a balance between conservation and use could be achieved in developing the numerous buildings which had to that point been closed to the public and left to deteriorate.

When the army was there, Portsea had a vibrancy about it. There are a number of businesses who could use those buildings for art, culture, hospitality or even a university campus and it could become a mini-town. I would like to see
the buildings utilised and not abandoned. The sooner people come into the area, the better (Rodgers, cited in Robin, 2013).

No local CTO or local tourist industry group made comment. The TTF (2013) and VTIC (2013b) were vocal in their support for the Point Nepean Master Plan, seeing it as fulfilling the potential of the area utilising the existing footprint by creating a tourist destination for local and international visitors.

TTF Acting Chief Executive Officer Trent Zimmerman said private investment was critical to ensuring visitor access to the National Park. “Allowing an appropriate mix of activities on the site will provide the public with greater access to the military structures and buildings which have been locked up for years,” Mr Zimmerman said. “This plan is evidence that the government recognises the critical role tourism can play in supporting the conservation of important natural and cultural heritage sites (TTF, 2013).

Friends of Point Nepean (Opitz, 2012) recognised the need to utilise existing buildings within the quarantine site to protect and maintain them, citing accommodation and conferences as acceptable uses, yet cautious this type of development would see further buildings being built in other areas which would be undesirable. Their other main concern was if CTDNP restricted access for public visitors. The state based VNPA also supported the use of the existing buildings, however criticised the vague guidelines and regulations set out in the EOI and management plan. The Nepean Conservation Group (Opitz, 2012) questioned the economic structure of where profits from any CTDNP would go, believing all profits should be re-invested back into the National Park. All conservation groups were concerned over the lack of height restrictions detailed in the EOI. Government explained they did not want to stifle potential ideas and innovations with such restrictions, but this did little to reassure some stakeholders.

I support a plan to conserve the quarantine station, something has to be done or it will disintegrate. But this doesn’t have to be some new development. The station could be renovated and brought up to current standards of accommodation by putting in en suites for example,” he said. “But I am very concerned about the possibility of development going on in other areas of the park” (Smyth, cited in Opitz, 2012).
Despite the reserved support from conservation groups and the reassurance from the government, the community were not supportive of the potential plans.

“The community should be comfortable that we are taking a very sensible approach,” Mr Smith said. “We won't allow anything that is inappropriate and we will assess everything on its merit” (Smith, cited in Tomazin, 2013).

They were apprehensive new infrastructure could potentially detract from the environmental qualities and the involvement of commercial interests in a public good. The local Flinders Community Association (Hall, 2012) was wary the removal of the current planning processes would eliminate necessary checks and balances and the opportunity for community engagement in the planning process. Long term, these changes could harm the Mornington Peninsula’s character and appeal to tourists.

Tourists want more than just a flash hotel to stay in, another fancy restaurant, another theme park. More and more they want to experience nature, history, the way things work like farming, wine making, cheese making, wildlife reserves (Hall, 2012).

Comments from the local community and recreational visitors in this area maintained the opinion that the government were favouring needs of developers and economic concerns over conservation and community needs. There were adamant developers should not be able to profit off public goods. Community were concerned changes would cause irreversible and long term damage to the National Park. A local Real Estate Agent, Luke Woollard, supported the plan for an education centre, as did local Federal Liberal Minister Greg Hunt. But Luke and other community members saw no need for developing accommodation or restaurant facilities as these were available in nearby towns and jeopardised the historic setting of Point Nepean National Park (Robin, 2013).

The motto of this govt., developers first, developers first, developers first (JPC, cited in Willingham, 2013).

All we're doing is going back to the Kennett era. Once the developers have it, it's lost forever (Jackson, cited in Tomazin, 2013).
National Park status used to mean protection and preservation of our natural assets, but over the years it has been watered down (by both sides of politics) to mean playground. The argument here isn’t about development in National Parks. The real issue here is that there is an expectation by governments that parks pays for themselves (Kakmi-Kene, 2013).

The surrounding region attracted a large amount of visitors in the summer months and had a high level of second homes, and there were some comments from the community which indicated they did not want any further developments or an increase in numbers of tourists. In addition, there seemed to be concern potential CTDNP would increase the exclusive access for “rich” visitors to environmental assets and increase the divide between locals and “rich” holiday makers. National Parks were valued as areas to protect the environment and remain largely undeveloped as a place for reflective recreation.

We get inundated with idiots here every summer; we don't want more of them. The whole point of a National Park is to escape people, not dodging hotels and latte sippers (Smith, cited in Tomazin, 2013).

There was a small group who offered their support to the plans. They believed CTDNP could increase access for recreation purposes. In the long term increased visitation could lead to an increase in visitors receiving environmental education and an increase in National Park support from the community. One commentator recognised the potential for increased competition in the marketplace could improve the quality of visitor services.

Develop carefully and well, and not only will it do more to protect these areas than it will damage, it will also open these places up to our kids to be able to visit, see and learn about them. What area's get logged and mined etc., the area's nobody goes, so develop some very sensitive quality well managed tourism to these places and they will suddenly be protected forever. People need to be intelligent and offer an opinion on how to make change right, instead of arguing against change for the sake of arguing against change (Really, cited in Willingham, 2013).
Wilson Promontory National Park

Wilson Promontory National Park was created in 1898. One of the oldest in Victoria, it contained the most developed tourism facilities of any Victorian National Park, and has consistently received high visitor numbers as a popular domestic family holiday and bushwalking destination. Previous government plans for CTDNP in the 1960’s and 1990’s resulted in considerable protest from both National Park management and the Victorian community. This area received the least direct comment from local stakeholders, however was mentioned numerous times in media comments by all state stakeholders, illustrating the high value the Victorian population place on this National Park in particular and justifying its use as a subunit in this study. VCEC received two submissions from Wilsons Promontory National Park stakeholders during the inquiry, one from a CTO and the other from the tourism industry peak body. Friends of the Prom and Prom Country Tourism spoke out through other media formats. The local government remained silent in the debate; however local Member of Parliament Deputy Premier Peter Ryan assured his electorate any CTDNP would be sensitive to the environment.

The Friends of the Prom was a long established conservation group with eco-centric values who opposed CTDNP. They disputed the VCEC proposal that CTDNP would increase access and improve the visitor experience, stating access was already sufficient for all groups of society. They believed increasing visitor numbers would put further undue stress on the National Park environment. They believed the current Wilsons Promontory tourism model was proving successful enough. This included extensive private accommodation infrastructure outside of the National Park borders, and the conversion of existing war time camp building into public accommodation within the National Park by Parks Victoria. Friends of the Prom believed National Parks should remain wholly and solely publicly owned and managed. They commented that regulations which offered environmental protection have been previously stretched by developers who have financial power in other situations and saw no reason this would not happen in the National Park scenario. Friends of the Prom representatives perceived their opinion may be heard by government, but they believed it had no real chance of being taken seriously against the commercial voice and needs of developers (Henderson, 2013).
National Parks were reserved to preserve significant areas of the state in as close as possible to their original state – and that tourist should be secondary to conservation values (Jewell cited in VNPA, 2012d).

In contrast, Destination Gippsland, the peak tourism industry body, supported CTDNP saying CTOs already operating within the National Park borders were sensitive to the environment. In addition the examples of Tasmania and New Zealand showed sustainable CTDNP did exist, allowing tourism to deliver such benefits as economic generation; increased investment; enhancing environmental protection; and environmental education. Destination Gippsland explained strict regulations and guidelines would need to be followed for this to occur, and a strong partnership created with Parks Victoria.

Interstate and international experience demonstrates that if they are strictly regulated and implemented with strong environmental controls they can enhance people’s understanding of the need to protect the environment rather than destroy it (Destination Gippsland, 2011:1).

Prom Country Regional Tourism held similar views, sensitive CTDNP has successfully existed inside Wilsons Promontory National Park facilitating visitor use, but now needed updating, and private investment could be a beneficial part of that upgrade. While not supporting “development for development’s sake” (Henderson, 2013), environmentally sensitive CTDNP which consulted local stakeholders could be beneficial. For this to occur, the opportunity for community feedback needed to be extended in the EOI process, not just at the beginning. Consideration needed to be given to ensuring CTDNP benefits would spill over into nearby regions, and not take away from their potential business.

A land owner 400m from the entrance of the National Park had intended to build a Nature Retreat in order to protect the environment inside National Park borders, but had been hampered by planning bureaucracy and regulatory barriers on private land. He believed opening the National Park up to CTDNP would deter potential investment into tourism in the surrounding region, creating unfair competition. Moreover community protest could draw out any National Park planning approval process, and during this time, investment outside of the National Park would remain hindered. He further argued development
within the borders would require significant resources to overcome flooding and bushfire dangers.

A development within Wilsons Promontory would face more infrastructure impediments than a resort at the entrance. A more reliable sustainable power source would be required as well as major standby facilities, water supply and sewerage treatment upgraded. More people staying in the park will require increased car parking facilities. There is a major threat from bushfires and flooding. Bush fire recommendations require substantial clearing vegetation around public assets. Wilsons Promontory assets at Tidal River are already at levels below that recommended by the Victorian Coastal Strategy report (note recent flooding). Together with leasing, insurance problems and recourse back to the government for lack of access to the park because of road failure, power or water failure would mean somebody would have to carry a large contingent liability (Tootell, 2011:3).

Summary of Results for Local Stakeholders

The majority of local stakeholders were not clear in their support or objection to the regulatory reform due to the complexity of the issues and the high degree of uncertainty of what the regulations meant in practice for CTOs, and the impact on National Parks. Overall local shire councils were supportive of the potential to improve their region’s tourist facilities and generate economic activity and employment in their areas; however all held some concerns about the implementation and actioning of the plans. The community and recreational visitors of local regions reflected the larger state based population; the majority opposing private investment and CTDNP, with a small group of supporters who saw potential improvements to visitor facilities as favourable. On principle, conservation groups objected to CTDNP, apprehensive that sustainable tourism regulations would not be strong enough to withstand the wants of commercial investors. The exception was within Point Nepean National Park where conservation groups acknowledged utilising existing buildings would be the most effective method to conserving them long term.
The Great Ocean Road tourism industry group was representative of the STIG’s opinion, vigorously supporting sustainable development and regulatory reform. The Wilsons Promontory National Park’s tourism industry groups were supportive of private investment in updating facilities within the National Park, but were concerned there was not enough opportunity for stakeholder comment within the government EOI process. The greatest difference in opinion was found between STIGs to that of the CTOs themselves, which arguably the TIGs represent. Mornington Peninsula CTOs made no comment, while the local CTO from the Wilsons Promontory National Park and the four recorded from the Great Otway National Park area were vocal. They desired to improve tourism infrastructure in their regions, however conflicted with TIGs assumption CTDNP would benefit them. In contrast, these CTOs believed the potential competition between providers within National Park borders would compete unfairly with those outside of the National Park, generating opposition to the plans.

4.3 Discussion

There were several major themes found throughout Stage One of the research. They are presented here in four main areas: firstly stakeholder values; secondly access to National Parks and fostering visitor environmental appreciation; thirdly the economic structure of the National Park system and stakeholder concern over private investment; and finally government regulation and its ability to deliver sustainable tourism outcomes.

Stakeholder values
In previous studies (Crowley, 1997; Darcy & Wearing, 2009; McKercher, 1997) stakeholders have displayed evidence of holding both eco-centric and anthropocentric values, and within this case study this trend continues. This is particularly true for recreation visitors and the community, who value National Parks for their conservation outcomes (eco-centric), however also believed the availability of natural places for recreation (anthropocentric) were equally important. Essentially, conservation groups were predominantly eco-centric; tourism industry groups and the Victorian Government predominantly anthropocentric; and recreational visitors and community a mix of both, although it appeared the majority of these groups identified themselves as eco-centric value holders.
Consistent with previous research (McKercher, 1997), a stakeholders value did not
determine their support or opposition toward tourism. There were anthropocentric
stakeholders who ‘opposed’ and those who ‘supported’ CTDNP, and similarly there were
eco-centrics who ‘supported’ and ‘opposed’. There was however a particularly strong
perception from the majority of eco-centric stakeholders (largely from the SCG, SC and
SRV) of a divide between themselves and those they considered to be anthropocentric
(SG, STIGs and CTOs). This perceived division was magnified as eco-centrics argued the
enquiry was led by the VCEC, an ‘Efficiency Committee,’ they perceived the
recommendations as focused on economic outcomes and failing to uphold National Park
conservation and social values.

Eco-centric value holders were strong and vocal in defending their National Park values
throughout their comments. Their view was that conservation was the primary role for
National Parks, protecting environmental and cultural assets for Victoria’s future
generations and for their intrinsic value. In terms of recreation, they shared similar views
to Sax (1980) and Woodley (1993) who believed that the National Park system’s role was
to provide society with a natural setting for reflective recreation, low impact activities
requiring little to no infrastructure, with environmental appreciation the foundation of the
visitor experience. National Park tourism was not objected to; rather large CTD should be
built outside of National Park borders, leaving inside the borders natural and protected.
Low impact sustainable tourism appeared to be supported inside National Park borders.

The language from ‘opposed’ eco-centric stakeholders waged war against those they
perceived as anthropocentric: the state government; tourism business; and high end
tourists, confirming the perceived divide between the two value groups. From the outset
the divide appeared extensive. Further analysis of comments however revealed common
ground existed between all stakeholders in their objectives to protect the environment and
to provide low impact sustainable tourism based on the naturalness of an area, indicating
stakeholders could be in agreement in some areas even though their comments were
confrontational. The perceived conflict between the groups is derived from their opposing
values or motivations which form the basis for their beliefs and tone of their comments.
This fits within Rokeach’s (1968) explanation that values are an overarching and long-
standing influence over attitudes and beliefs. For example STIG’s anthropocentric values
motivated them to protect the environment for human use through tourism, whereas eco-centrics were motivated to protect the environment for its intrinsic value. The outcome is potentially the same, yet the value based motivation is different, and this is where perceived conflict exists.

**Access & Environmental Appreciation**

Developing various types of tourism accommodation and improving tourism infrastructure within Victorian National Park borders, was justified by its potential to increase access and visitation numbers. An increase in visitation could improve support for National Parks within the community, as Eagles and McCool (2002) and Tilden (2007) explained, National Park visitation provides an opportunity to deliver conservation messages, inspiring environmental appreciation and to generate support for the National Park system. ‘Supporters’ of CTDNP, particularly the small group of eco-centrics found in local regions and the SC and SRV, argued the potential to increase access to a larger and more diverse group of visitors increased the opportunity to improve environmental awareness and protection throughout society.

‘Opposed’ stakeholders agreed access to natural areas was essential for the Victorian National Park system to fulfil its recreational objectives, however, they argued National Parks were already accessible and tourism would be best developed by building accommodation outside of National Park borders where visitors could stay nearby and make day trips into the National Parks. They were concerned that as opposed to increasing access, CTDNP could potentially result in areas zoned off for private eco-tourists and decrease access for the wider community. Similar comments were recorded in McKercher’s (1997) study but were not expanded on in his discussion. In this case study these comments suggested a connection some stakeholders, particularly SRV, made between tourism and a perceived threat to National Park recreation objectives by limiting public access to areas. Furthermore the focus of SG and the STIGs on international tourists angered the SC who believed the government and Parks Victoria should instead be concerned with the long-term conservation needs of Victorians.
There was an added hostility from existing National Park users toward potential new eco-tourists who would rather stay in newly built CTDNP than cabins or camp. This hostility was two-fold: firstly existing users believed CTDNP would potentially destroy the natural setting they relied upon for their for ‘reflective recreation’; and secondly this new market was perceived as ‘rich,’ and wanting a luxurious experience not conducive with National Park values. Studying the tourism policies of conservation groups during the 1990’s, McKercher (1997) criticised conservation groups of a similar standpoint, reproaching them for being prejudicial against visitors based on their environmental values, as this polarises the community and disregards the democratic foundation of National Parks that they are to provide recreation for everyone.

During this debate, the SRV and SC expressed their dislike of the SCG policies. Their perception was that the SCG wanted to reduce access and ‘lock up’ National Parks to ensure preservation of the environment. Upon analysing the comments made by SCG’s in this case study, it appears SCG comments and policies are representative of the SC and to an extent the SRV, accepting National Parks are there for community access and to use for suitable and compatible recreation. Therefore there is a misconception between SRV, SC and the policies of SCG. The misconception of SCG policies could be explained by looking at Turner’s (1981) study, where conservation group messages were found to be of limiting access, and not keeping up with changing needs of National Parks as more users wanted access for a more diverse range of recreational activities. Turner (1981) proposed elite conservation group voices were the strongest to influence government, and were not necessarily representative of the larger community. This has since changed, as in the late 1990’s during the protest against development at Wilsons Promontory National Park, Slattery (2002) found the community and conservation groups shared similar opinions protesting against development. It may be that the SC and SRV perceptions of SCG policies are based on the SCG of the 1980’s and not updated, and this may therefore be an example of where perceptions of values and attitudes can create rifts which are in fact non-existent.
Economic Structure & Private Interests

Victorian National Parks attract high visitation numbers, but receive a low yield from these visitors. A key finding and recommendation of the VCEC (2011a) report was that if the National Park system could be restructured to increase economic yield from its visitors, tourism could provide an alternative source of funding for National Park management as opposed to relying upon government support. Shrinking government funding was one of the key issues identified by the literature review and according to Worboys and Lockwood (2007) the most critical issue facing Australian National Parks. The economic focus of SG and STIG’s discussions throughout this issue appeared to support this claim. Eco-centricists took issue with the economic focus of the anthropocentric statements from the SG and STIGs. In their view the value of National Parks should not be measured in the level of income they generate, but funded by government and measured by their social and conservation benefits. Moreover eco-centric stakeholders doubted the government, tourism industry or Parks Victoria had the necessary skills to develop a sustainable National Park tourism system which considered conservation first.

Both STIG and the SG advocated an improvement in infrastructure would increase access to a more diverse spread of the community and improved facilities would attract the growing Asian and nature-based tourism markets, improving visitor yield. As government funding is limited, private investment is argued to be necessary to building this infrastructure. Further, CTOs would have the necessary resources and skills to provide a better quality visitor experience than Parks Victoria. The changes in regulations placed pressure on Parks Victoria to identify tourism opportunities, and to regulate their ongoing management, increasing their workload and shifting their focus from conservation to tourism. Eco-centricists voiced their concern that by allowing CTOs to invest in National Park infrastructure; Parks Victoria would be pressured to shift the balance of management from conservation, to the needs of business, a view supported by Buckley (2003). Buckley (2003) has previously warned increasing tourism infrastructure and visitation does not necessarily increase management income, but generally the opposite due to the increase in operational and maintenance costs. Both SCG and SC expressed similar concerns. In their view as opposed to generating income for National Park management, increased facilities, visitor numbers and management of CTOs would increase the cost to Parks Victoria considerably. Only the small group of supporters for tourism from the SRV and the TIG in Wilsons Promontory National Park, brought up the need for
improvement in National Park maintenance, and saw the possibility private investment could improve National Park quality for all users.

In addition to generating income for National Park management, SG and STIGs further argued increased CTDNP would also provide economic generation for the tourism industry and Victorian regional areas. This claim was disputed by eco-centricers, particularly by the SC, who recognised if CTOs were allowed to develop inside National Park borders on public land, the value of land with potential for CTD surrounding National Parks would decrease. In addition the operations of built facilities within National Park borders, regardless of whether they were operated by private or public operators, would have an unfair advantage over CTOs outside of the National Park. Eco-centricers argued to this end, increasing tourism facilities within National Park borders would have a detrimental effect on the economic structure of surrounding areas. In order to maintain a fair competitive marketplace, all development should be outside of National Park borders.

This was one area where the subunit data added an insight into the complexities of the debate. Economic generation for the regions and creating local employment was a strong argument from STIGs in allowing private investment and CTDNP. However comments from the regions and the few local CTOs who made submissions expressed concerns this would not be the case. In contrast, they felt frustrated at being denied the opportunity for developing their own tourism businesses on private land by the previous restricting regulations, and the possibility that new CTOs may now come in and develop within National Park borders, creating unfair competition in the marketplace. This is a significant finding considering the STIGs are representing CTOs.

The quality of the environment is acknowledged by all local stakeholder groups as a key competitive advantage for Victoria and for each of the regions, and therefore important to protect. Local stakeholders were proud of their regions character and lifestyle and protective of retaining this for both their own benefit, and as their competitive advantage within the tourism market. Not necessarily a case of NIMBY as found in Darcy and Wearing’s (2009) study in NSW, as these stakeholders did not necessarily oppose tourism
development within their region, but any changes to their area must be in line with the local character and fair competition in the market. ‘Opposes’ to the CTDNP were unanimous in stating given the structure of each of the regions, with towns close to each National Park, tourism infrastructure can be built outside of National Park borders, increasing the opportunity and security for commercial tourism investment in the area. Most see CTDNP as potentially inhibiting investment into the surrounding regional areas, rendering useless the Victorian Government justification to increase economic stimulation into these areas.

**Government Regulations & Sustainable Tourism**

All stakeholders agreed the current regulatory system was a barrier to entry for CTOs. ‘Opposers’ perceived it as a necessary barrier which should remain in place to ensure CTOs or large developments remains out of the National Park system. The SG and STIGs advocated if private investment and CTDNP were allowed, government and self-regulation would continue to ensure CTDNP would be controlled and managed with sustainable tourism outcomes. ‘Opposers’ however saw government regulations as a short term panacea which over time will weaken in favour of business needs. Eco-centric ‘opposers’ labelled the then Premier Ted Baillieu as ‘rich’ and as personally part of the cohort of economically focused big business aiming to invest in National Parks and exploit public land for their own private benefit.

They perceived Baillieu and his Liberal government as anthropocentric, strengthened by the government’s recent environmental decisions such as: re-introducing cattle grazing into the Alpine region; allowing firewood collecting and mining in National Parks; and the lack of an overall environmental policy. Eco-centric ‘opposers’ claimed such decisions by the Liberal Government indicated their future controls and regulations would not be sufficient to protect the conservation values of the National Parks. These stakeholders were also concerned that the EOI process and ongoing regulations could be easily manipulated in favour of business. This view is a long standing one. Figgis (1996) expressed her doubt in government regulations in 1996 when governments and CTOs began to propose CTDNP, explaining regulations were too malleable to deliver long-term conservation promises. Further back in the 1960’s Little Desert campaign, issues were raised around government conservation and land decision processes which saw the
establishment of the LCC (Worboys et al., 2005). The new EOI process for CTDNP decision-making proposed by the Baillieu Government will move back toward the previous scenario where one Minister had sole control of approving tourism investment and CTDNP applications, a concern highlighted by ‘opposers’.

Russell, Lafferty and Loudoun (2008) argued there was a continuum of opinions toward government environmental regulations: from those who believed in market control where CTOs self-regulate in order to conserve the environmental and cultural assets their tourism product is based upon; to those who favoured high government control to ensure conservation is achieved; and in the middle a partnership approach whereby government and CTOs work together to achieve National Park objectives. From the ‘opposers’ comments it was evident they favoured the strong government regulations restricting private investment and CTDNP. Their increased distress and objection to this situation was caused by their perception that if private investment and CTDNP were allowed, the anthropocentricity of the Liberal Government gave them little faith a suitable regulatory system would be created and upheld. The comments also indicated eco-centric ‘opposers’ perceived tourism developers and CTOs as anthropocentric, and would put business needs ahead of conservation if left to self-regulate.

Literature attested CTOs have imposed strict self-regulations to ensure they gain support from community; improve their marketing image; and ultimately protect the setting of their tourism product (Huybers and Bennett, 1997). Studies have also shown not all of the tourism industry is anthropocentric (McKercher, 1997), however on this issue, all messages from the STIGs that represent the tourism industry appeared anthropocentric. Anthropocentric views do not necessarily indicate STIGs do not believe in conservation, rather they value and protect the environment not for its intrinsic value but for its potential to support human use. All studies so far have shown CTOs believe some form of government regulation as necessary to control private interests on public land (Huybers & Bennett, 1997; McKercher, 1997) and comments made in this case study indicated similar findings.
Links were made between the Liberal Baillieu government and the Liberal Kennett government who while in power in the 1990’s planned to develop Wilsons Promontory National Park. ‘Opposers’ called for a re-ignition of the ‘Hands off the Prom’ campaign, which eventually stopped the Wilsons Promontory National Park CTDNP. STIGs acknowledged the previous plans for Wilsons Promontory National Park were inappropriate and misguided, and advised proposals such as the one made in the 1990’s of large developments would not be considered. STIGs claimed since then, tourism management practices had advanced and the tourism industry matured to be able to deliver sensitive and sustainable tourism development, a view supported by Butler (2002) that sustainable tourism can be a reality.

Sustainable tourism appears to be the answer to balancing both costs and benefits of tourism and to achieving conservation and use balance within the National Park setting. ‘Supporters’ argued sustainable CTDNP can be achieved and cited best practice examples as Tasmania, New Zealand, Western Australia, and Queensland as evidence. The SG further justified its actions by stating Victoria was only catching up with other states and other destinations who allowed CTDNP, and therefore they were only keeping up with competition and opportunity. ‘Opposers’ argued the Victorian National Park system was unique and different to those listed as best practice as it had smaller National Parks closer to regional town centres compared to other systems. Therefore each development needed to be assessed on its own merit. SC further argued Victoria needed to do what was right for Victoria and Victorians, irrelevant of what other states or destinations were doing.

4.4 Summary

Figgis’s (1999) report at the turn of the century highlighted the four key issues for National Park systems as: decreasing government funding; increasing CTO demand and nature-based tourism industry; society’s increasing anthropocentric view of the environment; and the economic pressure on National Park management. Throughout the regulatory reform during 2011-2013, these issues remained relevant and unresolved. To encourage continued support of a National Park system, Eagles and McCool (2002) explained government and National Park management needed to develop National Park policy in response to community and social pressures. This regulatory reform followed
the policy process by defining the issue; consulting stakeholders; considering various solutions; and developing policy and regulations to support the chosen method of action, yet conflict existed between the government and the community, and other stakeholders the government were empowered to represent. The majority of conflict in the policy arena appeared to be based on the economic/anthropocentric values of the government and tourism industry which was supporting regulatory reform; and the conservation/eco-centric values of the community, National Park users and conservation groups.

During the announcements of the policies and regulatory reforms, the SG and STIGs misjudged or did not consider the SC or SRV reaction or their values. By focusing on economic gains, international visitors, and private investment, SG and STIGs polarised themselves from the community. The assumption that perpetual economic ‘growth’ for National Parks was firstly desirable by the community of Victoria and its National Park users, and secondly possible from tourism in the long-term, seemed to be a basic flaw in the regulatory reform process by government. Had the community been assured their conservation values would be upheld, and had they been given a clearer indication or proof of this with clear management or regulatory strategies, perhaps criticism would not have been so impassioned. As it stood, there was a ‘call to arms’ from eco-centric ‘opposers’ who waged war against the anthropocentric regulatory reform.

There was no direct opposition to the building of infrastructure for tourism use, the major arguments occurred about where this infrastructure should be developed. SRV, SCG, SC all supported development outside of National Park borders in surrounding regions, arguing this protected the natural environment within the National Park, and ensured economic benefits were directed to regional areas. In addition, building outside of the National Park reduced the potential for unfair competition between public and private facilities, and -or those private CTOs inside and those outside of the National Park. SRV supported small walking huts with no vehicle access, to expand the potential for long-distance walking visitor experiences. Their description fit within the best practice huts of Cradle Mountain, Tasmania, listed by SG and STIG as the type of tourism infrastructure they would consider approving; and a clear example of how the messages from each group are tainted by their perceptions and values, creating conflict even though some beliefs may be the same.
This chapter has presented the research results from stage one of the study based on document analysis. It provided data and discussion pertaining to identifying the key stakeholders within Victorian National Park tourism, their National Park values, and beliefs and attitudes toward tourism and CTDNP. The following chapter presents the results from Stage Two of the study based on interviews with National Park tourism stakeholders and their perceptions of the efficacy of regulatory strategies used to control commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks. The final chapter draws together the results from both stages, and offers final conclusions, implications and contributions of this study.
Chapter 5: Stage Two Results & Discussion

The following chapter builds on the stakeholder National Park values and tourism beliefs discovered from Stage One of data collection. Stage Two of data collection was designed to elicit responses more specific to the regulatory strategy theoretical framework. Two data sets were collected. Firstly Government Hansard transcripts were used to obtain the opinions of Members of Parliament from both the State Government and Opposition State Government, and secondly 25 stakeholder groups from three case study sites (Great Otway National Park; Point Nepean National Park; and Wilsons Promontory National Park) were interviewed regarding their opinions of the legislation changes to allow private investment and CTDNP, and of the current, proposed and potential regulatory strategies that could control these activities. To present a holistic view of the data representing stakeholder perceptions of regulatory efficacy, both these data sets were analysed concurrently and the results are presented here together within this chapter. A brief discussion introduces the National Park values and tourism beliefs of stakeholders interviewed, followed by a detailed discussion of government and stakeholder perceptions of regulatory efficacy presented through the theoretical framework of the eight regulatory strategies described in Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011)(Appendix B, page 268).

5.1 National Park Tourism Stakeholder’s Values & Beliefs

Government Hansard transcripts containing the perception of regulatory efficacy by both State Government (SG) in power and the State Opposition Government (SOG) were analysed and 25 Victorian National Park stakeholder groups were interviewed across three case study sites from stakeholder groups identified in Stage One of the research: high impact recreational groups (HRG); low impact recreational groups (LRG); local conservation groups (LCG); and local tourism industry groups (LTIG). The 15 CTO groups were divided into four stakeholder categories: accommodation providers inside and in nearby areas of the National Parks (AC); licensed Parks Victoria school/outdoor education and activity camp providers (OE/A); Parks Victoria licensed tour operator providing both day tours and overnight trips (LTO); and Parks Victoria licensed tour operator providing both day tours and overnight trips who also managed accommodation facilities (AC/LTO). During Stage One, the voice of the CTOs was minimal in the media.
Their involvement in the second stage was crucial due to their high level of experience with regulating commercial tourism in National Parks. The response rate from this group was high. CTOs were motivated to participate utilising the opportunity of this research to firstly get their opinions heard, and secondly to learn more about the situation.

The community stakeholder group were omitted from Stage Two of the research as the case study area was large in size, and with no organised representative group, there was an obvious limitation in accessing a suitable community sample. The Victorian PAMA refused invitation to participate stating their purpose was to carry out and enforce the legislation of the government; therefore their opinions were that of the government and they would make no further individual comment. Government opinions were well represented through Hansard transcripts.

**Stakeholder Awareness of Changes**

Stakeholder interviews were conducted during August 2013 as legislation was being debated in State Parliament and receiving media coverage (Appendix A, page 266). Throughout the interviews it was evident stakeholders had a broad understanding of the potential for National Park private tourism investment and development, with less knowledge of the government legislation and regulation amendments. Awareness and knowledge ranged from one participant who had never heard about the issue, to others who were quite involved and informed early on in the process, having made VCEC submissions or read early reports, but were now unclear of how far the process had gone. A representative statement:

> Understanding? (Of the legislation change and potential development plans) I don’t believe there is. You get snippets from some of the high profile greenies down here who are very anti- a lot of those sorts of things (development). You get snippets from the local press about someone’s planning to do this; someone’s planning to do that. How true they are, how factual they are, who knows? (LTIG, 2013, 13 August)
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The low level of stakeholder knowledge could be a result of the long length of time the government had taken (over three years) for reform, or the type and sources of information available. After the final VCEC report was released, there was minimal to no communication or consultation from government or Parks Victoria about the issue to local stakeholders interviewed, the majority receiving information from the media or third party sources such as the VNPA or VTIC. Stakeholders were aware these messages were advocacy based, and not representative of the whole scenario. The nominal amount of consultation with was deemed “disappointing” by most who desired to be more involved. When one conservation group was asked if they had been approached they responded:

Never. It’s been a nagging thing in my mind because they set up a consultative committee made up of representative of you name it, every conceivable interest group of and none of them really had any connection with the park. When they set up that committee I thought surely they would as a representative of (Group name) who goes out there working knowing the place so well to give our thoughts by that never happened, it was more of a political exercise I think, disappointing (LCG, 2013, 22 October).

Stakeholders interviewed sensed the greater community were also largely uninformed about the government reforms, holding a general apathetic attitude toward the issue. The community support and voice which was vocal in previous protests (most notably Wilsons Promontory National Park in the 1990’s) was not as strong during this campaign. Stakeholders listed possible reasons as: minimal media coverage; slow pace of changes; legislation changing the National Park system as a whole, not affecting one National Park potentially diminished the personal connection individuals had with the issue; community mindset the issue had been dealt with in the 1990’s, thinking “they (government) can’t do anything now, they’ll never develop Wilsons Prom now, they can’t” (LCG, 2013, 13 August); the age group of bushwalkers being older meaning the youth of this generation may not have had as personal a connection to National Parks as those previously; the tourism voice, particularly VTIC, was louder than in previous debates; and finally a possible shift in the National Park visitor from nature focused, to those wanting accommodation inside the National Park and therefore supporting CTDNP.
Stakeholder Perceptions of National Park Objectives, Values & Regulations

Results from the Stage Two data reflected Stage One findings of stakeholder National Park values and tourism beliefs. All stakeholders held strong natural environment values, some valuing the environment in its own right (eco-centric) and some valuing it for its natural recreation setting (anthropocentric). All stakeholders believed conservation (of both environmental and cultural heritage) and compatible recreation were the fundamental National Park objectives. Public access to National Parks was perceived as essential by all stakeholders. From the anthropocentric viewpoint National Parks were there for human recreation, access therefore critical to this objective. Eco-centric beliefs public access and visitation was necessary to educate and encourage natural values and support for the National Park system within society, achieving the long-term objective of protecting biodiversity for future generations. Stakeholders were highly aware of the necessity for a strong government regulatory structure, and management by both Parks Victoria and CTOs, to achieve the delicate balance between National Park conservation and human use.

I think the National Park objective is to make easy access for people to enjoy that’s the first thing. Unless people can get into the park they can’t enjoy it. They can’t appreciate it, they won’t preserve it. You need all of those things. The access should be easy so it doesn’t get destroyed as well. There is a combination, there is two things, one is to get in, if you don’t let people in they don’t get to appreciate it. Then you’ve got to make sure it doesn’t get destroyed. Now they will love it to death (AC, 2013, 24 August).

Low-impact commercial tourism focused on nature appreciation in the form of walking and camping tours was seen by all stakeholders as a compatible National Park use. Attitudes toward the plans for private investment and CTDNP were mixed. Most stakeholders held a base position either in ‘support’ or ‘opposed’ to government plans, but within the qualitative interviews, the complexity and conflicts of the issue were more apparent. Stakeholders ‘supporting’ CTDNP agreed building outside the borders was probably preferential, while some who ‘opposed’ conceded they may accept the building of low impact walking huts or cabins inside of the National Park if regulation effectively controlled outcomes.
Just leaving things alone is really important. Allowing the intrinsic values of nature to be able to thrive is for me, really important. Humans can observe it and experience it, but not influences it unduly (LTO, 2013, 22 August).

The efficacy of government regulations controlling commercial activity within Victorian National Parks was seen as an important issue to all stakeholders, CTDNP was “acceptable in general, but tightly controlled. There has to be facilities for people to enjoy the surroundings, that’s what they’re there for, that’s why we have National Parks” (LCG, 2013, 22 October). Regulation was especially critical for outcomes such as controlling environmental damage, “from our point of view, the only way that (CTDNP) could work is by strong government mandate” (LRG, 2013, 16 August). National Park regulations should be practical and achievable. Stakeholders explaining regulations too onerous on CTOs and too complex to monitor and enforce by Parks Victoria would not be adhered to and therefore not effective.

All stakeholders believed if regulated effectively, tourism could be developed sustainably and sensitive to National Parks, however ‘sceptical’ stakeholders were unconvinced government could provide the framework in which this would happen. This opinion was based on the belief government did not value the environment, demonstrated by: the lack of funding for National Parks and conservation; previous government decisions concerning the environment; and the economic focus of the CTDNP debate. ‘Sceptical’ stakeholders believed the risk in destroying the natural environment was too high to take.

This is where I’m really conflicted, because I can see that something like the Bay of Fires would be absolutely fantastic. But it’s the implementation of it and having confidence in the government doing it properly. The other thing is they may set it up with good intentions, but unless it’s monitored and enforced well into the future, things can change. My major concern is that I don’t have confidence in the government doing this well, I don’t have confidence in them drawing up the guidelines or the contracts to cater for now and for the long term future (AC, 2013, 4 August).
Other stakeholders were more ‘optimistic’, believing Parks Victoria and government would develop and maintain strong regulatory controls over any CTDNP. Many of these ‘optimists’ thought the most effective regulations could be developed by a consultation process which included a variety of National Park stakeholders from: Parks Victoria; conservation groups; government; tourism operators; and recreation groups.

I think yes (government will regulate CTDNP to protect National Parks). I think the days of Jeff Kennett era, Las Vegas type developments are not what Victoria is based on, it’s not part of the story, it’s not part of what we are, and I don’t think it would get off the ground. (LTO, 2013, 1 August)

Creating and enforcing effective regulations was influential to stakeholder’s perceptions and opinions, and could be a decisive factor in generating support for CTDNP. The SOG noted “when we look and measure good practice I am sure we can satisfy Victorians who might be concerned about the impact of commercial activities in Parks” (Victoria, Legislative Assembly, 2013c:2437). These results and discussion highlight how influential effective government regulation is and potentially the importance of regulations in achieving desired National Park outcomes.

Issues & Benefits of CTDNP in National Parks
The greatest concern for stakeholders about CTDNP was its potential impact on National Park objectives of conservation and recreation. Specifically: the environmental impact on the National Park; the destruction of the natural setting and access for recreation; and the indication government would prioritise economic gain over National Park conservation values. Several stakeholders were concerned CTDNP could potentially change the National Park experience, taking focus away from nature and onto manmade attractions. The argument about increasing access for a larger market did not seem justifiable to many. One stakeholder comment “not everybody has to be able to do everything,” (OE/A, 2013, 2 August) illustrated several stakeholder’s belief Victorian National Parks were sufficiently accessible. They advocated for the history of low impact tourism, such as family camping trips, to be upheld in favour of tourism based on built development.
It’s taking away from what a National Park’s supposed to be. One of the beauties of a National Park is the remoteness: that it is remote; that it is hard to get to; that it is special. I accept that not everybody’ll go to it but that’s what it is like. Not everybody can afford to go to Surfers Paradise. That doesn’t mean we make it so everybody can go (LRG, 2013, 20 August).

Many were worried there would be reduced public access if private areas were created in National Park (raised most emphatically by recreational groups, but mentioned also by most other stakeholder groups). This could go further to creating an ‘us and them’ mentality between National Park visitors who are camping, and those using commercial facilities, particularly if these are luxury facilities.

The complexity of the PPP was discussed, with issues arising from allowing a private CTO to hold public land and the increase of public resources needed to monitor and manage CTDNP and its visitors, adding pressure to an already overloaded Parks Victoria. This concern was extended to the possibility government could become liable for expensive ongoing maintenance and capitol works, and possibly liable for remuneration to commercial investors if CTDNP were not successful. Existing CTOs interviewed questioned the business sustainability of a CTDNP. The longevity of the luxury eco-tourist market, and the ability for any investor to achieve a return on investment could be low, opening up the possibility of the government becoming liable and the National Park being left with a “scar” of unused development.

There was doubt about the size of potential economic benefits; most stakeholders agreeing a CTDNP would create an economic entity in the region, but believed the spread to community and Parks Victoria would be minimal, with investors being the ones most likely to profit. CTDNP would be in remote areas making finding employees and the logistics of where they would stay difficult. If they lived in nearby towns, then the added pressure of employees driving through the National Park would impact on the environment and roads. If employees lived on-site, it would increase the scale of development and impact within the National Park.
All stakeholders perceived issues with CTDNP, however not all perceived benefits. The most accepted form was the potential use of existing buildings (particularly the historic Quarantine Station in Point Nepean National Park and Lightstations around Victoria), with the benefit of protecting and maintaining these buildings into the future. Stakeholders believed CTOs could potentially provide a more unique quality tourist product in the form of accommodation or an attraction CTDNP, as opposed to the non-descript existing public National Park accommodation. A quality CTDNP could benefit the whole community (including CTOs outside the National Park who could benefit from the visitor overflow) by: strengthening the destination image of the surrounding region; attracting more tourists to the area; increasing their length of stay; and widening the tourist market during off-peak times. Further to this creating a new economic entity to the area could generate employment and opportunities for the local area to supply goods (food) and services (hospitality staff and tradesmen).

Increasing the variety of National Park accommodation could further increase accessibility of National Parks, particularly for visitors inexperienced in camping or bushwalking, and interstate and international visitors. The increase in visitation and contact with National Parks could then encourage community awareness, respect and support for Victorian National Park’s natural and cultural assets to a wider audience. CTOs could be motivated to protect the natural environment setting which their product is based on, ensuring their facilities and visitors are well managed and behaved.

5.2 Regulatory Strategies

The regulatory structure of the tourism industry is complex, and many stakeholders believed unique to many other industries. CTOs within National Parks may need to adhere to local council, state and federal government legislation covering many areas such as: food; liquor; environment; driver’s licences; vehicle registration; travel agency; industrial relations; and National Park regulations. Regulations were seen as necessary to ensure businesses addressed potential issues of their operations, however needed to be realistic and achievable for the industry to succeed.
It’s actually the thing that’s most important in tourism, because unless it’s regulated properly and easy for tourism operators, people just get out because it’s too hard (LTO, 2013, 3 August).

The following discussion based on the regulatory strategies outlined by Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) address how Members of Parliament represented in the Hansard transcripts, and stakeholder’s interviewed, perceived government could best regulate CTDNP in order to address issues and achieve beneficial outcomes.

5.2.1 Command & Control Strategies

The National Park command and control regulations are those enforceable by law which provide rules and constraints on business activity (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). Command and control regulations were seen as the most effective and necessary in guiding CTO behaviour to deliver National Park outcomes, but were criticised for being overly complicated and poorly enforced, jeopardising National Park and business outcomes. This result is consistent with Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) who stated onerous command and control regulations can reduce compliance and become a barrier to entry for CTOs.

Regulations of Land Surrounding National Parks

Fourteen of the 25 stakeholders interviewed staunchly and the SOG, ‘opposed’ any CTDNP, advocating for the restriction on CTD inside of National Park borders to remain. They explained Victorian National Parks were not like those in other states or countries where CTDNP exists; Victorian National Parks were smaller in size, more environmentally sensitive, and closer to regional towns where existing infrastructure (electricity, water, sewage, roads, and employees) could support development. Any development inside a National Park would need this infrastructure put in place, as well as land clearing to protect it from fire, resulting in excessive environmental impact.

So many people have given so much of their time to keep what we’ve got. There’s no need to, there’s plenty of private land adjacent to the park (LCG, 2013, 24 August).
I think there’s a lot of opportunity for that sort of development on the edge of National Parks, private land bordering, like we’ve done here, that can support and promote the vales of the National Park without impacting upon it (AC/LTO, 2013, 23 August).

Stakeholders’ ‘opposed’ supported regulatory reform which would allow CTDNP to be more appropriately built on private land outside of or adjacent to National Park borders. Several ‘supporters’ of CTDNP also gave priority to development outside the National Park, and only where this is not suitable then development within the borders would be acceptable. Three stakeholders remained undecided; stating they would decide on a case-by-case scenario, believing sustainable, well regulated low-impact tourism development could be acceptable within the National Park.

Once we’ve exhausted the surrounding townships where the infrastructure is in place, then okay maybe you can start thinking about National Parks if you had to, or need to. I just don’t see the need. There’s a lot of regional towns, perfect places where these developments can happen (AC, 2013, 22 August).

Small type accommodation exists around the Great Otway National Park area and proposals for larger CTD on private land have been hampered by land zoning regulations. Based on this, stakeholders in this area were especially vigorous in objecting to CTDNP and reform of private land regulations. A large eco-tourism development near Wilsons Promontory National Park had also been hindered by land zoning regulations. In both these areas, building a larger CTDNP which could accommodate coach tours was seen as necessary. By building on private land, stakeholders argued CTOs could have greater control over their investment, and could then bus tourists into the National Parks on day trips.

There was some concern if CTDNP were to go ahead, regional towns would become ‘ghost towns’ as tourists move straight through them to the National Park attraction. This could deny regional areas the economic and employment generation government were claiming would be realised from CTDNP. These stakeholder sentiments reflected the
original findings from the VCEC enquiry which recommended enhancing regional tourism by developing CTD on private land as priority, and if this was not achievable, then within National Parks. The Victorian Government accepted the recommendation by reforming regulations on both public and private land, however were perceived to be more strongly encouraging CTDNP.

‘Supporters’ of building CTDNP maintained Victorian National Parks were not the pristine wilderness many of those ‘opposed’ believed them to be. Some Victorian National Parks had been scarred and developed by extensive road building and tourist facilities, such as Tidal River in Wilsons Promontory National Park, and contained severe environmental damage caused by weed infestations. ‘Supporters’ attested a CTO could develop a sustainable and sensitive development which complemented the surrounding environment with minimal long-term disruption, compared to that which already exists. These developments would need to be managed and heavily regulated, but would enable a new type of visitor to enjoy the National Parks and may generate extra resources for National Park environmental management.

People think that National Parks are somehow this pristine wilderness that has never been touched, and there’s nothing wrong with them and they are in perfect environmental order. The reality is that parks are nothing like that. They’ve all had impact. It may have been a bulldozer went through and did something years ago. It could be that weed has taken over the whole park or it could be polluted water ways for some reason (AC/LTO, 2013, 22 August).

Enforcing & Monitoring Regulations: Parks Victoria
Stakeholders overwhelmingly perceived Parks Victoria as underfunded and under resourced, therefore incapable of monitoring and enforcing existing or potential National Park regulations, “Parks Victoria are severely inadequately resourced to look after the parks they’ve got” (LRG, 2013, 16 August). The SOG thought it was timely just as “the government is talking up this form of private development at the same time as it is slashing investment in National Parks” (Victoria, Legislative Council, 2013b:2475) and ‘slashing’ their employee numbers. The investment and potential economic gain from CTDNP was not seen as a realistic solution to this problem, and raised concern from a
majority of stakeholders, that even if suitable CTDNP regulations were put in place, Parks Victoria would be incapable of enforcing them. The lack of government funding reinforced the perception government did not seriously value Victoria’s environment or conservation objectives.

Individual National Park rangers were praised for their genuine concern for conservation and for doing the best they could with the minimal resources afforded to them, but the organisational structure and business experience of Parks Victoria was found wanting in its ability to support licensed CTOs within National Parks. Parks Victoria’s commercial understanding was questioned by CTOs who have an existing relationship with the National Park management agency.

There is a real disconnect with Parks Victoria and us as an operator. If we have an obligation, we need an answer about something, is they work on Parks time and we are living in a commercial world. I just don’t think they have the ability to fulfil any real structure, or real quality assurance of controlling these things. Because they are just not in that mindset. They are not commercial operators. They may think they are and then employ people to do it, by those people get caught up in the Parks bureaucracy and therefore that’s what it is, it’s a process that’s non-existent. You can’t get an answer (AC/LTO, 2013, 23 August).

They reported difficulties in decision-making, communication, getting meetings, information delivery, and the constant changes in staff meant CTOs could not develop long-term relationships with staff. In addition any action required by Parks Victoria needed by CTOs to continue or enhance their business was slow or non-existent. Some CTOs reported their frustration and lack of monitoring from Parks Victoria, had lead them to not fully complying with regulations, or to act without permission. This finding supports Russell, Lafferty and Loudoun’s (2008) previous research into CTO regulatory compliance. They concluded the relationship between CTOs and their regulator, and the CTO’s perception of their regulator greatly influenced their compliance to regulations. As seen in this case study, and found by Russell, Lafferty and Loudoun (2008), if a CTO has a poor perception of their regulator, they are less likely to comply with regulations.
Stakeholders believed there was a risk of damage to National Parks if Parks Victoria were unable to adequately monitor CTDNP. Potential investment risks caused by government and Parks Victoria were also identified. Firstly the ability and real possibility of regulatory reform of CTDNP could cause uncertainty and add costs, potentially jeopardising continuity of product. Secondly, burning National Parks as part of Victoria’s fire management may cause difficulty. Parks Victoria sometimes did not communicate planned, controlled burns, or had burnt high visitation areas, reducing the quality of visitor experience. In dire circumstances, National Parks have been closed for long periods due to flood and fire damage. This could potentially risk the feasibility of any CTDNP.

Given the lack of Parks Victoria resources and business experience, most stakeholders agreed an effective model could be an increased partnership relationship between CTO’s, recreation groups, conservation groups and Parks Victoria, in designing, monitoring and enforcing National Park regulations. This could increase compliance and develop ownership of the National Park to a larger part of the community. The existing relationship was difficult due to the high turnover of staff. Further to this decision making meetings regarding National Park management plans and regulations were held during the week, particularly difficult for volunteers of recreation groups and conservation groups to attend and advocate for their groups.

I think as user groups we need to be able to liase with the governing bodies of that said park, but just shutting us out all the time or limiting our access is not going to help (HRG, 2013, 29 July).

Currently seen as an “enforcer,” and not a particularly successful one, Parks Victoria would possibly need to work towards creating these partnerships with stakeholders. CTOs expressed willingness and desire to be better utilised to monitor visitor behaviour and environmental conditions and for maintenance works to ease Parks Victoria’s workload. The issue of capture did arise, where Parks Victoria or government may act in the interest of private investors as opposed to upholding National Park values (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). Caution would therefore be needed by Parks Victoria not to act in favour or prioritise commercial needs over conservation outcomes.
What happens is after they encroach in the area then the new lot of politicians come and say “Well they are in here now, it wouldn’t hurt to do a bit more”. In other words we’ll rape a bit more, that’s what worries me about (CTDNP) in the parks (AC, 2013, 24 August).

**Commercial Tourism Operator Licences**

In 2013, there were 321 Licensed Tourism Operators in Victorian National Parks (DSE, 2013a). All stakeholders agreed the existing low impact licensed tourism activities were acceptable uses of Victoria’s National Parks and necessary for visitor access. Parks Victoria offered facilities to independent visitors; however CTOs delivered a complete National Park tourist experience for those not able or wanting to travel independently. The existing regulatory framework was perceived as thorough and effective in controlling these activities and their impacts. CTOs believed the potential loss of licence should CTOs not abide by licence conditions, effectively jeopardising their business, was motivation enough to adhere. CTOs interviewed considered themselves and their peers as good National Park users with strong conservation values. A representative stakeholder comment:

> I think operators who are licensed to use the National Park are by definition good park users and good operators. I’m not sure there’s anything in the licence that we wouldn’t be doing anyway, but I think it’s a nice process for Parks (Vic) to know who is using the park and to set some guidelines (AC/LTO, 2013, 23 August).

One stakeholder thought testing CTO’s knowledge of regulations could improve behaviour of those operating within the National Park, “if you’re going to have rules and regulation’s the person driving the bus should know them” (LTO: 3). There was criticism of the requirement for CTOs to specifically detail each trip; its activity, route and timetable for their licence application. If a CTO operated outside of the parameters they listed, they could be penalised. For CTOs who customised tours or activities in multiple National Parks, this offered little flexibility and given the time taken to amend their permits was a potential cost to their business. These CTOs found developing relationships with local rangers more effective in overcoming licence issues, rather than dealing with
the bureaucracy of Parks Victoria at a state level. This is consistent with Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) who stated CTOs will find ways around regulations if they are not workable.

In terms of our licensed tour operator side of things they’re really, really painful, like incredibly painful. We hate dealing with them. In terms of working with the park rangers in the National Parks, we have a very good relationship with them and things work really well. (OE/A, 2013, 27 August)

There was praise in general for Parks Victoria’s licensing system:

However, there's still lots of adjustments and stuff that we make to that, ongoing, all the time, to that licence. That's actually quite an easy process, I would say or it's an amicable one. There's never been a major problem with making changes to licences and we always find that Parks Victoria is receptive to that (OE/A, 2013, 9 August).

Stakeholder’s consistently commented on Parks Victoria’s inability to monitor and enforce visitor behaviour of independent users (due to resource shortages). CTOs and recreation groups were considered heavily regulated by command and control strategies through permit and licensing conditions, whereas unaccompanied school groups and individual users were largely left to self-regulate their own behaviour. Parks Victoria’s lack of resources to monitor individuals affected both licensed CTOs and recreation groups. For example damage caused by unmonitored individuals had resulted in camp sites and facilities being closed and unusable by CTOs and recreation groups. This frustrated CTOs especially whose licence fees were supposed to go toward upkeep and maintenance of the National Park for them to use, while independent visitor’s paid no entrance fee. Some CTOs had been further inconvenienced when school groups illegally camped in spots designated and booked by CTOs. CTOs recommended extending licence or permit requirements and regulations to school groups in order to control their behaviour and reduce conflict with CTOs within National Parks. These recommendations are in line with findings from previous research by Hill and Pickering (2002). They surmised visitor did not comply with National Park regulations as they were largely unaware of what they were. A licence or permit system which covers all high-impact and
overnight visitors to National Parks would offer an opportunity for education and awareness of regulations and therefore increase compliance.

The concern some stakeholders had about the creation of a double standard between commercial and independent visitors should CTDNP go ahead therefore already existed. Considering the above scenario, some stakeholder’s perceived visitors travelling with a CTO may actually cause less damage, rendering them a preferential National Park visitor than independent visitors or school groups. They supported this statement by adding licensed CTOs: monitor their visitor’s environmental behaviour and impact; educate about environmental values; and take visitor safety precautions. Independent visitors and school groups do not necessarily adhere to these standards.

Another group criticised was CTOs providing self-guided tours along the Great Ocean Walk, where-by they provided hikers with accommodation and transport to and from the trail-head each day, but because they did not provide a guide walking with visitors along the trail, they did not need to be licensed through Parks Victoria. These CTOs therefore did not necessarily abide by safety and environmental standards. Some Great Otway National Park stakeholders believed this was one area of the licensing system which needed to be reformed to improve the quality of CTOs along the Great Ocean Walk. The possibility of limiting CTO licences to create competition within the marketplace was mentioned as potentially being effective in improving product quality and limiting visitor numbers, reducing impact along the trail.

Regulating Specific Recreation Activities
A fundamental objective was for National Parks to be open to the public for compatible recreation. Stakeholders accepted any human activity would cause impact. Some mentioned the simple building of a dirt walking trail disturbed delicate ecosystems of birds, snails and frogs. Stakeholders did not want to see National Parks “locked up”, and retaining public access was a concern of all stakeholder groups (particularly recreation groups) if CTDNP went ahead. What recreation activities were acceptable varied, with most acknowledging different National Parks could handle different activities better than
others. Parks Victoria’s individual National Park management plans were therefore perceived as essential to controlling and regulating recreational activities and their impact.

Low-impact reflective recreation was the most accepted; those based on appreciation of nature with minimal infrastructure needed, such as walking, bird-watching, camping and swimming. One CTO described “plain observation type things of nature in all its diversity, limited infrastructure, in line with the values of the National Park” (AC, 2013, 4 August) while some stakeholders mentioned the adage “take only photographs and leave only footprints” (Interviews 1, 3, 22, 25) should be the overarching principle behind recreation regulations. High-impact activities such as four-wheel driving, mountain biking and horse riding were accepted in some National Parks (Great Otway National Park) but not others (Wilsons Promontory National Park). Some stakeholders acknowledged they believed high-impact activities were not compatible with their idea of National Park values, but they could understand some people wanting to do them and believed strongly National Parks needed to cater to different parts of the community. Activities such as shooting and hunting, recently permitted in NSW National Parks, were not accepted at all.

I suppose you’ve got to think about how do you get people into National Parks? Someone like me, I will go into the National Parks in a rainstorm with a backpack on and happily hike there for five days. Not everybody wants to do that and I understand that. All I would ask is that, again you have to repeat that any activities that you undertake with the type of values. You take photographs and you only leave footprints (LCG, 2013, 13 August).

To manage the impact of activities and reduce conflict between users, command and control regulations outlined in the individual management plans needed to be well thought-out. These included zoning off areas for different activities and maintaining facilities, particularly pertinent for motorised vehicles and bikes due to their noise pollution and potential for high impact accidents with other users. These activities needed management tracks capable of handling traffic, leaving walking tracks for people on foot a safe distance away. One motorised user explained “our biggest fear from other users is actually having an accident with them, people not following (regulations), adults let their
“kids ride around which is of course illegal” increasing the opportunity for collisions (HRG, 2013, 29 July).

While stakeholders believed most visitors behaved appropriately and regulations in place were adequate, there was a small group of individual visitors described as “hooligans” or “cowboys” who did not adhere to regulations and were singled out as having a negative impact on National Parks. One CTO explained “the regulations they read fine, but they’re not kept to” (AC, 2013, 24 August). These visitors were not adequately monitored by Parks Victoria (due to lack of resources), and caused damage to tracks and facilities by using motorised vehicles on non-designated tracks and destroying camping areas. As well as the inconvenience and safety issues to other users, the vandalism had a high cost to the National Park system. High-impact recreation groups were aware of the bad reputation hooligans gave to their activities, and desired to work with Parks Victoria more to manage and monitor National Parks.

Hoons is the biggest problem we have, shutting down facilities that have, either we have worked on or whatever because there are not enough Parks guys to monitor them over a weekend (HRG, 2013, 29 July).

Stakeholders recommended increasing fines and monitoring to manage these impacts, but were realistic increasing regulations “would work, but again it’s going to come back to funding, who is going to set them and police them?” (HRG, 2013, 29 July). Most feared that adding CTDNP to this mix would only add more pressure to Parks Victoria and decrease their ability to manage visitor behaviour.

5.2.2 Incentive Based Strategies

Whereas command and control strategies restrict the behaviour of a CTO, incentive strategies aim to induce good behaviour and desired outcomes by offering rewards for desired actions and outcomes or by penalising those undesired (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). CTOs and recreation groups were stakeholders most likely to comment on these types of regulations, based on their experiences developing incentive based relationships with Parks Victoria. Corresponding with Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011), incentive regulatory strategies were perceived by stakeholders as suitable in dealing with outcomes.
not critical to the fundamental National Park objectives of conservation and recreation. For example, CTOs could extend their licences by gaining eco-accreditation. This accreditation is not necessary for environmental protection, but Parks Victoria rewarded the extended commitment CTOs made to the environment. Possible CTDNP outcomes which stakeholders thought could be incentivised were using local produce or employing local people.

Existing CTOs interviewed were mixed in their response and adoption to the extended-licence incentive. Some CTOs interviewed already had the eco-accreditation and were therefore automatically eligible for longer licence term incentives; some were already adhering to the eco-accreditation behaviours and therefore became certified; while others did not believe the accreditation system or benefit of extended licences was worth the cost to the business. This appeared to match the data from Parks Victoria (2013) that of the 321 licensed CTOs, 77 percent held a one year licence, 20 percent a three year licence, and only 3 percent had fulfilled the incentive requirements and taken out the 10 year licence. The mixed response and compliance to existing incentives supported both theory (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011) and stakeholder thoughts that incentive regulations are most suitable to outcomes which are not fundamental to National Park objectives. It also illustrated the need for incentives to be substantial and enticing for commercial tourism developers to see benefit over cost in changing their behaviours and supported Baldwin, Cave and Lodge’s (2011) theory incentive regulatory strategies offer CTOs more flexibility to choose how they operate their business.

All recreation groups interviewed (both high and low impact) had developed an incentive based relationship with Parks Victoria. Individual clubs had an existing working relationship with their local National Park rangers and state based organisations worked with Parks Victoria. Together they developed regulations and guidelines and organised the carrying out of maintenance and environmental monitoring in National Parks. In return, recreation groups gained satisfaction, better access, credibility and participation in the management of the National Parks. One recreation group heavily participated in Parks Victoria operations and maintenance to open tracks and to remove heavy rubbish.
We help them open up their tracks on time. They (Parks Victoria) get a heap of free labour, and we get to go down tracks we may have used to go down a long time ago, that may have been closed off (to other users) for one reason or another (HRG, 2013, 29 July).

Another high impact user group was designated as a responsible club and therefore did not need to get permits to enter their National Park. These groups were highly regulated not only by Parks Victoria but also their managing organisations by both control and command and incentive based regulatory strategies. The turn-over of Parks Victoria staff was noted as negatively affecting these relationships and, similar to CTOs, recreation groups desired to work closer with Parks Victoria to improve the relationship. Recreation groups and camping based CTOs responded positively that potential incentives could include special access to areas for good users which had been closed due to the bad behaviour of independent hooligans. One CTO explained their desire to be recognised as a good user:

What if our incentives included less restrictions? Individual incentives, where they recognized that you are a really great team, you are really passionate and great at group management, we’re going to say that at you can use bush camps (in certain areas) because we get put with other user groups, like hunters and the army, and everybody else who goes down there and trashes it, therefore Park Victoria is going to close it to everyone. It infuriates me because I know we don’t treat the land that way and the reason we’re going is to show visitors this is how you should be using it (OE/A, 2013, 9 August).

Monetary or reduction in fees could also be a potentially strong incentive; however Parks Victoria relied on this income. Incentives which lower costs of business were therefore seen as perhaps more appropriate, such as inclusion in Parks Victoria marketing activities or partnering in activities which would add to the visitor National Park connection. For example planting activities would allow visitors to be educated and to develop a connection to the National Park which could foster long-term conservation awareness and support. This would benefit both Parks Victoria conservation objectives and the CTO by creating a unique visitor experience.
5.2.3 Market Harnessing Controls

Market harnessing control strategies are those regulations which seek to ensure CTOs have fair opportunity within the National Park tourism market. This could include regulating competition between public and private provision of tourism, or between the CTOs themselves (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011).

The National Park Tourism Market

Regulatory reform of National Park private investment and CTDNP was originally recommended to assist in unlocking tourism in Victoria, with the government aiming to attract the growing Asian market and increase length of stay and tourism yield in regional areas. “Governments position is that Victoria’s appeal as a Nature-based Tourism can be enhanced through encouraging sensible and sensitive investment in National Parks” (Victoria, Legislative Council, 2013b:2472). Most existing National Park CTOs and stakeholders interviewed dismissed the ability for a CTDNP to achieve these goals. Their belief was these issues are a reflection of the existing tourism market structure. One CTO explained:

The whole issue with National Parks and staying longer in remote regional areas in Australia is not the problem with the regions, it’s the problem with the city centres, the city hubs. Everything is geared around Melbourne being the hub. The bus companies are in cahoots with hotels. They are all promoting one day trips. Most of those trips don’t spend any money in the National Park, they don’t offer any money (AC/LTO, 2013, 23 August).

Any CTDNP would therefore need to be developed carefully considering: the type of tourist market they were aiming at; its structure of visitation; and the compatibility of that market with National Park values; in order to achieve sustainable business and tourism exposure. Several stakeholders commented this may mean development is not accommodation, as most assume, but an attraction inside of the National Park which could potentially diversify and increase attractiveness of the area. Stakeholders believed there should be more consideration of what tourists to Australia, and Victorian regional areas, were seeking. Based on the comments from their customers, existing CTOs
perceived this to be the unique and untouched features of Victorian National Parks. Many stated their international visitors especially, commented positively on the natural state of Victoria’s National Parks compared to those more developed overseas. There was concern any development, particularly a large five star type facility, would damage this destination image and “lose the character” (LTO, 2013, 3 August) of National Parks. Further to this, stakeholders did not see the high-end eco-tourism market sustainable in the long-term. These visitors tend not to be repeat, and other facilities around Australia attracting a similar market have not been successful long-term.

Criticism came too as the government appeared to be focusing on the international market when targeting the domestic market was seen to be more feasible, especially with the drop in international visitors experienced due to the high Australian dollar. The Asian and Chinese market was perceived to be growing, but not necessarily a viable option for National Park visitation. Chinese tourists travelled in large groups by bus, staying for short periods of time with crammed itineraries, minimum spending and preferred an experience built on entertainment. These types of visitors were perceived as not sharing National Park environmental values. A representative understanding of the Chinese market:

Their guests (Asian) want some sort of entertainment. That’s why the penguins are so popular. They’re close to the main city and there’s entertainment. We don’t have that down here. The natural environment is the attraction. I wonder about large numbers of international visitors coming in for one night and wanting to be entertained. One night, that’s a really expensive way to turn over guests. It’s a big impact on the area for very little gain. They wouldn’t be spending any dollars in the area: not for any of the locals; the local town; the food; the bus would take them there and straight out again. That would apply enormous pressure to the roads, traffic, and the environment (AC, 2013, 4 August).

“Compromising environmental values of any park to attract an audience” (LRG, 2013, 16 August) was not acceptable to stakeholders, environmental values should remain the basis of the National Park management and visitor experience.
Some CTOs thought the Chinese market could possibly follow the maturity of the Japanese market that used to travel on bus tours, but have matured to self-drive trips. Independent travellers who have more confidence to travel alone and to regional areas were seen as a more viable market option. This could extend to the international walking market who seeks icon walking experiences such as the Milford Track in New Zealand. To attract walkers, an environmentally conscious market, any development would need to be shown to be sustainable and sensitive to the National Park. Some CTOs did not believe Victoria held suitable natural icons to develop this part of the industry, and as it is not a particularly large market, was not seen as a solely viable option. The conference market was another possibility, particularly viable for Point Nepean National Park where a variety of large existing infrastructure could be utilised, less so for Wilsons Promontory National Park and the surrounding region too far from Melbourne.

**Competition for the Market**

The Victorian State Government designed a five stage process that would guide “*Tourism Investment Opportunities of Significance in National Parks*” (2013). An EOI would be released by the government asking proponents to put forward their preliminary concept proposal. Each proposal would be evaluated against eight guiding principles and if found satisfactory released to the public for comment for 28 days. After receiving feedback from government and community, proponents would have the opportunity to develop and submit a full proposal which will be considered by the Minister for the Environment. If approved, a long-term lease which encourages private investment within the National Park, will be offered by the government as a contact for exploitation, effectively allowing the proponent to ‘exploit a public good in return for making a capital investment and paying taxes on profits’ (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011:167).

By calling for an EOI, the Victorian government would move the ‘competition in the marketplace’ to ‘competition for the market’ (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011:165). Stakeholders were decisive the government should not generate specific development ideas and put them out for tender. The EOI process was seen as more effective in its ability to create competition within the market, allowing CTOs to innovate and leading to better outcomes, supported by all stakeholders to be the most efficacious. Baldwin, Cave
and Lodge (2011) theorised an EOI provided a process which allowed CTOs more flexibility to respond to market needs, and allowed government to decide upon the most suitable proposal. Stakeholder’s believed the ultimate outcome would be for “four or five viable operations come up, and hopefully they (government) have picked the best one” (AC, 2013, 13 August). A representative comment from other stakeholders:

I suppose the EOI does open it up to lots of different ideas that might be at a higher standard than what the government would put in there themselves. I think that would be my preference. At least a committee or board can review all of those ideas (AC/LTO, 2013, 23 August).

Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) advised for effective EOI process, well designed proposal guidelines should be administered. Guidelines too restrictive could limit CTO innovation, while unrestricted proposals could be difficult for government to review and compare. In addition, if government did not communicate their needs, proponents could waste resources developing proposals that have no chance of approval. The Victorian government guidelines and restrictions on the National Park EOI were minimal in detail which could lower confidence in both environmental and business outcomes. A potential significant issue in Point Nepean National Park where the EOI process had commenced:

(Government) should have published constraints first of all, so for example, it seems to be an open slather if someone said for example we want to build a hotel right at the point then I think that is allowable at present. Now I don’t think they’ll be allowed to do it, because they’ll come down with regulation saying no we’re going to restrict it to the Quarantine site (LCG, 2013, 22 October).

Whether you are a developer or a park lover wanting to know what this means for a particular development in a National Park, the guidelines do not tell you anything, they are meaningless (Victoria, Legislative Council, 2013b:2474).
Poor guidelines meant the approval process could be left up to interpretation.

It may be very well for this coalition government to say ‘we clearly understand what we intend’, but this legislation will be in place for a long time. Who knows what future environment ministers will understand this legislation to be. Once you do this there is no going back (Victoria, Legislative Assembly, 2013c: 2427).

With the final decision being made by the Minister of the Environment, one individual would hold almost unlimited power. To ‘sceptical’ stakeholders the absence of detailed regulation and focal decision making, substantiated their opinion government were risking a capture scenario which would result in them upholding investor’s needs over National Park values.

The SOG noted these guidelines were not enforceable by law; they were not part of legislation. In addition to lowering community confidence, this could lower investor confidence. Unclear or weak regulations could create uncertainty for the future. For example an investor may be concerned if they build accommodation within the National Park, that another development may be approved in the future, jeopardising their long-term business outcomes. ‘Optimistic’ stakeholders did think “common sense will prevail” (LCG, 2013, 22 October), that government will effectively regulate CTDNP in the long-term to ensure conservation and recreation outcomes were achieved, “as long as they’ve still got in the back of their mind maybe restricting that then. Do you know what I’m saying? Again, to me, it’s still the end result” (OE/A, 2013, 27 August). Government believed the process to be transparent and suitably guided with conditions on the Minister for Environment to consider the existing management plans for the National Park in question, government risk and future liabilities.

Several stakeholders considered an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) would be a crucial part in assessing proposals, but held concern the pattern of Victorian government decisions and assessments, including those of the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT), had been pro-development, rendering the EIA process as unreliable and an opportunity for National Park development to become “open-slather” (OE/A, 2013, 22 August & LCG, 2013, 22 October). The Environmental Plan was not required.
until the final part of the approval process after community consultation. Stakeholders believing consultation to be an important part of the approval process criticised this timing.

My major concern is that I don’t have confidence in the government doing this well. I don’t have confidence in them drawing up guidelines or the contracts to cater for now and for the long term future. I’m almost always dismayed with developments like this when the Environmental Impact Statement is done for three months. That is just totally unrealistic and it means nothing. It just reinforces our sense that the environment is always the least important thing in any of those commercial developments (AC, 2013, 4 August).

Most existing CTOs interviewed were smaller operators who were motivated by their personal environmental values; passionate about working in National Park tourism because of the opportunity it gave them to share these values with visitors. This contradicted stage one results where the perception from other stakeholders was CTOs would be primarily driven by economic considerations. Given stakeholder perception the Victorian Government are economically motivated, and Parks Victoria will be ineffective in monitoring CTDNP, all stakeholders placed great importance on partnering with a CTDNP with compatible National Park values, “no matter what the company is, that’s what it boils down to is the values of the people behind it” (AC/LTO, 2013, 23 August). Existing CTOs perceived values as important because they understood the influence environmental values had on their business interaction with National Parks, and other stakeholder groups because of the fear they held of economic objectives taking priority over conservation. “Money hungry,” “profit-driven,” “that’s the problem that people are greedy and they want more, more, more” described stakeholder perceptions of potential investors.

I think it comes back to the aims and objectives of the park, which if they don’t align with conservation of the park and the best interest of the park and the community in that park and it’s just profit, then I think it probably shouldn’t go ahead. I guess to find a partner, maybe the best solution is to advertise the specifics of what sort of partner they’re looking for (OE/A, 2013, 9 August).
Stakeholder’s deeply considered what type of CTDNP will be attracted and what outcomes this would have for National Parks. “If you want the private sector to invest, don’t just give them free land in pristine places, because you will get the wrong sort of development because the wrong sort of people will take them on.” (OE/A, 2013, 2 August). The right type of investor would share in National Park environmental values and work with the surrounding region during development and ongoing operations. In addition to this criterion, the business skills and tourism industry experience should be considered during the EOI process. Investors would need to produce a feasible and sustainable business idea and management plan which mitigated risks, and demonstrate their ability to carry out their proposal. A repeat of past failures, such as Wilsons Promontory General Store and Mt. Buffalo Chalet, should be avoided.

Existing CTOs held mixed ideas about what would be most feasible and what would create a higher level of risk. Some argued accommodation facilities would need to be large enough to create profit, while others thought the larger the development the longer it would take to gain a return on investment, increasing risk.

The Southern Ocean Lodge on Kangaroo Island, these are not places that make money in the long term. They take an enormous amount of money to get started, there is no business, and they are not always the most successful business (LTO, 2013, 1 August).

Some believed giving one investor a monopoly over the market to reduce risk would be acceptable if it was the right CTO. Others could see more benefit of a consortium structure in reducing risk and sharing benefits. Dealing with government and Parks Victoria was also seen as a high business risk for any potential investor due to control and ability to change regulations. Some believed this would be a strong deterrent for any investor responding to an EOI.

The 28 day period for community consultation was seen as a significant part of the process. Some stakeholders had communicated to government regarding CTDNP through letters to ministers, involvement in meetings or submissions to the VCEC inquiry. As
National Parks were a public good most felt government had an obligation to facilitate community consultation during the EOI process.

It’s up to the owners of the land, which is us, through our representatives, which is the government. (We) should quite clearly outline what the controls should be. Now they’re going to do that they tell me, and if they do things I don’t agree with or the group I work with who love the place don’t agree with, we’ll let them know in no uncertain terms, I think the community down here will as well (LCG, 2013, 22 October).

The community comment period was condemned as too short a timeframe, especially by those who desired to be involved with the process, some of who would need to discuss proposals with members of their group before registering their feedback. In addition, at the point it is scheduled, community may not have access to all the information concerning the proposal, such as the Environmental Management Plan. For many, it illustrated the government’s pro-development stance and unwillingness to represent community desires. One group who had reserved their support or opposition toward CTDNP held this as one of their greatest concerns and commented:

We ask for members feedback, which is why we are not going either way because there will be mixed views. Thirty days is tight for us, yes we would like it extended in the initial stage. It’s tricky and its election time again next year. I think I am just a bit cynical about the process really (LTIG, 2013, 4 August).

Other stakeholders commented on the type of community comments and feedback any CTDNP proposal would receive. Stakeholder’s ‘supporting’ development could understand there would be resistance to change, but thought much of this would be based in the old mindset of large destructive developments and it would be commentary from stakeholders or community who are “not actually living and breathing in the park” (AC/LTO, 2013, 22 August). The SG believed ‘opposition’ beliefs were formed based on “scare campaigns” driven by conservation groups and the SOG. “The reality is that this type of old-fashioned outdated emotional rhetoric is exactly that” (Victoria, Legislative Council, 2013b:2478). ‘Supportive’ stakeholders’ maintained tourism could now be developed sustainably, and proposals should be considered before knee-jerk reactions.
dismissed them. This was particularly true in the case of Point Nepean National Park stakeholders; the majority of who supported development in their National Park. They believed opposition would come from people who did not have a true connection or understanding and were “mongers’ of despair and negativity” (LCG, 2013, 22 October).

The general community, they don’t know it, they make all these incredible statements, we go there and work once every two weeks and we know the place inside out, some of the things they say are ridiculous (LCG, 2013, 22 October).

There are a lot of high profile people that would want nothing done down there. I think a lot more people are a bit more realistic about the thing. I think it would be good for the region, assuming it’s done in good taste (LTIG, 2013, 13 August).

Several CTOs expressed their involvement in sponsoring local sports teams and in the scout organisation helped integrate them into the community and recommended the same to any CTDNP in an effort to gain community support and become a “good corporate citizen” (LTO, 2013, 15 August).

**Net Community Benefit Measure**

Through the EOI process, government was to evaluate each tourism development proposal by a ‘net community benefit’ measure. Stakeholders questioned what criteria would be used to calculate this measure and by who. One stakeholder stated “my biggest question is who's measuring the benefit and what benefits are we looking for?” (OE/A, 2013, 27 August) while another summarised many stakeholders viewpoint:

The net community benefit is difficult because you're measuring something that is tangible against something that is intangible. You can quantify the dollars; you can’t quantify the environmental benefit (LRG, 2013, 16 August).

Stakeholders who ‘opposed’ CTDNP were anxious ‘net community benefit’ would be economically based on outcomes such as tourism spending and employment generation while costs such as: scarred land; destruction of the natural setting and pristine environment; and the potential long-term cost of government subsidies if business fails, would not be adequately assessed. One conservation group believed “there is no
justification for having private investment to that extent inside the park” (LCG, 2013, 13 August) while another recreation group maintained “money isn’t everything” (LRG, 2013, 20 August). Many did not understand why “they are trying to put a monetary value on everything” as it was “not necessarily the conservation way to go, to have to justify a place’s existence,” in monetary terms (AC/LTO, 2013, 23 August). This only strengthened the perception government and developers would act from an anthropocentric economic based value-set, increasing concern CTDNP would have detrimental outcomes for the fundamental objectives of conservation and recreation.

‘Supporter’s’ observed there would be economic benefits to the community by allowing a CTDNP to go ahead, “if you’ve got nothing and you bring in a new experience, you are going to bring economic benefit,” and understood there would be some environmental impact, but claimed “if you choose the right sites which may be already impacted, I think the development can be very sympathetic to the existing National Park” (AC/LTO, 2013, 22 August). They did question the size of the economic benefits. Stakeholder’s claimed larger CTDNP would most likely source supplies and maintenance services from large Melbourne companies rather than local business, and in all likelihood their guests would drive straight through surrounding regional areas to the development and back out when their trip is over, not stopping or spending at all in regional areas. In this way the multiplier effect used to calculate economic benefits to regional areas was questioned in its reality. Any CTDNP should work closely with the local area, not creating an enclave resort style system, but an integrated entity as part of the larger tourism network, if economic and tourism benefits are to be realised. Although desirable, this activity should not be regulated through command and control strategies as these could be unrealistic and impractical; rather the local market should be responsible for creating desired product, but perhaps incentivised in some way.

There are positives, it can bring additional people down, give them different reasons to come down and that can filter through to our accommodation providers and our restaurants and provide economic, provided again that the development considered is able to have that filtration, the one thing no one would want to see within the group, people getting bussed down to (the National Park) they get bussed straight back, and there is no leakage at all (LTIG, 2013, 4 August).
Similarly the claims of economic benefits to Parks Victoria and National Park maintenance were viewed with caution. Many contested the only ones to profit from CTDNP would be developers, and possibly general government revenue. Stakeholders firmly believed any government revenue generated from CTDNP should be re-invested directly to the upkeep of the National Park in which it was held. Stakeholders believed government did not prioritise National Parks and they would therefore need alternative resources in the long term, “do we need money outside of government money, well apparently we do because the National Park people don’t have the money to keep the parks in a state where they’re acceptable” (LCG, 2013, 22 October).

Contracts for Exploitation: Existing Infrastructure
The leasing out of existing National Park public buildings for CTDNP, such as lighthouses, cabins or other infrastructure, was supported by many stakeholders based on the perception of potential benefits of using and protecting these buildings. Stringent regulations considering the type of CTO, retaining public access, ongoing costs and maintenance, design changes, and the quality of the experience delivered were desired by stakeholders, “I wouldn’t object personally if one of the group lodges (WPNP) became more of a backpacker type situation” managed by the YMCA as opposed “to Hilton hotels or something” (LRG, 2013, 20 August). Some believed government should be looking to expand or improve existing facilities before building new CTDNP. Camping sites, cabins, lighthouses, and visitor education facilities in some areas were not believed to be running to their potential and could be improved with investment and quality management by either Parks Victoria or a CTO, “the development I would look at would be expansions of facilities that are already there that are not meeting the needs” (OE/A, 2013, 2 August).

Support for private investment and CTDNP was highest for Point Nepean National Park due to its unique status of containing a large number of existing historic buildings. Most stakeholders, including those ‘opposing’ development in other National Parks, believed CTDNP could improve and protect these historic buildings long-term as opposed to relying on government funding and management “it needs some usage otherwise the historical buildings that are there just can’t be preserved” (LCG, 2013, 22 October).
Parks Victoria had received $18 million from government to improve Point Nepean National Park and was praised for the work completed such as weed clearing and constructing visitor paths, “I think Parks Victoria have done a wonderful job” (LCG, 2013, 22 October). Stakeholders believed it was still not achieving its full potential as a tourism attraction or historic site and required further private investment for these improvements and ongoing maintenance.

Caution would need to be exercised to ensure sustainable tourism development was achieved, and National Park objectives of conservation and public access for recreation were maintained.

It would have to be done very carefully and it would have to be done with an eye for effect. This is public land and it’s been preserved as a National Park for a reason. In some respects, it’s more of a historic park than a National Park. It’s an unusual situation Point Nepean (LRG, 2013, 16 August).

Point Nepean is being wasted; it has such good tourism features. They do want to build down there and I am not against that, it’s one of the few National Parks I’m not (against CTDNP), because it’s more a National heritage area because of the history with early settlement of Australia (LTO, 2013, 3 August)

There were mixed views on what would be the most appropriate use of Point Nepean National Park buildings. The existing museum, run by volunteers, was favoured to be handed over to a CTO who could improve efficiency and quality; however the SOG noted the preference for investors would be for commercial activities which offer a higher return. For other buildings, an education or research centre was supported by some stakeholders, accommodation by others. One commented they believed major infrastructure maintenance to plumbing needed to make the Quarantine Station buildings habitable for accommodation would be costly, and therefore preferred new accommodation facilities to be built, while another stated:

Down there (Point Nepean National Park) there’s plenty of room, and I do see that as quite a bit different because of the previous history and the development that’s already there. I think that’s very different to what I think
Wilsons Promontory might go like. That (Wilsons Promontory National Park) to me, let them build the accommodation, let them develop the place, but outside the gate (AC, 2013, 13 August).

Contracts for Exploitation: Lease Requirements

Each National Park had unique conditions, and each CTDNP approved would be unique in its design and structure, therefore stakeholders were clear in stating the individual ‘lease agreement’ needed to contain a strong government regulatory framework to direct the ongoing activity of CTDNP. SG agreed stating “any lease must contain conditions that prevent or minimise any adverse impacts on the relevant park” (Victoria, Legislative Assembly, 2013c:55). Many stakeholders mentioned New Zealand’s stringent command and control regulations controlling the CTOs operating the Milford Track as best practice, particularly regulations requiring all waste to be flown out of cabin sites on a regular basis. An expensive activity, this had increased the cost of business and the visitor experience. Many stakeholders believed this was appropriate. The cost of a facilitated experience inside of the National Park needed to reflect the business cost of protecting the environment.

Waste management was the most mentioned ongoing concern. Water, soap, rubbish, effluent and food scraps would all need to be carefully managed to protect the surrounding environment. This may extend to the banning of plastic wrappers or regulating types of utensils used (not plastic). Other areas to be addressed included noise pollution; visual pollution; and the maintenance, upkeep and public access of shared facilities between the CTDNP and other uses. These included public visitor access roads which would also be used to bring in supplies and employees, and walking tracks.

Stakeholders discussed lease length, acknowledging a longer lease would provide investor security with a greater opportunity to gain a return. A “lease is the only suitable way of providing the required degree of security of tenure for large investments on public land” (Victoria, Legislative Assembly, 2013a: 1779). Some stakeholders believed the 99 year lease was too long if government did not have some other avenue of penalty should the
lease holder continually misbehave. Another commented a potential CTO would perhaps prefer a shorter option enabling them to take out their investment. To be effective in delivering sustainable CTDNP outcomes, stakeholders were aware ‘lease agreements’ and regulations would need to be commercially viable. One stakeholder explained “you put that much red tape and that many rules and regulations, they’ll just walk away and leave it” (LTIG, 2013, 13 August). There should be room for the CTO to innovate and respond to market needs given tourism would be their expertise.

Above and beyond stakeholder’s concern for creating an effective lease agreement, was the ability for the government and Parks Victoria to monitor, review, and penalise lease holders. Given their lack of resources and business experience, their previous poor level of interaction and outcomes with lease holders within Victorian National Parks, there was doubt and uncertainty by many stakeholders that CTOs would be held accountable and suitably sanctioned should they not adhere to lease conditions. Previous examples where CTOs leasing public goods had undesirable outcomes were given as: the Wilsons Promontory National Park general store; various lighthouses; and the Mt. Buffalo chalet. An existing lease holder confirmed these fears describing the difficulty they had in running their business and trying to deliver a quality tourism experience:

What we’ve got here is a bit of an issue with what is meant to happen and what happens in reality. We are a commercial organisation that’s trying to operate within our parameters, of heritage, of parks, of aboriginal cultural aspects, but we are constrained by the fact that parks aren’t fulfilling, as far as I understand it, aren’t fulfilling their obligations of capital works. Which ultimately means we struggle with power, we struggle with infrastructure, with plumbing, with electricity. The entrance out the front is inadequate from a world class tourism destination (AC/LTO, 2013, 23 August).

This was the basis of opposition for stakeholders who ‘opposed’ CTDNP. The poor track record of producing successful partnerships on public land between government and private enterprise left most stakeholders in doubt the likelihood of a successful sustainable CTDNP ever being realised. Had they more faith in government and Parks
Victoria effectively developing and monitoring regulations to protect and deliver National Park objectives of conservation and use, they may have been more supportive.

**Competition between Public & Private Markets, & Inside & Outside the NP**

Stakeholders not directly involved with the tourism industry brought up the possibility a CTDNP could create unfair competition to those outside. Stakeholders within the tourism industry, particularly smaller accommodation providers interviewed, did not see this competition as an issue. Rather they saw benefit in growing the overall tourism market in the region and believed as “a little operator, we’ll pick up the crumbs” (AC, 2013, 13 August). Further to this, building an iconic CTDNP could improve the destination image, bring more visitors and encourage repeat visitation benefiting the region as a whole.

I think as that area builds a brand for ecotourism, I think the more ecotourism is accredited and serious about eco-tourism, the better for that brand. Not so much intent on competition, I think probably it would be quite complimentary in terms of marketing branding sense (AC/LTO, 2013, 23 August).

Concerns were raised about the disparity between the costs of businesses. Possibility a CTDNP may be supplemented by lower land or rental costs than those operating on private land. Government may need to regulate here to ensure any government investment or land costs allocated to a CTDNP does not unfairly subsidise the business, and product pricing reflects true costs, “then you price it so that it’s not cheaper than private land, it’s really the pricing of the land that may even the playing field” (AC, 2013, 24 August).

One CTO was concerned the outcome could result in a business structure similar to the Visitor Information Centres which were perceived as unfairly supplemented by government:

You go into them, they sell souvenirs. You can’t even get information because you’ve got to fight your way through this IKEA maze of souvenir stuff. Those souvenirs are competing with the street shops. It’s funded and subsidized by us as tax payers and rent payers. With that principle in mind I don’t necessarily agree with funding development unless it’s equitable (AC/LTO, 2013, 23 August).
Overall stakeholders did not feel well informed of the possibilities for CTDNP. CTOs in particular would have preferred to be kept better up to date so as to plan for their business futures. Several of the CTOs interviewed had previously submitted plans to government for CTD on their private land or ideas for public land, but had been prohibited due to land use regulations. The legislation changes frustrated some of these CTOs, yet they understood business and government evolves as markets change. Whether a CTDNP is accommodation, visitor centre or tourist attraction, CTOs desired government to monitor visitor experience quality, as this delivery will reflect and affect the success of the whole National Park tourism market in the region. Stakeholders were adamant Parks Victoria should not then be the one to deliver tourism operations; it should be left to the professional private enterprise.

5.2.4 Disclosure

Disclosure regulatory strategies allow government to control CTO business information by requiring them to disclose specific details to customers or Parks Victoria (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). Licensed Parks Victoria CTOs were required to disclose information regarding activities undertaken in Victorian National Parks through a ‘trip return’ form. This was perceived by licensed CTOs as an efficient and effective process for Parks Victoria to remain informed of tourism activities. One CTO had failed to return their trip information on time and commented due to the reduction in staff numbers at Parks Victoria, they had not been able to monitor compliance as comprehensively as in previous years. Requiring CTOs to disclose information to the visitor market would only be seen as an effective regulatory strategy if the consumer market was well informed about the information they were receiving. For example eco-accreditation was deemed of little value because of an uneducated visitor market.

5.2.5 Direct Action & Design Solutions

Government can utilise their own resources to influence outcomes either by ‘direct action’ (such as government building sustainable accommodation and then leasing out to a CTO) or by ‘design solutions’ (for example regulating the design of a building or landscape) (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011).
Stakeholders were adamant government should not build and operate tourism facilities within National Parks believing they lacked the resources, efficiency and business skills. There were criticisms of the management and quality of the Wilsons Promontory National Park Wilderness Tents and Great Ocean Walk, and comments such as “government can’t build things. They may think they can or they may think they would like to, but they are lousy at it, their bureaucracy is such that they can’t do it within a financially viable model” (AC/LTO, 2013, 23 August) and “a lot of these people that are in charge of these things don’t have a business background, you kind of need a business head” (LTO, 2013, 1 August) were representative. Government’s previous efficiency in spending on facilities, with poor planning and consulting resulting in poor outcomes and wasted resources was noted. Stakeholders also perceived the environment was a low government priority, with few resources and therefore “government wouldn’t be able to do it (CTDNP) because they haven’t got the funds” (LCG, 2013, 22 October), extended to “Parks Victoria who govern all the National Parks just don’t have the money to do it properly” (LCG, 2013, 22 October).

Most stakeholders therefore believed the most efficient and effective framework would be for the private sector to invest and deliver quality tourism products while government and Parks Victoria manage the overall National Park system. This would have the added benefit of lowering government costs and shifting risk and responsibility onto the private sector.

They should be a sophisticated land manager not an operator. They were going to operate these lodges with accommodation, “what are you doing that for? That’s what we do. They should be making sure that the conservation values are met and that the requirements of licence are being met and that the government’s getting a fair return (AC/LTO, 2013, 22 August).

Before CTDNP went ahead, some stakeholders wanted government and tourism planners to update Victoria’s nature-based tourism strategy to identify the state’s competitive advantages and plan for suitable quality experiences. Taking a state based approach would enable the delivery of a variety of experiences in areas able to accommodate environmental impact. For example developing a multi-day facilitated walk in one
National Park, while leaving others undeveloped to provide a wilderness experience, achieving both conservation and recreation outcomes. The SOG were staunch on this issue, believing the government was moving too fast by enacting legislation before a Nature-based tourism strategy was written, and this was an indication the government was not serious about supporting the industry. If a state-based approach was established government could begin taking direct action by constructing infrastructure needed to support CTDNP’s. This would include large infrastructure: roads; car parking; power and energy facilities; water supply; waste management; weed control; and clearing areas for buildings and reducing fire risk, and smaller visitor management infrastructure such as: paths; signage; and bridges. Public transport to National Parks could be improved to facilitate and increase visitor numbers. Contracts between government and the CTDNP would need to be thorough in detailing who was responsible for establishing, upgrading and ongoing maintenance of such infrastructure.

The majority of stakeholders maintained all CTD should be outside of National Park borders. If CTD was to advance within National Parks, stakeholders were then extremely concerned about regulating its location and design. Regard should be given to the National Park system from a state level, which National Parks could best handle impact and which should be left untouched due to their environmental sensitivities. Further to this, the location of CTDNP within the chosen National Park should be regulated to protect environment, scenic landscape, visitor experience and public access to special areas. Zoning regulations controlling CTDNP would depend on the type of facilities built., with stakeholders certain that high-end ecotourism development should be developed away from camping areas, “it (CTDNP) would have to be in an area where it did not disturb the experience of others (camping) and in a way that several groups do not run into each other, no cross pollination” (LTO, 2013, 1 August).

Location and zoning should be controlled by government as investors would desire the best location for their CTDNP to enhance visitor experience. Stakeholders from Great Otway National Park were especially concerned development should not be allowed along the coastline of the Great Ocean Rd which would impede on the landscape of the Twelve Apostles.
The thing is to me is there are developers that see a beautiful piece of land and they say, “I want that.” If when you go down to (special area) there will be people that say, “Well if we can only build in there wouldn’t it be marvellous?” Well it bloody would be but it would ruin for everyone else over time (AC, 2013, 24 August).

You go to Bay of Fires and you’ve got that, people just sit there and look and they go, this is special. It’s special because you’ve got that view. There’s an issue with the planning scheme and the overlays on the coast (AC/LTO, 2013, 22 August).

Hardening the area by building infrastructure can change the visitor experience, for example boardwalks separate visitors from physical contact with nature and create a disturbed view. In National Parks where visitation is increasing this was seen as a necessary cost to protect the environment from visitor impact, and could be improved to increase visitation.

It’s striking the balance between the two (visitor satisfaction and conservation). I think that’s the hardest things for National Parks to do is to make sure that they are still attracting people and that they have the infrastructure there as well but you don’t want to destroy what people are coming to see (LTO, 2013, 4 August).

Some stakeholders believed building CTDNP in areas which were already impacted would reduce further unnecessary impact upon the National Park. Others argued areas already developed, such as Tidal River visitor precinct in Wilsons Promontory National Park, were at capacity and would have difficulty with any increase in development or visitation without major infrastructure improvement. In Point Nepean National Park one stakeholder was emphatic “any commercial involvement be restricted to the Quarantine station in the historical precinct” (LCG, 2013, 22 October).

The size of the design was influential on some stakeholder’s opposition toward CTDNP, for its potential visual and environmental impact. These stakeholders perceived a CTDNP would need to be large to be feasible, increasing the amount of infrastructure and building needed to accommodate not only guests but staff and tour guides, “the roads, the water,
the electricity, the mobile coverage. So it’s got to be big, it’s got to be expensive to make it worthwhile” (HRG, 2013, 20 August 5). Some noted the government justification for 99 year leases was for private investors to realise a return on their investment, indicating tourism development would be large. Government argued development would be sensitive to the area. The SOG retorted if this were true, then stronger government regulations concerning size and design would have been included within the legislation and if restricted to smaller infrastructure such as a café or kiosk, they would have offered their support. Government believed their approval process would prove successful in controlling these outcomes “The Bill will make sure that there is consultation in relation to any longer term lease granted to ensure – and I will keep repeating it – that any development is sensible and sensitive” (Victoria, Legislative Assembly2013c:2428).

‘Supporters’ of CTDNP believed tourism infrastructure has:

Changed so much since the original ‘Hands off the Prom’ movement when they (government) were thinking massive large scale hotels and resort sort of thing. Now if you are thinking National Park you tend to think of Sapphire or Freycinet in Tassie, those sort of ones that very much meld with the natural environment (LTO, 2013, 4 August).

Tasmania’s lodges were seen as effective design solutions, it was important for many stakeholders to note they supported these developments, as they were outside of the National Parks. The fact these lodges were still operational, and had been successful with limited environmental impact, were an indication to some stakeholders the possibility something similar could be created in Victoria. Some advised technology and design had matured even further since the Tasmanian lodges were built. While others were supportive of these ideas, they remained adamant any impact is unacceptable inside of the National Park and therefore such CTD should be built outside.

Alternative designs mentioned were minimalistic huts or demountable buildings. “The situation with huts and minimalistic experiences I think is one of merit. It’s more merit because it doesn’t require the staffing, the infrastructure the maintenance, the upkeep of it” (AC, 2013, 23 August). Demountable lodges were favoured as they could be removed when their life-span was over, returning the area to its natural state. Huts or cabins inside

Chapter Five: Stage Two Results & Discussion
National Parks along the Great Ocean Walk was perceived as unnecessary, as there is existing accommodation and facilities surrounding the area on private land. There was a more positive response to building low impact accommodation within Wilsons Promontory National Park. Environmental management design features such as the inclusion of solar panels and water tanks could lessen impact and the need for large infrastructure, possibly increasing stakeholder support, but as many believed this was not the type of CTDNP which would eventuate, they remained ‘opposed’.

It doesn't have to be walk in, but it definitely has to be environmentally sensitive. Low to the horizon, blending in, using sustainable products, using all the best sustainability methods available. Absolutely no desalination plant and no letting go of waste into the ocean. And a size limit. The size has to be restricted from the footprint point of view, and the number of people it can cater for, sleeping people and any other people who might visit on a day basis. That puts pressure on the environment, and it certainly puts pressure on the waste water system (AC, 2013, 4 August).

Designs should be regulated to ensure they did not disturb the larger landscape or natural setting for other recreation users. Details such as: height; colour; materials; and the ability for the design to blend in with the existing environment should be addressed. Striking the right balance of size, feasibility and minimum visual and environmental impact could require considered direct action and design regulatory strategies, and could influence many stakeholders support or opposition toward CTDNP.

I hope the people who are in charge of framing the constraints, as well as the commercial operators can do it within the limits of having the place when you drive into it still looking like the Quarantine Station and I’m hopeful that they will (LCG, 2013, 22 October).
5.2.6 Public Compliance, Insurance Schemes, Rights & Liabilities

Parks Victoria licensed CTOs were required to have public liability insurance. Recreational groups travelling on organised trips were also treated as CTOs in this area. The person leading the trip was considered a tour operator according to Transport Accident Commission in Victoria, therefore there were benefits to being a part of a larger recreational group, “if you are leading a group of people you are not covered by the public liability so being in a group like we do you get the insurance” (HRG, 2013, 29 July). As advised by Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011), insurance regulatory strategies can incentivise good behaviour. One recreation group interviewed received a lower premium due to their safety record and responsible behaviour.

Stakeholders all agreed a fundamental objective for National Parks was recreation, and the community therefore had a right to access these public areas for this use, “I think that’s what they’re there for, not only to protect but also to offer access to this so people can enjoy those assets, no point locking them away” (LTO, 2013, 15 August). Most stakeholders saw a contradiction in believing the community had a right for National Parks to be accessible, yet only offering camping or in some cases cabins as the only available accommodation, effectively limiting National Park access to overnight visitors who did not want to camp. Eco-centric stakeholders remained adamant access for other visitor groups was not a justifiable excuse to allow CTDNP in these areas as these visitors could stay outside the National Park.

Other stakeholders saw the benefit and compatibly with National Park objectives if alternative forms of accommodation or commercial attractions were built to open National Parks up to a wider visitor market. As each National Park is unique in its situation, CTDNP could be focused to different types of markets and levels of development depending on the National Park.

In terms of commercial interests, I think the value that I have as a business owner and what (business name) does, is that where the argument is, it’s just for the young and the fit that are prepared to sleep in tents, and have knowledge and skills. But that’s a limited group of people who can enjoy
those places and how unfair that is for other. I guess these two businesses broaden the potential for people, for example, my guided walks business brings international visitors to areas, and they might not feel comfortable to do that on their own or people from interstate. A lot of people just don’t have the confidence to engage in an activity like that on their own and they’d like to enjoy the place, but they don’t feel they can. I think there’s a bit of a balance there between my commercial interest and I guess a passion that I have to introduce people to those places in a respectful way (LTO, 2013, 22 August).

Public awareness and engagement with National Parks was acknowledged by several stakeholders as the most effective way to encourage support for the Victorian National Park system. To educate people about the value of National Parks to long term environmental and cultural conservation could increase support from community and in turn from government. The opportunity to increase visitation to a wider breadth of the community, and their right to access, was influential in many stakeholders supporting some form of CTDNP and weighed on the mind of those who ‘opposed’.

People should think about the condition of the National Parks. We’ve got to support out parks. It’s important to keep these special places. Whereas if you lock them up and no one would go in there, it’s out of mind, out of sight. They’re getting people into parks; actually I think it is a good political process because it gives people ownership. They want to keep it and protect it and improve it (AC/LTO, 2013, 22 August).

We need to continue the education of the public. Most of the public are pretty good, but we need to continue that education, I think there is room for better education of the public for what a park is and what it’s for (LRG, 2013, 16 August).

Regulations should therefore support access to National Parks; this included ensuring any CTDNP did not limit public access to areas of significance or reduce the ability of public visitors to carry out their recreation activities. Government would need to balance commercial visitor interests with public needs arising from the complex scenario of allowing commercial exploitation of a public good.
We would have a problem with any desire to create private tracks and trails that others couldn’t share or private facilities of any sort other than huts themselves perhaps that people couldn’t share in. Therefore, the partnership would need to reflect public good as well. In that sense, anybody operating a National Park has certain public obligations quite outside of the commercial ones, in our view (LRG, 2013, 16 August).

Victorian SG addressed the public right to access both for recreation and for Aboriginal and Cultural Heritage Rights through the *Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*. When introducing the bill to parliament, they declared “*any restriction on people’s movements would only be imposed to the extent necessary to fulfil the purpose of the lease*” (Victoria, Legislative Assembly, 2013a:1779). This meant the government declared when assessing a proposal, the issue of community access would be considered before offering a National Park lease. They extended access to National Parks is limited already in some areas, such as Wilsons Promontory National Park where a ballot is taken during peak season to allocate out limited camping spots.

### 5.2.7 Self-regulation

Self-regulation occurs when CTOs control or manage their own behaviour in order to achieve desired outcomes. Guidelines mentoring and enforcing behaviour can be created by: the CTO itself (firm self-regulation); by the tourism industry (industry self-regulation); or by a combination of government, firms and industry (co-regulation and meta-regulation) (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011). CTOs interviewed thought the nature-based tourism industry held high environmental care standards above and beyond those enforced by government regulation due to the reliance of nature as their product, and their personal environmental values. The motivation for working within the industry was to share these values with tourists. Many commented the environmental values of nature-based tourists themselves were a strong motivation for self-regulation, as tourists would not travel with a CTO they believed or saw destroying the environment. In some instances this could lead to a higher standard.
All stakeholders agreed due to the high risk of destroying Victoria’s protected heritage, firm self-regulation was not sufficient and there need to be government involvement, “I think their levels can be higher than what is imposed, but it’s good to have a base” (LTIG, 2013, 4 August). To ensure protection, there needed to be a framework or minimum standard set for the CTO behaviour to abide by, “government should have a hand in it. The reason I say this, is again, the framework has to be set. Self-regulation is only effective within a framework” (LRG, 2013, 16 August).

Government should not ‘trust’ the altruistic values of CTOs when decisions are to be made between conservation and cost; ultimately they believed “self-regulation doesn’t exist. You can’t trust anybody” (LRG, 2013, 20 August). “We can’t afford to trust anybody to be honest with you. In business if things get tough people will exploit” (AC, 2013, 4 August) for example once operating, the CTDNP operators may push to enlarge their development to increase its feasibility. Another example given by one recreation group:

I think we’re very distrustful of self-regulation because it almost, by definition, involves a conflict of interest. It is true that in the long term, responsible operators are going to look after the environment because it’s in their own interest to do so, but here’s an awful temptation for a quick dollar and to cut costs on things like supply and waste product management. In New Zealand for example they had to have a helicopter stop in (to deliver goods and collect waste) and it’s very expensive. They have to. There’d be a strong temptation to want to build a four wheel drive road here or a track there. From our point of view, the only way that (CTDNP) could work is by strong government mandate (LRG, 2013, 16 August).

Low monitoring by Parks Victoria and government, CTOs in National Parks to some extent self-monitored. One CTO explained self-regulation is “totally efficient from a business point of view. Whether it’s effective from conservation, (National) Parks point of view, I would say no. I could do anything here and it would probably take, they (Parks Victoria) wouldn’t even probably know ever what was going on” (AC/LTO, 2013, 23 August). The importance of selecting the right CTO with compatible National Park values
to carry out CTDNP was therefore re-enforced in self-regulation and monitoring discussions. This extended to recreation groups and visitors:

I think you’ve got to take some personal responsibility because who polices it? I’d rather people at Parks Victoria spending their time creating walking tracks and so on. I don’t know how you could possibly police it, it’s not like Asia, where you’ve got people in one little forested area walking around. It’s so vast (HRG, 2013, 24 September).

The nature-based tourism industry developed eco-accreditation and visitor experience accreditation to guide CTOs toward best behaviour. As a co-regulation and incentive strategy, Parks Victoria offered a longer licence period to National Park CTOs who acquired eco-accreditation. The eco-accreditation was not seen as a significant tool to improve marketing and increase visitor numbers, as tourists were mainly unaware of its meaning and existence. For some CTOs this deemed it inefficient and superfluous despite the incentive. For others “it adds to the atmosphere” (LTO, 2013, 1 August) of their business, gave them a framework to operate and a means of communicating their environmental values to both visitors and employees.

We actually had it because it was more in line with our ethos of our business. We felt we were in a National Park we should have that sustainable focus and way in our business. It wasn’t a marketing thing for us, it was purely really just an operational value for us to bring staff on board and then see that they take that on board in their own values (AC/LTO, 2013, 22 August).

Eco-accreditation was seen by most CTOs (both those who had it and those who did not) as too onerous to achieve, with little reward in the marketplace. For co-regulation between government and the nature-based tourism industry to be successful, eco-accreditation needed to be re-designed with a focus on one national eco-accreditation standard which can be marketed to the consumer. With so many different eco-accreditation programs across Australia, marketing messages were diluted and confusing, and resulted in green washing whereby CTOs could easily acquire some form of eco-certification without necessarily behaving in an environmentally sustainable way.
I see there’s a need for a simpler system and there’s a need for identification of the consumer. That’s why it’s got to be a really simple system but somehow it’s got to be converted to people understanding, that’s a big job to educate people (AC/LTO, 2013, 22 August).

The outdoor education and activity industry also had a co-regulation structure with Parks Victoria. The outdoor education and activity industry worked with, and funded by government, to develop Adventure Activity Standards which mitigated risks to the environment, visitors and business. Parks Victoria accepted these standards and required all CTOs conducting recreation activities in National Parks to abide by those developed by the industry. This had benefits to stakeholders. As they explained it effectively allowed them to regulate their own industry, ensuring regulations were realistic, efficient, and effective, increasing the likelihood for compliance. Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) explained it also benefited the regulator, in this case Parks Victoria, in minimising costs to develop their own regulations. The close relationship between the outdoor education and activity industry and Parks Victoria increased the opportunity for regulations to be discussed and revised. Similar to the nature-based tourism industry, it was the values of those working within the industry that made it successful.

At the moment it happens to be the people that we’ve got in the industry really want to see the best out of people and look after everyone. If that dynamic changed, that could cause some issues with self-regulation I would suggest (OE/A, 2013, 27 August).

Visitor Education
Self-regulation extended to National Park visitors, both independent and those with a CTO, as they predominantly controlled their own behaviour. To achieve National Park outcomes, visitor education and awareness of how to behave responsibly was seen as critical by all stakeholders. By communicating National Park values and potential visitor impacts, most people will behave correctly therefore “education doesn’t need to be structured and formal” (OE/A, 2013, 22 August). In other Australian states information is passed on to independent visitors with their National Park annual pass or permit to camp.
“It’s about public education, educating the users” which could be done through “magazines, word of mouth, signage, and internet forums” (HRG, 2013, 24 September).

The dominant benefits of CTOs in National Parks were their abilities to better control and educate their visitors. “In general I would say that going with a tour guide is a good way to ensure appropriate visitation because a tour guide will ensure guests remain on the path” (LTO, 2013, 15 August) lessening monitoring pressures on Parks Victoria. CTOs themselves achieved great job satisfaction from connecting their visitors to nature and by imparting National Park values. This was perceived as an extremely effective way to increase environmental awareness and values for both National Park protection and beyond, “just getting people, school kids to feel the earth, then they will grow up with those values” (OE/A, 2013, 22 August), “connecting with nature in a way that they want to sustain it in the long run but also into their everyday living” (OE/A, 2013, 27 August).
5.3 Summary

This chapter has presented the results from the semi-structured interviews and Hansard transcripts, which elicited stakeholder’s perceptions of existing regulations, and specific proposed or potential regulatory strategies controlling the behaviour of commercial tourism within Victoria’s National Parks. Appendix B (page 268) illustrates each regulatory strategy and its perceived strengths or weaknesses in achieving National Park outcomes as identified by stakeholders. The positive finding here is that many of the results were consistent with Baldwin, Cave and Lodge’s (2011) theoretical considerations. When considering the efficacy of regulations, perhaps more important to stakeholders than the regulatory strategies themselves, was the issue of their creation and enforcement. Some stakeholders remained ‘optimistic’ government would effectively regulate commercial tourism in National Park; others were ‘sceptical.’ SG reasoned “it is both possible and practical to effectively manage private investment in National Parks in a way that complements park values and objectives” (Victoria, Legislative Assembly, 2013c: 2425) and most stakeholders agreed, yet ‘sceptical’ stakeholders did not ‘trust’ government or private investors relying on commercial success, to uphold National Park values. The SOG summarised:

The great disappointment is that the government has poor form on the environment. That is a big issue of trust. The problem the public has is not so much around the commercial interface with the parks system – I think when you explain the issues logically the public understands that – but that this government has such a shocking and poor record. We need to ensure that there are appropriate bipartisan approaches to long-term environmental planning and management and the government has failed on that (Victoria, Legislative Assembly, 2013c: 2438).

The next and final chapter will draw together results from both stages of research to provide a final discussion of conclusions and discuss the research implications and contributions to knowledge.
Chapter Six: Conclusions

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss and draw conclusions from the results of this study and to identify its major limitations. The implications for theory and practice are discussed, specifically in relation to the future regulation of commercial tourism operators in National Parks. A number of recommendations are also made for future research. The contribution of this study to the field of tourism and regulatory practices is discussed followed by a concluding statement.

During the time this research was being conducted, the subject at the centre of this case study, the regulation of commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks, was under government review. This increased the complexity of the research, but added veracity to stakeholder observations as they were commenting on a live issue. To mitigate this complexity, data was collected over a two-year period with stakeholder interviews toward the end of the process. Appendix A (page 266) illustrates both the timeline of events and the data collection. It begins in 2011 with the release of the Victorian Competition and Efficiency Committee (VCEC) final enquiry report into “Unlocking Victorian Tourism” which effectively reignited the debate of commercial tourism inside of Victorian National Park borders by recommending (in part) that government should allow private investment and tourism infrastructure to be built on public land, and concludes with the passing of the Victorian Coalition Government’s National Parks Amendment (Leasing Powers and Other Matters) Bill 2013 in August 2013, which enacted these recommendations.

The need to regulate CTOs operating in National Parks was firmly established from previous literature and past empirical research (Eagles & McCool, 2002; Huybers & Bennett, 1997; McKercher, 1993a; Worboys et al., 2005), and findings from this study support this stance. Regulatory approaches in this context generally seek to control CTO activities and behaviour in order to reduce their negative impact on National Parks. Commercial tourism activity in Victorian National Parks had been limited to mainly day tours, overnight camping trips and a limited number of lease holds on existing infrastructure. The Victorian National Park Act 1975 restricted CTOs from building
tourism infrastructure on publicly protected land. The Victorian Government’s 2013 amendment to allow private investment and commercially built tourism infrastructure within National Parks was therefore a fundamental change to the legislation and subsequently the management practices of the previous 50 years. It divided National Park stakeholders into those who supported the new direction and those in staunch opposition. ‘Supporters’ believed the tourism industry had matured and gained enough knowledge to build sustainable infrastructure within a National Park to bring economic and visitor benefits to National Parks and surrounding regions, while those ‘opposed’ believed any such activity would be better built outside of National Park borders in order to protect the integrity of National Parks.

Stakeholders considered that potential impacts of commercial tourism inside National Parks were magnified when CTOs were able to invest and build infrastructure within the borders. Stakeholders all agreed that if tourism infrastructure was to be built inside National Park borders, an efficacious regulatory system guiding such activity was essential to protect the ethos of the National Parks, that of conservation of environmental and cultural assets and of providing public access to natural areas for recreation. Understanding what regulatory strategies best deliver National Park objectives and how they should be included in such a regulatory system was therefore critical. The Victorian Government in 2013 released “Tourism Investment Opportunities of Significance in National Parks: Guidelines” (DSE, 2013b) to guide and control the EOI process for CTO investment and future infrastructure development proposals. The regulations pertaining to the building and ongoing operations of commercial tourism infrastructure inside of National Park borders were to be developed and released on a case by case basis. The aim of this study was therefore to explore the efficacy of current, proposed and potential regulatory strategies used by government and National Park management to control commercial tourism in the Victorian National Park system from a stakeholder perspective.
6.1 Research Questions

Two research questions were developed in order to fulfil the research aim; both are discussed in this section. The most striking observation from this study was the complexity of the regulatory environment for National Parks. To develop and implement regulations for CTOs in National Parks, the Victorian government was found to be constrained by three distinct conditions. Firstly, the multifaceted nature of the tourism industry necessitated addressing a diversity of regulatory areas including: building regulations; food and liquor licences; workplace health and safety; vehicle registration and driver licensing; employment conditions and many more. Secondly government were dealing with the historically politically contentious issue of environmental conservation. Community protests against previous governments plans for such National Park commercial developments evidenced in case studies by Foster (2006) and Slattery (2002) and more recent actions such as: the consideration of allowing cattle grazing, logging, and prospecting back into Victorian National Parks (Brown AM et al., 2013); decrease funding and cutting job at Parks Victoria (AAP, 2013); and not providing a conservation or environmental policy (VNPA, 2012c), hounded the current Coalition Government. Finally, the various stakeholder groups within the debate held competing values, most evident in the conflict between conservation groups fighting for National Parks to remain public goods conserving environmental and cultural assets, and the tourism industry groups advocating for an easing of regulation to enable National Parks to deliver enhanced economic benefits through commercial development.

Q1a: How do stakeholder’s value and perceive the role of NPs in Victoria?

There were four findings relevant to answering the first part of question one, how do stakeholder’s value and perceive the role of National Parks in Victoria.

Firstly, stakeholders of all types identified conservation of the state’s cultural and natural assets, now and into the future, as the primary role of the Victorian National Park system. Recreation in a natural setting was an important secondary role of the Victorian National Park system, and further to this, providing the community with a place for environmental education and scientific research. These activities needed to be compatible and well regulated so as not to conflict with the primary conservation role. Findings which resonate with both theory (Eagles & McCool, 2002) and practice (Parks Victoria, 2013)
of National Parks. Stakeholders also clearly understood that each individual National Park within the Victorian state system had its own unique environmental assets and infrastructure, meaning recreation activities within one National Park or environmentally sensitive area may not be acceptable in another. The most accepted recreation activities by stakeholders were those based on natural appreciation, such as bushwalking or camping, resembling Sax’s (1980) beliefs that National Parks should be areas for reflective recreation. In terms of high impact recreation there were mixed responses. The majority of stakeholders were opposed to activities such as motorbike riding and four-wheel driving. Other stakeholders supported these activities advocating that National Parks should be accessible for various types of recreation, and these high impact activities could be compatible if properly controlled and limited to hardened areas.

Secondly, an early and important realisation was that, in this study, interest groups within a stakeholder category were not all homogenous. For example not all CTOs shared the same opinions, each group was found to potentially contain a range of values and beliefs in relation to National Parks and tourism. As stated earlier, all stakeholders did identify conservation of the state’s cultural and natural assets, now and into the future, as the primary role of the Victorian National Park system. These assets, however, were valued from an eco-centric standpoint (either scientific protection for biodiversity, flora and fauna or the romantic image of protecting nature) and from an anthropocentric standpoint (as a setting for recreation and wise-use) (Turner, 1981). The prominent value messages from this study are presented in Table 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.1: Anthropocentric &amp; Eco-centric messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anthropocentric messages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· There is potential in National Parks for development, and it should therefore be ‘unlocked’ and realised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· National Parks are assets for the tourism industry to exploit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· National Parks are responsible for generating income for their own management and for the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As to be expected from previous research (Crowley, 1997; Darcy & Wearing, 2009; McKercher, 1997) and illustrated in Figure 6.1, Conservation Groups remained predominantly eco-centric. Similar to previous Victorian studies (Foster, 2005; Slattery, 2002) the State Government and Tourism Industry Groups were largely anthropocentric in their comments. The State community comments were also eco-centric, however it is important to note these comments were made by community members who felt strongly enough about the National Park issue to comment, and may therefore not be representative of all community members. Recreation Groups and CTOs were mixed in their comments; similar to the Tasmanian public in Crowley’s (1997) study, they had an overarching eco-centric value mindset, but with some anthropocentric reasons. They valued National Parks for the natural setting it provided for their recreation and tourism activities (anthropocentric) however were adamant such activities should be based on nature appreciation and upholding conservation as priority (eco-centric).

Thirdly, there was an intense conflict between eco-centric and anthropocentric value holders. Media releases announcing government plans to accept proposals for CTDNPs concentrated on the potential economic value of National Parks, illustrating a strong anthropocentric value set by both the government and the state Tourism Industry Groups.
Eco-centrics, mainly those from conservation groups, the wider Victorian community and some CTOs and recreation groups, valued National Parks for their conservation value and saw the government and tourism industry group messages as in direct conflict with their values and idea of good National Park policy. Fear these policy outcomes would shift National Park values from conservation to economic values, eco-centric stakeholders retaliated by waging war on the government and tourism industry vowing to fight against any future proposals for tourism development inside of National Park borders. Promises from government and the tourism industry that future CTDNP would be ‘sensitive’ and ‘sustainable’ did little to appease this group of stakeholders. They perceived Victorian Government actions in passing the National Parks Amendment (Leasing Powers and Other Matters)(2013) Bill as anti-environment and pro-development and believed developers would value their return on investment over conservation outcomes.

As discussed in the literature review, anthropocentric values and actions do not necessarily result in environmental degradation of a natural asset; rather they value the environment for its use to human activities. In the Victorian National Park system, in areas where CTDNP could be allowed, the environment would be protected for its potential to deliver a natural setting for eco-tourists. Pressey (1993) proposed valuing land for both its human use (anthropocentric) and conservation (eco-centric) value may result in an increase in the number of areas protected overall; arguing anthropocentric policies can still deliver conservation outcomes. Within this study, all stakeholders believed conservation was the fundamental role of a National Park; however conflict was prevalent when discussion turned to how this was best be achieved: by valuing the National Park as a commercial tourism asset in order to generate income and increase its human use value; or leaving it as a purely public good for its value to conserving environmental and cultural assets for future generations.

These findings of conflict between stakeholder values and government plans for CTDNP reflect those found in similar previous studies. Slattery’s (2002) research on government plans for commercial accommodation in Wilsons Promontory National Park and Munro, King and Polonsky’s (2006) study on the proposal for a commercial visitor information centre in Point Campbell National both detailed cases where the Victorian community
and conservation group values conflicted with government plans. In both cases government plans were abandoned due to the conflict. Darcy and Wearing’s (2009) study detailed stakeholder conflict during tourism development of the North Head National Park Quarantine Station in NSW which resulted in lengthening the development and building process. Previous conclusions attested there is a necessity for understanding stakeholder values and conflicts and for genuine government engagement in stakeholder consultation (Foster, 2006; Munro, King & Polonsky, 2006; Slattery, 2002). The findings from this case study suggest similar conclusions can be reached, that the Victorian government needs to improve in these areas if they wish to minimise the potential for protest against any future proposals they intend to consider or accept for CTDNP.

Finally, even though Conservation Groups in this study were in support of public access to National Parks, other stakeholders perceived them as wanting to lock up National Parks. Similar results were previously found in McKercher (1993b) and Turner (1981) where Conservation Groups showed a clear disdain for commercial tourism. McKercher (1993b) admitted the environment does need its advocates within the National Park commercial tourism debate, but he recommended conservation groups could be more beneficial to policy development efforts if they accepted National Parks had to balance conservation aims and commercial tourism use. Conservation groups within this study were supportive of visitor access and commercial tourism in some form, understanding it promoted community support for the system and could foster environmental values in visitors. They did however believe visitor access and commercial tourism activities were sufficient without resorting to building tourism infrastructure within National Park borders.
Q1b: How do stakeholder’s value and perceive the role of commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks?

The previous section addressed the first part of question one, how stakeholders perceived and valued the role of National Parks. This section contains the five findings relevant to the second part of question one, how do stakeholders value and perceive the role of commercial tourism in National Parks.

Firstly commercial tourism was a recognised and valued part of the Victorian National Park system by all stakeholders. Stakeholder opinions only differed between *what* types of commercial tourism were acceptable and the *level* of tourism infrastructure seen as compatible with National Park conservation objectives. All stakeholders were accepting of low impact commercial tourism which did not require built infrastructure such as bushwalking or camping tours. All stakeholders were supportive of built tourism infrastructure adjacent to National Park borders or in nearby regional areas. A central finding was that the large majority of stakeholders were supportive of the utilisation of ‘existing’ infrastructure by commercial operators for tourism purposes such as accommodation or a visitor centre, such as the Point Nepean National Park Quarantine site. It was the amendment to government legislation in August 2013 to allow private investment and the building of ‘new’ tourism infrastructure inside of National Parks which brought the most stakeholder opposition, with the majority of stakeholders strongly ‘opposed’ to these changes, and a minority ‘supportive’ of potential CTDNP.

Secondly, the predominant desired outcome for all stakeholders was for sustainable tourism. Remarkably the great majority of stakeholders shared Butler’s (2000) view that sustainable tourism was possible, however as in the literature and the tourism industry, there was no consistent stakeholder vision of what this looked like. There was a general belief that sustainable tourism would involve low-impact tourism infrastructure which would realise the benefits of commercial tourism in National Parks, while controlling its potential negative impacts to ensure long-term conservation objectives were achieved. Specific criteria of what sustainable tourism could involve differed between stakeholders in line with their views of what forms of commercial tourism and infrastructure they believed could be compatible with National Park conservation objectives. Some
stakeholders, predominantly those within the tourism industry, believed larger lodge style accommodation could be built sustainably within National Park borders, while others agreed, yes it could be built sustainably, but these types of larger facilities should remain outside of National Park borders. The majority believed low-impact walk-up huts could be sustainable, however these were seen as unnecessary in National Parks along the Great Ocean Walk where similar accommodations already exist close the National Park borders. The most accepted location for walk-up huts would be in more remote backcountry areas, such as those in Wilsons Promontory National Park, where existing facilities cannot be accessed.

Further to this, a stakeholder’s belief of how compatible government and the tourism industry’s ‘sustainable tourism’ ideals were with their own greatly influenced their attitude toward CTDNP and the legislation changes. For example stakeholders who believed low-impact walk-up accommodation could be built sustainably were ‘supportive’ only if they believed this is what government and the tourism industry intended to deliver. For the majority of stakeholders, although they agreed such facilities could be built sustainably, they believed government and the tourism industry intended to build large incompatible infrastructure, and were therefore ‘opposed’ to the legislation changes. Stakeholders explained they developed this opinion as government is proposing long-term leases of up to 99 years to be given to CTOs to build inside of National Parks, which they believe indicated government desired large private investment, resulting in larger CTDNP. This was an interesting finding, given that the government and tourism industry had listed their best practice examples as the low-impact walk-up accommodation built inside National Parks along the Milford Track in New Zealand and the Overland Trail in Tasmania. Other best practice CTDNP listed by government and the tourism industry were low-impact, larger style accommodations built outside of National Park borders, such as Freycinet and Cradle Mountain Lodges in Tasmania and Kangaroo Islands Southern Lodge in South Australia. ‘Opposed’ stakeholders did not believe these best practice example indicated government’s true intentions of the legislation changes, but believed these examples only supported their ideology that large CTD should be built outside of National Parks. They felt this was especially true for Victoria where the National Parks were small in size and close to regional areas which could support
infrastructure development, and were especially critical of land regulations which had prevented previous proposals for CTD on private land adjacent to National Parks.

Thirdly, a critical finding of this case study was the importance stakeholder perception of government regulatory efficacy played in determining their opinion toward CTDNP. There was an understanding by all stakeholders that commercial tourism was an exploitive industry and a strong regulatory structure was necessary to achieve sustainable National Park tourism outcomes, a view well documented in the literature (Huybers & Bennett, 1997; McKercher, 1993a). Stakeholders could be categorised into two groups, those ‘trusting’ government regulation and those ‘sceptical’ of its efficacy. ‘Trusting’ stakeholders were mainly those who were already conducting tourism within National Parks and they believed government and National Park management would design, implement and enforce effective regulations onto CTDNPs. They were therefore more likely to ‘support’ the 2013 government legislation changes to allow private investment and CTDNP. ‘Sceptical’ stakeholders explained they developed their opinion from their disappointment in environmental decisions made by the Coalition Government (for example allowing cattle grazing in Alpine National Park), the decreased funding for Parks Victoria, and the perception government valued economic outcomes over conservation. ‘Sceptical’ stakeholders feared regulations would be designed to favour the economic focus of government and the tourism industry. Even if suitable regulations were put in place, ‘sceptical’ stakeholders believed government would not adequately resource Parks Victoria to enforce and monitor them. ‘Sceptical’ stakeholders were therefore more likely to ‘oppose’ CTDNP.

An important finding of this study was that a stakeholder’s perception of government regulatory efficacy was found to be a more reliable determinant of ‘support’ or ‘opposition’ of CTDNP than that of their eco-centric or anthropocentric value set (illustrated in Figure 6.2). For example some anthropocentric stakeholders supported the idea of tourism development inside of National Park borders, but due to their ‘sceptical’ view of the ability of government to effectively regulate such a development, were ‘opposed.’ This may be explained because a stakeholder with anthropocentric views remained protective of National Parks for their human use and if they were sceptical’ of
government’s ability to effectively regulate against potential damage to National Parks from CTDNP, then they were more likely to be ‘opposed’ to it. The importance of this finding is that it shifts the conversation of stakeholder attitude toward CTDNP from a simplistic value based debate, to a more nuanced discussion which must include greater focus on the level of stakeholder ‘trust’ in government to develop and implement an efficacious regulatory system.

Fourthly, further important findings of the complexities of stakeholders ‘support’ and ‘opposition’ toward CTDNP were evident. Many stakeholders who identified as ‘supporters’ of CTDNP conceded that building outside of National Parks would be their preferable option. Because these stakeholders also believed infrastructure could be developed sustainably inside the National Parks, and in some cases this would be the best option, they identified themselves as ‘supporters’ of government legislation changes, ‘trusting’ government would regulate effectively to ensure sustainable tourism outcomes.
were achieved by building outside in most cases, and only inside National Park borders where appropriate.

Some stakeholders who identified as ‘opposed’ to CTDNP acknowledged allowing tourism infrastructure within National Parks could improve the variety of accommodation and increase access to National Parks to a wider section of the community, an outcome they were greatly in favour with. When questioned further, these ‘opposers’ were in fact ‘supportive’ of CTOs using and developing existing National Park infrastructure. They were even ‘supportive’ of building new infrastructure if it was low-impact and sustainable. However they were ‘sceptical’ of government and did not believe CTDNPs would be regulated efficaciously to meet these outcomes long-term, they therefore identified themselves as ‘opposed’ to government plans.

Fifthly, stakeholders identified benefits of commercial tourism in National Parks consistent with previous empirical research from McKercher (1997) and National Park literature (Butler & Boyd, eds, 2000; Eagles & McCool, 2002; Worboys et al., 2005). All stakeholders agreed commercial tourism played a role in facilitating access for potential visitors who may otherwise not have been able to visit a National Park, perhaps because of logistical transport issues or confidence in spending time in nature. In addition tourism brought an economic entity to the National Park and its surrounding region. Stakeholders were careful to articulate commercial tourism should not have a predominant role as an income source for National Park management as this would jeopardise decision making processes favouring commercial outcomes over conservation. Other benefits were listed as visitor education; quality visitor experiences; visitor safety; better visitor behaviour; and generating support for conservation through nature appreciation.

Potential negative impacts of CTDNP were also identified. First and foremost the potential for environmental damage, specifically that caused by implementing energy sources; access roads; land clearing; fire precautions; and employee accommodations. Secondly the destruction of the natural setting for other recreation users and the potential for any long-term scaring of the landscape; and finally the reduction of public access for...
independent recreation visitors if CTOs were allowed to develop private areas within the National Park. This last finding was reminiscent of arguments put forward by Buckley (2002a) and Woodley (1993) that National Parks were public goods, not areas to be restricted to those who pay the highest entry price. It has been mentioned previously in literature, and again in this case study by several stakeholders, that any move towards commercial tourism which prioritises high paying visitors could risk changing the character of National Park visitation away from recreation based on nature appreciation. This was particularly poignant for stakeholders when discussing Wilsons Promontory National Park which had a long and valued history of family and camping-based recreation focused on spending time in nature. Stakeholders were concerned this type of recreation would be phased out in favour of the high end eco-tourist market, effectively destroying this family-focused traditional form of National Park use.

Q2: How do stakeholders perceive the efficacy of existing, proposed & potential regulatory strategies controlling commercial tourism within Victorian NPs?

Four elements influential to stakeholder responses to question two - how stakeholders perceive the efficacy of government regulatory strategies controlling commercial tourism within Victorian National Parks - were identified and organised. These are presented in Figure 6.3 as 1. Stakeholder’s desired outcomes; 2. Perception of regulatory development; 3. Regulatory strategy performance; and 4. Perception of regulatory control. All four elements influenced a stakeholder’s perception of regulatory efficacy and further to this, their attitude toward commercial tourism inside of Victorian National Parks. The elements were found to be interconnected, but not necessarily linear in nature. In this section each of the four elements are explained, followed by a fifth finding considering stakeholder’s thoughts on the structure of the relationship between Parks Victoria, interest groups and CTOs; and a final finding relating to the potential issues that may affect the success of such relationships.
Figure 6.3 Stakeholder’s perception of regulatory efficacy & attitude toward commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders desired sustainable &amp; sensitive tourism, but differed on what this was. Factors included stakeholders’:</td>
<td>Stakeholders considered the NP values of those developing regulations &amp; the creation process:</td>
<td>Stakeholders explained considerations of the efficacy of specific regulatory strategies &amp; system design</td>
<td>Stakeholders considered the ability of government &amp; Parks Victoria to monitor &amp; enforce regulations, &amp; CTO compliance. Factors included:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Level of acceptable environmental damage</td>
<td>• Did government value economic outcomes over conservation?</td>
<td>• Address critical issues</td>
<td>• Resources allocated to Parks Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perception of business sustainability</td>
<td>• Were the regulations comprehensive?</td>
<td>• Address desirable outcomes</td>
<td>• Values &amp; resources of CTOs to compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opinion toward building inside or outside NP borders</td>
<td>• Could future governments re-interpret regulations?</td>
<td>• Be attractive &amp; benefit over cost</td>
<td>• Values of the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The size, design, location, energy use &amp; infrastructure needs of commercial tourism</td>
<td>• Was there sufficient community &amp; stakeholder consultation?</td>
<td>• Encourages innovation</td>
<td>• Lobbying power of the tourism industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholder perception of regulatory efficacy & ability of government & tourism industry ability to deliver desired outcomes

- TRUSTING
  - More likely to SUPPORT commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks

- SCEPTICAL
  - More likely to OPPOSE commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks

Chapter Six: Conclusions
1. **Desired Outcomes**

The first element influencing a stakeholder’s perception of regulatory efficacy and attitude toward CTDNP was their desired outcome in relation to CTDNP. Most stakeholders desired ‘sustainable tourism’, however there was no clear vision of what this was; stakeholders did consider it to involve both business sustainability and the long-term condition of the environment. The main differences in opinion were focussed on whether tourism should be inside or outside the National Park; the size, location and design of the development; and the level of infrastructure needed to carry out commercial tourism activities. For example, if a stakeholder ‘supported’ the building of low-impact walk-up accommodation, then they agreed if regulations controlling the size, design, location and environmental impact were implemented and delivered this outcome, they would perceive that the regulations were effective and thus ‘supported’ CTDNP. If a stakeholder believed all tourism infrastructures should be outside of the National Park, then they perceived the Victorian *National Parks Amendment (Leasing Powers and Other Matters) Bill 2013* and the regulatory barriers restricting CTD on adjacent private land as failure of government, and regulatory inefficacy.

2. **Creating Regulations**

The second element influencing stakeholder’s perception of regulatory efficacy is the process by which the regulations are created and the perception of the government’s values in creating them. For example if a stakeholder themselves held strong conservation values, and they perceived the government to value economic outcomes over conservation, then they generally feared any regulations created by such a government would be developed with less environmental restrictions, allowing greater profit for CTOs and potentially resulting in regulatory failure delivering poorer conservation outcomes. A stakeholder with this viewpoint was more likely to therefore ‘oppose’ CTDNP. There was consideration here of not just the government in power, but the ability of any future government to exploit and manipulate regulations to provide 99 year leases on publicly protected land. Figgis (1999) shared a similar viewpoint, that regulations can be ‘malleable’ over time, leading to long-term regulatory failure. The fact that the Victorian Government’s initial *“Tourism Investment Opportunities of Significance in National Parks: Guidelines”* (DSE, 2013b) for the EOI process were considered by many to be somewhat imprecise, increased some stakeholder’s fears for potential for future...
governments to interpret them as they saw fit and thus led to their ‘scepticism’ of
government’s regulatory ability.

This research did not seek to assess the policy process by which legislation changes
occurred. However during stakeholder interviews the importance of stakeholder
consultation during the policy process became apparent. In particular, stakeholders were
concerned with the short time allocated to community consultation in the EOI process,
just 28 days. Consistent with previous findings in Victoria (Foster, 2006; Munro, King &
Polonsky, 2006; Slattery, 2002) the government were seen to be minimising the
opportunity for community consultation, and limiting the amount of information
stakeholders received, creating an atmosphere of mistrust from ‘sceptical’ stakeholders in
particular. All stakeholders were not only keen to be informed, but believed they had a
valuable perspective to offer government during this process, given that many of these
stakeholder groups worked within the National Parks where developments may take
place. It appeared better communication from government and more comprehensive
consultation with stakeholders could improve stakeholder perceptions of regulatory
efficacy and potentially increase support for commercial tourism outcomes.

3. Regulatory Strategy Performance & System Design
The third element found to influence a stakeholder’s perception of regulatory efficacy
was the overall design of the regulatory structure and effective use of each regulatory
strategy to address issues and deliver desired outcomes. To a minority of stakeholders,
this element was not influential in shaping their perceptions. They placed more
importance on outcomes rather than the regulatory strategies used to achieve them. The
majority of stakeholders however believed an effective regulatory system should combine
a range of government, industry and self-regulatory strategies to address potential issues
and deliver desired outcomes based on each strategy’s strengths and weaknesses, a view
supported by the regulatory theory of Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) and the empirical
research by Russell, Lafferty and Loudoun (2008). A stakeholder’s perception of how
well the regulatory system would be designed and how each strategy would be utilised,
influenced their perception of overall regulatory efficacy.
Studies categorising the content of National Park policies and regulatory strategies was found to be a major theme in the literature review. The strength of this case study was that a framework based on the regulatory theory from Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) was used to categorise and discuss the regulatory strategies of commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks with stakeholders. This allowed for stakeholder comments to be compared with regulatory theory, adding depth to conclusions and recommendations (illustrated in detail in Appendix B, page 268). The relevant finding include: command and control strategies; market-harnessing controls; design and direct action; and self-regulation, summarised below.

**Command & Control Strategies**

The majority of stakeholders believed government enforced strategies should include structured intervention in the form of command and control strategies to deliver critical outcomes, such as conservation. While other outcomes which may be desired but not central to National Park objectives, such as CTOs using local products to support surrounding businesses in regional areas, could be best achieved by market forces or incentive based strategies, forcing local producers to compete and potentially improving the quality of their products. These stakeholder conclusions are supported by Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) theory. The command and control strategies requiring CTOs to hold licences or permits to carry out activities within National Parks were seen as effective in monitoring numbers and setting requirements for CTO behaviour, but could be more efficient in their administrative, comments found in previous studies (Huybers & Bennett, 1997; Moore et al., 2009; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). Further to this, it was believed by most existing CTOs and recreation groups interviewed, that licences should be extended to cover school groups, and potentially other high-impact independent visitors to educate and control their behaviour within National Parks, a recommendation also made in previous research by Hill and Pickering (2002).
**Market-Harnessing Controls**

As the “Tourism Investment Opportunities of Significance in National Parks: Guidelines” (DSE, 2013b) for the government’s EOI process were released at the time this study was being conducted, stakeholders were able to comment on these specific strategies. All stakeholders perceived the EOI process as the most effective in invigorating innovation in the tourism industry and attracting private investment, the strength of market-harnessing controls according to the theory (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge 2011). Almost all stakeholders believed government should not invest public funds or attempt to build tourism infrastructure themselves, preferring a CTO to accept the market risk by investing their own funds. In addition, most stakeholders felt a CTO would be more experienced and successful at operating tourism facilities, conclusions which again resonate with the Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) theory.

**Design & Direct Action**

The government’s design and direct action strategies which would regulate the CTDNP were seen as important to all stakeholders. At the time of interviewing there was some uncertainty by some stakeholders over the government’s regulatory efficacy in this area. Most stakeholders considered critical elements such as: the size; location; energy consumption; and infrastructure of CTDNP, needed stringent regulatory guidelines to effectively deliver positive outcomes, and to be efficient these needed to be communicated early in the EOI process. Doubt was raised however as the government EOI guidelines for submitting proposals for CTDNP in Point Nepean National Park were imprecise in these areas, for example they included no height or location restrictions. This increased stakeholder uncertainty and ‘scepticism’ of the ability for government to implement efficacious regulatory strategies which would protect conservation and recreation outcomes. Stakeholders acknowledged fewer regulations could increase potential innovation from CTDNP proponents, however they also thought better defined regulations at the EOI stage would minimise the possibility of CTO’s spending resources on developing proposals which would not fit government needs, considerations of the EOI process echoed by the theory (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011).
Self-Regulation

Self-regulation was present in the forms of industry self-regulation (such as eco-accreditation); co-regulation (Parks Victoria offering longer licence periods to CTOs who are eco-certified) and firm self-regulation. The industry self-regulation was currently seen by some CTOs as too rigorous to achieve, in both cost and effort, for little reward. These CTOs believed their customers had little knowledge of what the accreditation meant, rendering useless its marketing potential. Other CTOs saw some benefit in adopting eco-accreditation which gave them guidelines on how to manage their environmental impact and believed customers did respond to good environmental practices. All CTOs interviewed, and some other stakeholders commented, there needed to be a greater push on consumer awareness of accreditation and an improvement in the approval process for it to be a more efficacious regulatory strategy. Stakeholders extended these thoughts to the co-regulation strategy of Parks Victoria that offers an extended licence to CTOs with eco-certification. A low adoption rate for this incentive (only 1% of licensed CTOs) indicated to most stakeholders the weakness in both industry accreditation and the incentive strategy. Firm self-regulation was seen by all stakeholders as effective in delivering innovation into the industry, responding to tourist needs market demands, and in potentially delivering greater conservation outcomes as CTOs seek to protect the environmental and cultural assets their products are based upon, lowering regulatory costs to government. All stakeholders were adamant government enforced regulations needed to provide a base of acceptable standards and activities inside of National Parks, while any further self-regulation imposed by the firm itself could allow for innovation and self-management. These conclusions were well supported by theory (Baldwin, Cave & Lodge 2011) and previous research (Huybers & Bennett, 1997).

4. Monitoring & Compliance
The fourth element which influenced a stakeholder’s perspective of regulatory efficacy was their perception of government and Parks Victoria’s ability to implement, enforce and monitor CTOs in National Parks; and the ability or intention for CTOs to comply with regulations. The large majority of stakeholders perceived the government underfunded and under resourced Parks Victoria. Although most praised the organisation for their hard work and good intentions, many believed that Parks Victoria were not able to effectively enforce existing regulations for CTOs and recreation users, and feared
increasing their workload to incorporate management of CTDNPs would lead to regulatory failure in the long-term and poor outcomes. Insufficient funding of Parks Victoria and their predecessors has been a historical problem according to Anderson (2000) and Figgis (1999); these continuing concerns were the foundation of many stakeholders’ ‘sceptical’ attitude toward government and Parks Victoria in regard to their ability to regulate efficaciously and to achieve desired outcomes. Some stakeholders therefore believed even if a suitable regulatory framework and partnership structure were put into place, it would not be implemented or monitored sufficiently by Parks Victoria.

Because stakeholders did not have confidence in Parks Victoria to enforce regulations, they placed great importance on whether or not they believed CTOs would comply to regulations if they were left unmonitored. Specifically a majority of stakeholders felt if CTOs were granted long-term leases and were left unmonitored by Parks Victoria, they may not fully comply with regulations if they believed they could realise a faster return on investment. If a stakeholder believed CTOs would not comply with regulations, they were more likely to ‘oppose’ CTDNP, fearing this would jeopardise conservation outcomes. If a stakeholder believed a CTO would comply if unmonitored, they were more likely to ‘support’ CTDNP. Stakeholder’s therefore placed a high importance on the government’s EOI process which would evaluate and approve leaseholders. Stakeholders believed any CTO granted a long-term lease should clearly demonstrate compatible National Park values (i.e. prioritising conservation over economic gain), indicating, should they be left unmonitored, they would continue to make decisions in favour of conservation.

Within this study, National Park users (CTOs, Recreation Groups, & Conservation Groups) were found to be more compliant to regulations if they felt they were included in creating them, a strength of co-regulation supported by the theory (Baldwin & Cave, 1999). Empirical studies into CTO and visitor compliance to National Park regulations was a major theme of previous empirical research identified in the literature review. This research further supported previous findings by Russell, Lafferty and Loudoun (2008) that a CTO’s perception of their regulator influenced their compliance to regulations. CTOs interviewed in this case study admitted to not fully complying with regulations as
they believed Parks Victoria would not find out, Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) claim a weakness of government bureaucracy. The regulations in question were predominantly administrative based, not jeopardising conservation. In fact, of the CTOs interviewed in this case study, most held strong conservation values and sharing these with the wider community is what had initially motivated them to be involved with the nature-based tourism industry. Similar to Huybers and Bennett’s (1997) findings, CTOs operating in National Parks in this study agreed strong regulations needed to be in place to protect the National Park environment from tourism activities, yet they were also pro-active in seeking to ensure their businesses limited their impacts on the environment. They explained it was important to their customers and their business image to adopt good environmental behaviour, and to limit the potential of damaging the environment on which their product was reliant. Some stakeholders believed potential CTOs who would be given the opportunity to invest and build in National Parks would share similar ideals, and were confident they would comply to government regulations, whereas other stakeholders remained sceptical.

The four elements discussed from Figure 6.3 (page 238) each influenced a stakeholder’s perception of regulatory efficacy, and their overall attitude toward CTDNP. They were found to be interconnected, yet not necessarily linear in nature. The ability to potentially map decision points which determine a stakeholder’s perception of government, regulatory efficacy and ultimately their support or opposition to any prospective government plans for CTDNP is a unique finding of this study. It would greatly assist all those involved in stakeholder consultation by highlighting the key information government needs to communicate during such processes. Stakeholders were found to be extremely cautious when discussing regulation in the context of National Parks. They were well aware the outcome of regulatory failure was the potential for irreversible environmental damage and for many this risk was seen as too high. Eco-centric stakeholders in particular believed the potential benefits of increasing commercial tourism activities inside of National Parks did not justify the potential costs of regulatory failure. Therefore government should support development of tourism infrastructure on private land adjacent to or near National Parks by deregulating laws which prohibited such land use.
A fifth finding was the desire for stakeholders to develop a greater shared partnership relationship with Parks Victoria. Some Tourism Industry Groups, CTOs, Recreation Groups and Conservation Groups already had a high level of interaction with Parks Victoria, including the sharing of maintenance and environmental monitoring activities, and considerable involvement with developing the policies and regulations which governed their activities. Most argued though they had more to offer, and felt they could be consulted more. Specifically conservation groups, recreation groups and CTOs believed they could partake more in: developing and delivering visitor education programs to both commercial and independent visitors; assisting in environmental management and monitoring; and in consultation about CTDs on public land. Similar to the CTOs in Haukeland’s (2011) Norway study, these National Park user groups felt underutilised in Victorian National Parks and saw great potential in developing a successful partnership to increase Parks Victoria resources. In return CTOs, recreation groups and conservation groups desired to be acknowledged and treated as an integrated part of the National Park system and as ‘good users’.

Finally, some stakeholders had concerns government and Parks Victoria would not be able to develop an effective management relationship with a CTO lessee holder. This concern was supported from both previous research results (Moore et al., 2009) and findings within this study from those with existing relationships with Parks Victoria (including one existing lessee). The majority of CTOs interviewed had a positive relationship with Parks Victoria, but raised issues around communication and bureaucracy regarding decision making and regulatory processes, which hindered their business operations. In addition the staff turnover at Parks Victoria and their lack of government funding and resources inhibited the development of relationships. For a highly invested lessee this could prove crucial in delivering not only sustainable environmental outcomes, but sustainable business outcomes and a successful long-term partnership.

These exact stakeholder concerns with partnerships between public and private entities of communication, bureaucracy and decision making have been found in previous research (Huybers & Bennett, 1997; Moore et al., 2009; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). Further to this, these issues have been raised as areas in need of improvement in
regulatory reform reports by industry (TTF, 2007) and by the government itself (RRTF, 1997). Despite this, they remain unresolved. Given the history and occurrence of these issues, with little apparent improvement, there was nothing in this study to suggest a new CTDNP in a Victorian National Park would result in a better outcome. The majority of stakeholders felt unless there was a significant improvement in government funding and Parks Victoria resources to improve communication and regulatory processes, any new partnership would face the same difficulties and result in poor conservation and visitor experience outcomes, and potentially business failure.

6.2 Limitations

This research adopted an interpretative qualitative paradigm, using a case study method, to investigate a complex and evolving issue. There were six limitations identified in the research. They were addressed and minimised where possible, and are discussed in this section.

Firstly it must be acknowledged case study methodology limits the research to an individual case and this can affect the ability of the findings to be generalised. This is a common issue with National Park research in general. National Park systems are unique entities, with their own management structures and levels of acceptable commercial tourism. This case study explored the regulations of commercial tourism within Victorian National Parks. The findings are unique to this study, and caution should be used when applying them to other National Park systems, however it is possible to do so. Within most National Park systems where commercial tourism exists, the internal relationship between public and private sectors is influenced by regulations, government policies and stakeholder values and attitudes (Sowman & Pearce, 2000). Results from this case study relating to these elements can therefore be considered, with caution, in other National Park situations where public and private interaction exists.
Secondly, the specific regulations which would control the approved CTDNPs within Victoria’s National Parks were yet to be released by the Victorian Government when this study was conducted. This made evaluating regulatory strategies more difficult and limited internal validity. Utilising Baldwin Cave and Lodge’s (2011) regulatory framework and further developing it based on National Park visitor management literature, did ensure a variety of potential strategies were considered and using existing theoretical measures increased the reliability of findings. The result was the research produced: key findings on the few existing and proposed regulations; and recommendations considering how government could potentially regulate in the future.

Thirdly, measuring values, attitudes and beliefs in social studies involved its own limitations. Respondents were self-reporting during interviews, and secondary data including stakeholder comments was used with the potential of not considering all possible influences and potentially limiting internal validity. The theoretical framework of eco-centric/anthropocentric values has been tested within National Park case studies previously (Darcy & Wearing, 2002; McKercher, 1997; Turner, 1980). Results within this study are comparable to previous results. Further to this, triangulation of data was used to increase case study findings as recommended by Yin (2009).

Fourthly, during Stage One of the research secondary data was used. Limitations to secondary data are well documented in that it is not created for the specific research purpose (Jennings, 2010). During analysis and discussion of results it was therefore important to remember the information gathered may not have been representative of each stakeholder group, but only those who felt strongly enough to make a submission or comment about CTDNP. By gathering multiple sources of evidence and applying triangulation through confirming results from stakeholder interviews, this limitation was reduced, but not removed. Stakeholder value and attitude findings, and perceptions of issues and benefits of commercial tourism in National Parks, were reminiscent of these in previous studies by Darcy and Wearing (2009); Foster (2006); McKercher (1993b & 1997); Munro, King and Polonsky (2006); Slattery (2002); and Turner (1980);, who all utilised some forms of secondary data within their studies.
Fifthly, in the second stage of data collection, it was acknowledged there was a limitation in accessing a suitable representation of the community, and therefore this stakeholder group was eliminated from the second stage interview process. In addition Parks Victoria did not accept an invitation to be interviewed. Results from secondary data in Stage One were therefore used to establish results from these groups. Moreover the Stage Two sample was firstly purposeful in inviting representatives from each stakeholder category identified in Stage One to participate, but secondly one of convenience, where all those who accepted the invitation were included in the final sample. The perceptions of those not interviewed cannot be known. To reduce this limitation, triangulation of the interview data and the secondary data from Stage One improved result validity and reliability, consistent with case study method (Yin, 2009).

Finally, within a case study there is a limitation in ensuring all information has been gathered and considered satisfactorily to give a complete picture. To address this limitation, an embedded case study design was adopted. Three National Parks with various levels of commercial tourism activity were studied in addition to the state system as a whole, and this facilitated in generating a rounded picture of the overall case study unit. For example, CTDNP of the existing infrastructure in Point Nepean National Park was largely supported; however the building of new infrastructure in other National Parks was largely opposed. To further reduce this limitation, case study principles as advised by Yin (2003) were established by gathering a variety of data over a period of time (Appendix A, page 266) and keeping a thorough chain of evidence through the electronic programs of NVivo 10 (QSR International) and Endnote X6 (Thomson Reuters). This went towards creating a comprehensive data set to interpret from. Further to this a systematic and well documented analysis procedure was conducted as outlined by Saldaña (2009) and Yin (2009) to all data collected to improve reliability. This has reduced the possibility ‘undesired’ data could have been eliminated by the researcher, and instead created a broad complete overall ‘picture’ of the case study.
6.3 Implications of the Research

This case study investigated the regulations controlling commercial tourism within Victorian National Parks, with a focus on the legislation changes to allow private investment and CTDNP in the form of built infrastructure within National Park borders. It explored these regulations from a stakeholder perspective, discovering stakeholder perceptions of the regulatory structure greatly influenced their attitude toward commercial tourism. The research findings have implications to both practice and theory which are discussed here.

Implications for CTDNP in Victorian National Parks

As a real time case study, the findings from this research have revealed six implications for the Victorian Government regarding commercial tourism in National Parks and for the tourism industry and CTOs.

Firstly, this study found that stakeholders ranged from those directly influenced by National Park policy (i.e. CTOs, recreation user groups, or conservation groups), to the broader community, including active National Park users to members of the public who never use such resources. These results resemble those by Slattery (2002) and Foster (2006), and imply that implementing changes to Victorian National Parks policy or regulations requires a concerted effort by the Government in communication and the community consultation process. The NPAC (2012) warned the Victorian Government they did not feel there had been suitable stakeholder consultation during the regulatory reform process concerning CTDNP in Victorian National Parks, pre-empting the resultant community protest to the regulatory and legislation changes; concerns verified from the results of this case study. Future action by the Victorian Government could therefore be to engage in more active and meaningful stakeholder consultation and communication, particularly during the planning of any potential CTO in a National Park. Keeping in mind stakeholder groups are not homogenous in their opinions, as also found by McKercher (1997) and Turner (1981), within this study, stakeholder consultation should extend beyond the state representative interest groups to local stakeholder groups and individuals.
Secondly, within this study, those stakeholders most in ‘opposition’ with government plans to allow CTDNP inside of Victorian National Parks perceived government and the tourism industry as economically focussed and at odds with conservation outcomes. The extent of such stakeholder ‘opposition’, as also identified by Crowley (1997), Darcy and Wearing (2009), Munro, King and Polonsky (2006), and Slattery (2002), has the potential to greatly hinder or prevent the progress of CTDNP plans, through staunch public pressure and active protests such stakeholders can bring to bear. The necessity of early and legitimate stakeholder consultation, and importance of establishing a clear vision which acknowledges their values, has been well established in previous literature (Crowley, 1997; Darcy & Wearing, 2009) particularly in the state of Victoria (Foster, 2006; Munro, King & Polonsky, 2006; Slattery, 2002) yet, as evidenced by results from this research, has not been executed in this case. To overcome such ‘opposition’ to potential CTDNP, the Victorian Government and the tourism industry should be stronger in recognising stakeholder values and establishing and communicating a ‘sustainable tourism’ vision which asserts conservation as the National Park priority. In addition the tourism industry itself should consider ways of improving its reputation within the community by promoting their ability and desire to deliver sustainable tourism outcomes. Within this case study, CTOs were found to be highly motivated by their conservation values and aspiration to share these with National Park visitors, however this was wasted on stakeholders who had deeply entrenched perceptions the tourism industry was predominantly profit driven.

Thirdly, stakeholder’s perception of government regulatory efficacy directly related to their attitude toward CTDNP. Further to this, it was found to be a stronger influence than a stakeholder’s value. Those stakeholder’s ‘sceptical’ of the Victorian Government ability to effectively regulate a CTDNP, were more likely to be ‘opposed’ to any such plans. To mitigate ‘sceptical’ stakeholder perceptions and increase stakeholder confidence, the Victorian Government could develop more comprehensive regulations to guide the EOI proposal process based on National Park ideals, while allowing for CTO innovation. It is necessary for government to acknowledge and address the potential negative impact CTDNP could bring by developing a regulatory system which either prevents or punishes undesired outcomes. By not addressing impacts, stakeholder ‘trust’ in the government’s ability to regulate these issues was drastically reduced. The potential negative impacts...
which most concerned stakeholders, those of CTDNP size, location, design, energy use, and infrastructure requirements, and of ensuring public access remained, should be clearly acknowledged and addressed by the Victorian Government in the design of potential regulatory solutions. In addition, assurance should be given that resources allocated to Parks Victoria will reflect their workload, particularly in respect to managing CTDNP.

Fourthly, the findings in this case study suggest the issues concerning the potential PPP between Parks Victoria and CTOs need attention. Issues such as complex bureaucracy, poor communication, lack of continuity with Parks Victoria staff, and lengthy waits for decision making, have all been mentioned in previous studies (Huybers & Bennett, 1997; Moore et al., 2009; TTF, 2007; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009) and by existing licensed and lessee CTOs within this research. The Victorian Government and Parks Victoria could improve their communication with stakeholders and review their procedures to improve the timeliness of decision making.

Fifthly, within this case study stakeholders were more likely to support CTD on land adjacent to or nearby National Parks, than CTDNP, a view shared by the VCEC (2011a). If allowed within National Park borders, low-impact CTDNP which offers a variety to accommodation, and that facilitates multi-day bushwalking was the most likely to be supported in a suitable National Park (for example, this type of CTDNP was not likely to be supported in Great Otway National Park due to its proximity to existing accommodation facilities). In addition, stakeholders were supportive of the use of existing National Park infrastructure for CTDNP purposes (particularly in Point Nepean National Park). In reality the actions of the Victorian Government suggest they share these views; they have reformed regulations to allow CTD on adjacent and nearby National Park land; called for an EOI for Point Nepean National Park; and proposed low-impact accommodation and walking huts as best practice examples of sustainable tourism in National Parks. However the poor communication of these ideals and the government and tourism industry’s focus on the economic reward of such actions, has resulted in creating stakeholder doubt and uncertainty. The Victorian Government should show a greater commitment to these outcomes to improve stakeholder confidence. This should be initiated by releasing an updated Nature-based Tourism Strategy with Tourism Victoria.
which includes a clearer vision and management plan, and by developing a regulatory system which would deliver these outcomes and uphold National Park ideals.

Finally, within this case study conflict between some stakeholders existed based on their perceptions of each other’s values, when in reality no conflict may exist. For example, conservation groups have a long-standing reputation for wanting to ‘lock up’ National Parks, and from the findings in this study, it is apparent they still have a way to go in convincing other stakeholders they have evolved from this standpoint. The importance of resolving these perceived conflicts between stakeholder groups was present within this study. Some groups who were campaigning for public access, but against government legislation amendments, continued to perceive conservation groups as wanting to restrict access, and thus presented separate campaigns. If these groups resolved their perceived differences they would, arguably, be able to present a more united perspective to government.

Implications for Developing Regulatory Strategies

Stakeholders offered insight into the regulatory efficacy of specific regulatory strategies and structures and believed the Victorian Government should consider the strengths and weaknesses of each strategy in putting together a comprehensive mix of regulatory strategies, supported by Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) and Russell, Lafferty and Loudoun (2008). In addition to state based regulations, Parks Victoria should continue to develop Management Plans and regulations on an individual basis due to the unique nature of each National Park. These should include regulatory and management strategies addressing the location, time and the way activities are conducted. Presented below are five specific implications for government and Parks Victoria to consider when design and implementing their regulatory structure based on the findings of this case study.

Firstly, regulations cannot be too bureaucratic. Arduous command and control processes result in low compliance and business frustration which affects both National Park and CTO outcomes. Current licensing systems were deemed inflexible and contributing to business frustration, and although previously the subject of reform efforts, these case
study results indicated the Victorian Government could re-visit regulatory reform in this area. In addition, it was found desirable by many existing users of National Parks to have licences and/or guideline conditions extended to include School Groups (currently unregulated).

Secondly, incentive strategies should be used to address less critical issues, such as CTOs using local produce or employing local people. As stated in Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) and highlighted by stakeholders, incentives would need to be desirable and deliver benefits over the cost of their implementation. The current incentive whereby a CTO could apply for an extended 10 year licence if they gained eco-accreditation was not deemed strong enough (supported by Parks Victoria (2013) figures which illustrated only 1% of the 321 licensed CTOs had taken up this offer) and needs an improvement of market awareness of industry accreditation and a more efficient approval process. Stakeholders thought potentially desirable incentive strategies would be those which recognised CTOs and recreation groups as good National Park users and rewarded them with special access to areas. Other rewards should include more involvement in management activities such as developing and delivering visitor education programs or environmental monitoring and maintenance.

Thirdly, the EOI guidelines the government was using to accept proposals for private investment and CTDNP, was deemed effective in allowing potential developers to innovate and bring their strength of experience to the National Park. All stakeholders interviewed criticised the short community consultation period of 28 days and the inability for community to comment on the final proposal. The 28 day period should be extended by government, and further to this, government should provide opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the final proposal. Stakeholders were adamant government should not build and operate visitor services within the National Park. They should be involved with developing a state based nature-based tourism strategy to ensure Victoria protects, promotes and develops towards its competitive advantages. This would include direct involvement in developing infrastructure such as access roads and energy delivery. Government should be clearer of the design regulations that will be put in place to protect the natural setting and physical environmental and cultural assets of a National Park. This
would potentially improve stakeholder ‘trust’ in government and offer clearer instructions to CTDNP proponents.

Fourthly, self-regulation was determined to be least effective for critical issues such as environmental conservation, as CTOs within a National Park could prioritise business outcomes over conservation. Huybers and Bennett (1997) found CTOs accepted the need for regulation to protect the environment their products were based on, and added they often went beyond imposed government regulation to protect the environment. The findings from this case study suggested CTOs had strong eco-centric values and were responsible Victorian National Park users, supporting Huybers and Bennett (1997) findings. Future development should incorporate regulation by government in conjunction with industry self-regulation.

Finally, stakeholders perceived tourism industry accreditation as too cumbersome to achieve and showed little return to their businesses given the low consumer awareness of such accreditation programs. Those who obtained accreditation did so for their business and personal values as opposed to those of their consumer. The tourism industry should seek to improve its accreditation programs by making the process more streamlined in terms of its administration and improving consumer awareness. This may also serve to improving the overall image of the tourism industry within the community.

**Implications for Theory**

By adopting the theoretically regulatory strategy framework of Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) and adapting it to the Victorian National Park CTDNP case study, the findings from this study have five implications for regulation theory and National Park tourism research generally.

Firstly, a theoretical framework for regulatory strategies concerning National Park commercial tourism was developed and tested successfully in this case study. The framework was created by identifying management and regulatory strategies from
existing National Park tourism literature and positioning them within the comprehensive regulatory framework of Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) (Appendix B, page 288). The benefit of this was that research outputs based on this framework could draw from both National Park tourism literature and regulatory theory. As discussed in the literature review, regulation of commercial tourism in National Parks has not been given its due attention (Hjalager, 1996). One of the implications of this study is that the regulatory framework based on Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) has been identified and developed as a valid and useful theory for exploring regulation of commercial tourism in National Parks in future studies.

Secondly, Buckley (2012), Eagles (2013) and Eagles, McCool and Haynes (2002), all discussed the expanding involvement of CTOs within the National Park setting, and the increasing amount of PAMA time and resources needed to manage them. Empirical research identified regulation as a source of stress on this relationship (Huybers & Bennett, 1997; Moore et al., 2009; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). Stakeholders within this case study clearly identified with the regulatory strategy categories of the Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) framework and were able to discuss the strengths, weakness of each, and how they could be used most efficaciously. By developing a better understanding of regulatory strategies within the National Park context, this case study has implications for National Park management literature and research into the relationship between CTOs and PAMAs.

Thirdly, stakeholder conflict within the National Park commercial tourism policy arena has been the focus of previous case studies (Crowley, 1997; Darcy & Wearing, 2009; Foster, 2006; Slattery, 2002). Case studies offering understanding into stakeholder constructs are therefore valuable. This study followed Darcy and Wearing (2009), McKercher (1997) and Turner (1980) by measuring stakeholder values along the anthropocentric/eco-centric continuum. The findings from this case study continued to support previous findings that an individual’s value set did not determine their attitude toward tourism. Categorising the values of stakeholder groups on this dichotomy remains useful however in identifying perceived conflicts. One important finding was the stakeholder perception of the anthropocentricity of government and the tourism industry,
which cultivated a perception that they would value economic outcomes over conservation. This indicates that future research into stakeholders in the debate of CTDNP should extend to their perceived value of other stakeholders.

Fourthly, a valuable finding from this research was an individuals’ perception of the efficacy of regulators was found to be influential on an individual’s attitude toward tourism (Figure 6.2, page 235). More specifically, if an individual was ‘trusting’ about government ability to regulate, they were more inclined to ‘support’ CTDNP. If they were ‘sceptical’ they were more likely to ‘oppose’ it. It may prove stakeholders do believe sustainable tourism can be achieved, however they do not ‘trust’ government or PAMAs to deliver. This is an important finding for tourism research as it extends the discussion around NPCTD from primarily identifying stakeholder’s values to measuring their perceptions of the efficacy of regulations to offer a deeper understanding of the complexity of the underlying nature of their differences.

Finally, integrating the findings from this case study, a model of the relationship between stakeholder perceptions of regulatory efficacy and their attitude toward commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks was developed (Figure 6.3, page 238). The model comprises of four influential elements; a stakeholder’s desired outcomes; their perception of the regulatory development process; their perception of regulatory strategy performance; and their perception of the ability for government and PAMAs to successfully monitor regulations and the likelihood CTOs will adhere to them. This model has implications to the future study of commercial tourism in National Parks and stakeholder attitudes, as it identifies the elements which should be measured in order to predict and map stakeholder ‘support’ or ‘opposition’ to commercial tourism activities within National Parks. The failure to include one of these elements within a study may inhibit a researcher’s ability to represent the complete constructs of a stakeholder’s perception, reducing the quality of their research findings.
6.4 Recommendations for Further Research

Research into the regulation of commercial tourism in National Parks is in its infancy. The research findings and limitations acknowledged in this case study of Victorian National Parks suggest four main areas for further research. Foremost the further testing of the Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) theoretical regulatory framework within another National Park commercial tourism case study would be beneficial in building upon the findings within this study and to further develop a reliable tool for National Park tourism research. When the specific regulations which will control a CTDNP in a Victorian National Park are released, it would also be beneficial to revisit this case study to further test case study findings and the Baldwin, Cave and Lodge (2011) framework.

Secondly, previous research into the conflicts surrounding commercial tourism in National Parks has been limited to stakeholder values and tourism beliefs. However the findings in this case study indicated perceptions of regulations were greatly influential on a stakeholder’s attitudes towards tourism, and there would be value in further exploring this finding in future research. Further study in this area could begin to develop a greater understanding of these constructs, and recommendations for stakeholder consultation during the public policy process to reduce potential conflict.

Thirdly, within this study, sustainable tourism was mentioned by most stakeholders. As in literature, there was however no consistent understanding of what this is. Examples such as Freycinet and Sapphire lodge in Tasmania, and Ocean Lodge on Kangaroo Island were discussed and declared as best practice for commercial tourism involving National Parks, by a majority of stakeholders. However these accommodation facilities were outside of National Park borders, creating uncertainty and confusion from stakeholders about how they fit within the Victorian National Park discussion on potential CTDNP. Other examples where low-impact huts were built inside of National Parks were given as those along the Milford Track in New Zealand provided by Ultimate Hikes, and the Cradle Mountain Huts along the Overland Track Walk in Tasmania’s Cradle Mountain - Lake St Clair National Parks. These types of CTDNP were supported by most stakeholders as acceptable and sustainable tourism, yet many remained unconvinced these were the
outcomes the Victorian government were aiming for, again creating uncertainty and confusion with stakeholders. There may be value in further studying these best practice examples to explore what they hold that endears them to stakeholders as ‘sustainable.’

Finally, this research has based itself on the perceptions of stakeholders. This is valuable as stakeholder support is essential for commercial tourism in National Parks to move forward, therefore any understanding of potential conflicts or constructs of their attitude toward tourism is helpful. It does not however reflect or measure the exact outcomes of regulatory strategies. Research measuring actual outcomes could further the understanding of regulations of commercial tourism in National Parks, assisting policy makers; CTOs; PAMAs; and potentially reducing the concerns of stakeholders.

6.5 Contribution of the Study

This case study explored the efficacy of regulating commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks and the values, beliefs and attitudes of stakeholders towards commercial tourism in National Parks. This study has contributed to the body of knowledge surrounding CTDNP proposals in National Parks by exploring the efficacy of specific regulatory strategies, and the influential elements which determine a stakeholder’s ‘support’ or ‘opposition’ of commercial tourism in National Parks. The following section presents seven specific contributions to the field of tourism research and regulatory practices.

Firstly, the study identified a wide range of stakeholders need to be consulted during the policy process surrounding commercial tourism in National Parks. This includes direct users of National Park (recreationists, CTOs & conservation groups) and indirect beneficiaries (community members who do not visit the National Park, but desire its existence to conserve natural and cultural assets into the future). These findings are similar to those previously reported by Foster (2005; 2006) and Slattery (2002). Perhaps more importantly, community consultation needs to occur early and maintained throughout the duration of the process and needs to include a variety of representatives.
from both state and local levels, also supported by previous literature (Munro, King & Polonsky, 2006).

Secondly, stakeholders with conflicting value sets (eco-centric /anthropocentric) may share similar desired outcomes of commercial tourism in National Parks. Within this case study, stakeholder conflict increased when eco-centric perceived that anthropocentric messages from government and the tourism industry would result in outcomes which prioritise economic gain over conservation. Pressey (1993) explains this may not be the case, as anthropocentric value holders can achieve conservation outcomes of commercial tourism in National Parks by protecting these areas as a setting for their nature-based tourism activities. Understanding the perceptions of stakeholders and their values would be beneficial for government and the tourism industry in facilitating genuine stakeholder consultation and go toward reducing conflicts over CTDNP.

Thirdly, the relationship between a stakeholder’s National Park value and their attitude toward commercial tourism in National Parks is not conclusive. This has been previously found by McKercher (1997). In this case study there were eco-centric stakeholders who would ‘support’ commercial tourism, and there were anthropocentric who would not. More importantly, it was found that a stakeholder’s perception of government regulatory efficacy was strongly related to their attitude toward commercial tourism in National Parks, and specifically to CTDNP. Those stakeholders ‘trusting’ of government’s ability to regulatory efficaciously were more likely to ‘support’ CTDNP, those stakeholders ‘sceptical’ of government’s ability, more likely to be ‘opposed’ A finding not previously realised within literature and instrumental in expanding the discussion around CTDNP in both practice and theory.

Fourthly, commercial tourism can be developed in such a way that is supported by stakeholders. Commercial tourism activities in National Parks supported by all stakeholders were those low in impact, such as bushwalking or camping tours. All stakeholders supported developing tourism infrastructure near National Parks or in regional towns close by, many who supported CTDNP, would in fact prefer it to be
outside the borders where possible. The large majority of stakeholders supported the use of existing infrastructure (particularly that of Point Nepean National Park). Finally, the building of low-impact accommodation which would facilitate overnight walking trips or small type accommodation would be supported by many stakeholders, however not in Great Otway National Park where such facilities already exist nearby on private land.

Fifthly, it is well-established regulation of commercial tourism in National Parks is necessary to manage their potential damage (to both the environment and to other recreation users) and induce beneficial outcomes (such as delivery of a quality visitor experience and economic generation for surrounding regions and National Park management). While National Park literature has widely discussed the management techniques associated with controlling commercial tourism activities (Eagles & McCool, 2002; Newsome, Moore & Dowling, 2013; Worboys et al, 2005) this present study has explored the performance of regulatory strategies in obtaining successful outcomes. The greatest concerns to stakeholders of CTDNP which should be regulated were found to be the CTDNP: size; location; design; energy-use; infrastructure requirements; and public access.

Sixthly, this study presented a model of four elements influencing a stakeholder’s perception of regulatory efficacy (desired outcomes; creating regulations, regulatory strategies performance and system design; and monitoring and compliance). Further to this these elements and a stakeholders overall perception of regulatory efficacy, were found to be directly related to their ‘support’ or ‘opposition’ of CTDNP. This model is valuable to government, the tourism industry and tourism researchers in understanding the complexities of ascertaining a stakeholder’s opinions surrounding regulations and commercial tourism in National Parks.

Finally, research of commercial tourism in National Parks has focused on the management structure and relationship between the CTOs and the PAMA (Moore et al., 2009; Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). Regulation was identified in these studies as a source of stress on the relationship, and this study confirms those findings. In addition,
communication, bureaucracy, decision-making and staff turn-over within Parks Victoria, which have all been identified as barriers to developing a successful partnership and in some cases leading to poor business outcomes, were mentioned by stakeholders within this study. The lack of resources provided by government to Parks Victoria was mentioned by nearly all stakeholders when discussing regulatory efficacy, and was a decisive factor in many stakeholders ‘opposing’ any further CTDNP plans.

6.6 Concluding Statement

There is no doubt commercial tourism has a fundamental role in National Parks in providing access and promoting and supporting conservation activities. It also has the ability to damage National Park assets and inhibit the achievement of conservation and recreation outcomes. Therefore the necessity for government to regulate commercial tourism activities within National Parks is undeniable. Stakeholder conflict over what is appropriate and sustainable commercial tourism within a National Park has a long history, particularly in Victoria, with two main sides emerging, those who value National Parks for their intrinsic value, eco-centric, and those who value them for their human use, anthropocentric. It can be argued both sets of values desire, and can achieve, National Park outcomes, that of conservation of Victoria’s natural and cultural assets and providing a natural setting for recreation. It has been stated that resolving this stakeholder conflict is necessary if appropriate CTDNP is to be achieved, and has been a focus of National Park management literature.

In Victoria, private investment and CTDNP has remained minimal due to legislative restrictions on such activities. The Victorian Government passed the National Parks Amendment (Leasing Powers and Other Matters) Bill 2013, removing these regulatory barriers and re-ignited the debate within this state. The two opposing sides quickly emerged. This thesis aimed to go beyond previous research into CTDNP stakeholder conflict, by exploring the regulatory efficacy of strategies that will control commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks, in order to better understand how the balance between conservation and use (in the form of commercial tourism) can be achieved. The
dearth of, and need for, regulatory studies within tourism literature, particularly of commercial tourism in National Parks, has been noted.

The findings of this case study suggested the desired outcomes for CTDNP were similar in some respects for each value group. Both groups attest conservation as the National Park priority; both support CTD outside of National Parks with the government removing regulatory barriers on private land surrounding National Parks to encourage this; both believe sustainable tourism is achievable and desirable; and most supported some form of low-impact CTDNP. The debate ignites over the values behind these desired outcomes. Government and tourism industry conserving National Parks as a setting for nature-based tourism and supporting CTDNP for its potential of economic generation for Parks Victoria and surrounding regions; while eco-centric support greater access to National Parks in order to develop support for conservation, on the provision it does not jeopardise National Park objectives.

Determining an individual’s stakeholder category or values does not indicate their ‘support’ or ‘opposition’ to CTDNP. Some anthropocentrics were ‘opposed’ and some conservation group members were ‘supportive’. Perhaps the most important finding from this study was that a more likely predictor was an individual’s perception of the government’s regulatory efficacy. All stakeholders discussed the strengths and weaknesses of current and proposed regulatory strategies which control commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks, as well as identifying and discussing other potential regulatory strategies which could be adopted. Stakeholders interviewed were confident a well-designed, implemented and monitored regulatory system could achieve a sustainable CTDNP outcome without jeopardising National Park conservation outcomes. However there was a clear definition between those who ‘trusted’ government to deliver sustainable tourism outcomes, more likely to be ‘supportive’ of CTDNP, and those who were ‘sceptical’ of government’s ability to do, more likely to be ‘opposed’.

‘Sceptical’ opinions were developed based on the perception of the anthropocentricity of government motives; the limited resources and funding afforded to Parks Victoria; and
the previous National Park decisions made by the Liberal Coalition Government behind the legislation amendment to be pro-development and anti-conservation. Further to this, ‘sceptical’ stakeholders did not believe the EOI process facilitated legitimate community consultation, and feared the CTO who was awarded a lease on public land within a National Park, would prioritise achieving a return on their investment over conservation.

In the context of this study, the Victorian Government drastically misread the values of their community. In order for the Victorian Government to effectively regulate the CTDNP approval process and prevent further destructive conflict, they need to win the ‘trust’ of stakeholders. This could be done by facilitating genuine stakeholder communication with state based interest groups and local representatives and by developing an understanding of stakeholder values of National Parks. The Victorian Government and tourism industry need to create and effectively communicate a strong sustainable nature-based tourism vision which acknowledges these values and establishes conservation as the primary National Park priority. Once this has been accomplished, a stronger regulatory structure which will deliver this vision can be designed and implemented. This would need to include increasing the length and opportunity for community consultation during the EOI process and regulations addressing the main stakeholder concerns of CTDNP: location, size, design; energy use; infrastructure requirements; and public access. Should the Victorian Government fail to win over the ‘trust’ of stakeholders, they risk repeating past CTDNP failures.
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### Appendix A: Timeline of Regulatory Reform & Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism Policy &amp; Regulation Activity</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>September 2010:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Labour Government appoints VCEC to conduct an inquiry into regulatory &amp; other barriers to Victoria’s tourism industry. Submissions invited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November 2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Government loses State Election, &amp; Liberal/National Coalition is voted in. Ted Baillieu becomes Victorian Premier.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCEC release draft report ‘Unlocking Victorian Tourism.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCEC submission time closes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 21st 2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCEC release the final report ‘Unlocking Victorian Tourism: An Inquiry into Victoria’s Tourism Industry’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 31st 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Victoria’s China Tourism Strategy’ is released highlighting the Great Ocean Rd as a priority for commercial tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 23rd 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Coalition Government release ‘Victorian Government response to the VCEC’s Final Report’” recommending removal of regulatory barriers for CTOs to invest and build CTD adjacent to and inside National Park borders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 6th 2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Napthine becomes Premier of Vic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VCEC Submissions Data Collection:**
September 2010 – April 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>GO</th>
<th>PN</th>
<th>WP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Media Data Collection: 31st August**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>GO</th>
<th>PN</th>
<th>WP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Media Data Collection: 30th September**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>GO</th>
<th>PN</th>
<th>WP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Media Data Collection: 31st October**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>GO</th>
<th>PN</th>
<th>WP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND**

- ST = State of Victoria
- GO = Great Otway NP
- PN = Point Nepean NP
- WP = Wilsons Promontory NP
Tourism Policy & Regulation Activity

**March 31st 2013**
- Victorian Government release *Tourism Investment Opportunities of Significance in National Parks: Guidelines*

**April 9th 2013**
- Merge announced of Dept. of Sustainability & Environment with Dept. of Primary Industries, to take effect from July.

**April 14th 2013**
- Victorian Coalition Government release ‘Point Nepean NP Master Plan’ which includes details for commercial investment and tourism development

**April 30th 2013**
- Call for Expression of Interest for Point Nepean NP investment for CTD

**June 27th 2013**
- *National Parks Amendment (Leasing Powers and Other Matters) Bill 2013* passes through Victorian State Legislative Council

**July 4th 2013**
- *National Parks Amendment (Leasing Powers and Other Matters) Bill 2013* passes through Victorian State Legislative Council

**July 23rd 2013**
- ‘Victoria’s 2020 Tourism Strategy’ is released highlighting investment in tourist attractions, accommodation & & commercial development inside National Park borders on the Great Ocean Rd priority

**August 20th 2013**
- *National Parks Amendment (Leasing Powers and Other Matters) Bill 2013* passes through Victorian State Legislative Assembly

---

**Data Collection**

- **Media Data Collection 2nd April 2013**
  - Total (15) 13 ST 1 GO 1 PN 0 WP

- **Media Data Collection 30th April 2013**
  - Total (32) 14 ST 2 GO 14 PN 2 WP

- **Media Data Collection 31st May 2013**
  - Total (2) 1 ST 0 GO 1 PN 0 WP

- **Media Data Collection 30th June 2013**
  - Total (7) 6 ST 0 GO 1 PN 0 WP

- **Media Data Collection 31st July 2013**
  - Total (9) 4 ST 4 GO 0 PN 1 WP

- **Media Data Collection 31st August 2013**
  - Total (0) 0 ST 0 GO 0 PN 0 WP

- **Interview Data Collection August 2013**
  - Total (25) 8 ST 9 GO 4 PN 4 WP
Appendix B: Theoretical Framework & stakeholder responses

The following table illustrates the theoretical framework developed for this case study and the stakeholder responses. Following the research design of Hjalager (1996), National Park visitor management techniques were collated from the literature (Buckley, 2011; Eagles & McCool 2002; Eagles, McCool & Haynes, 2002; Hill & Pickering, 2002; Kuo, 2002; More, 2002; Newsome, Moore & Dowling, 2013; Worboys et al., 2005) and organised into a regulatory theory (Baldwin & Cave, 1999:58; Baldwin, Cave & Lodge, 2011:134-136). The strength of this design is that stakeholder responses could be compared to both regulatory theory and literature focusing on National Park management. This created a deeper understanding of how stakeholders perceive the efficacy of regulating commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks; allowed for more resolved conclusions to be derived from the data; and provided a greater pool of knowledge to draw from when developing recommendations for government, National Park management and the tourism industry.
## 1. Command & Control Regulatory Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation Theory Strengths &amp; Weaknesses</th>
<th>Visitor Management Theory Considerations</th>
<th>Victorian National Park Case Study Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths:</strong></td>
<td><strong>CTO Licences / Permits:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strengths:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force of law;</td>
<td>Controls group numbers, activities &amp; access to limit environmental damage &amp; visitor conflict;</td>
<td>Necessary &amp; most effective at setting minimum standards which are legally enforceable;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed standards set minimum acceptable levels of behaviour;</td>
<td>Must decide on usage limits, over space or time, &amp; how they will be administered &amp; enforced;</td>
<td>Creates a framework for business to adhere to;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screens entry;</td>
<td>This may include a permit fee &amp; application process which can be a timely &amp; costly practice.</td>
<td>Can best deliver conservation outcomes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibits unacceptable behaviour immediately;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Penalty of loss of licence is strong;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen as highly protective of public;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allows Parks Victoria to gain information &amp; monitor National Park visitors &amp; activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of penalties indicates forceful stance by authorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weaknesses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specific Activity Conditions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervenes in management;</td>
<td>Control activity locations behaviour;</td>
<td>Over bureaucratic, increasing business costs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prone to capture;</td>
<td>Considers visitor safety, equipment &amp; expertise required by staff, &amp; environmental protection;</td>
<td>Parks Victoria may be 'captured' making decisions based on CTO needs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex rules tend to multiply;</td>
<td>Can affect visitor experience, usually accompanied by.</td>
<td>Parks Victoria seen as an ‘enforcer’ not partner;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexible;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not communicated well &amp; poorly enforced;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information requirements severe;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not consistent across all users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive to administer.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Considerations:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Parks Victoria need greater funding & resources to effectively enforce;
- User’s involved with creating regulations more likely to comply;
- All stakeholders desired increased input with management;
- User’s created relationships with local Parks Victoria Ranger’s in order to get around bureaucracy;
- National Parks should be accessible for recreation compatible with conservation objectives.
### 2. Incentive Based Regulatory Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation Theory</th>
<th>Visitor Management Theory</th>
<th>Victorian National Park Case Study Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lease or licence fees can be:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strengths:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low regulator discretion.</td>
<td>• Annual flat fee;</td>
<td>• Effective for non-essential outcomes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low cost application.</td>
<td>• Percentage of revenue fees;</td>
<td>• Increase innovation &amp; autonomy for CTOs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low intervention in management.</td>
<td>• Fees per person;</td>
<td>• An effective reward for good behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incentive to reduce harm to zero, not just to standard.</td>
<td>• By type of visitors;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic pressure to behave acceptably.</td>
<td>• A combination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Economic incentive can be given to control CTO activity:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weaknesses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rules are required.</td>
<td>• Continue activities in low season;</td>
<td>• Need to be enticing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor response to problems arising from irrational or careless behaviour.</td>
<td>• Environmental &amp; service standards.</td>
<td>• Need to have consistent &amp; innovate National Park management to be successful;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Predicting outcome from given incentive difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Decreasing fees could reduce Parks Victoria income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mechanical, so inflexible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Politically contentious as rewards wrongdoer &amp; fails to prohibit offence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pricing regulations can affect:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Considerations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access: increasing fees can be seen as opposing the democratic right of public access &amp; discriminatory against disadvantaged groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Current incentive of CTO Licence extension if eco-accreditation achieved is not seen effective as cost outweighs benefit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Current incentives for recreation groups who receive recognition &amp; management input effective, but could be increased;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• More desirable incentives for CTOs would be rewarding ‘good users’ with: access to more areas; inclusion in marketing; inclusion with management decisions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Current fees seen as acceptable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Market-Harnessing Controls (Competition Laws; Franchising & Contracts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation Theory Strengths &amp; Weaknesses</th>
<th>Visitor Management Theory Considerations</th>
<th>Victorian National Park Case Study Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leases &amp; contracts:</strong></td>
<td><strong>EOI &amp; Contracts for exploitation Strengths:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchising (EOI) &amp; Contract</td>
<td>Application process needs to be efficient &amp; selection of operators needs to be transparent, fair, neutral &amp; competitive;</td>
<td>Increases likelihood of innovation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enforcement low cost to public;</td>
<td>• CTO can build facilities, &amp; donate back to NP after a period of time.</td>
<td>EOI most efficacious strategy for attracting O investment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low level of restriction &amp; respects managerial freedoms;</td>
<td>• Length &amp; cost of licence/lease, needs to consider initial investment, cost recovery &amp; viability of business;</td>
<td>Franchising out existing infrastructure accepted by all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allows competition in market;</td>
<td>• Fee needs to reflect costs incurred to natural environment &amp; management;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managers rather than bureaucrats respond to market preferences.</td>
<td>• Ownership &amp; responsibility of upkeep to build facilities &amp; infrastructure;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff training, qualifications &amp; customer service standards;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hours &amp; season of operation;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Range of services;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Product pricing;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management &amp; monitoring of environmental &amp; social impacts;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Signage, marketing, advertising &amp; information availability;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses:</strong></td>
<td><strong>EOI &amp; Contracts for exploitation Weaknesses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchising (EOI) &amp; Contract</td>
<td>• Need to specify service;</td>
<td>Needs to attract several bidders to be successful;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to specify service;</td>
<td>• Tension of specification &amp; responsiveness/innovation;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uncertainties impose costs on consumers;</td>
<td>• Uncertainties impose costs on consumers;</td>
<td>Need to provide detail to proponents without stifling innovation to avoid wasting CTO resources on unacceptable designs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requires competition for franchise but may be few bidders.</td>
<td>• Requires competition for franchise but may be few bidders.</td>
<td>Approval for development lies with Minister;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approved CTOs values must align with National Park ethos (that is conservation outcomes over economic);</td>
<td>Net community benefit difficult to measure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear government is being unrealistic about market (Chinese do not want National Park experience);</td>
<td>Community participation not sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A state nature-based tourism plan needs to assess viable market; their desires; &amp; develop suitable experiences;</td>
<td>Requires strong regulatory guidelines which can be bureaucratic &amp; inflexible;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approval processes must be fair &amp; transparent;</td>
<td>Difficult to communicate with Parks Victoria about ongoing issues &amp; decision-making;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Competition desirable as creates a stronger destination.</td>
<td>Parks Victoria can be unaware of CTO actions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Disclosure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation Theory</th>
<th>Visitor Management Theory</th>
<th>Victorian National Park Case Study Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Considerations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strengths:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low intervention &amp; low danger of capture</td>
<td>• Tourists may not have the information or awareness necessary to make decisions based on environmental performance</td>
<td>• CTO trip returns allow Parks Victoria to monitor activity use within National Parks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allows consumer to decide issues.</td>
<td>• Allows consumer to decide issues.</td>
<td>• Could be an effective method to communicate to customers about CTO behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weaknesses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information users may make mistakes.</td>
<td>• Economic incentives may prevail over information</td>
<td>• CTO trip returns were not monitored thoroughly;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic incentives may prevail over information</td>
<td>• Cost of producing information may be high.</td>
<td>• No standard, recognisable system to categorise National Park CTOs' behaviour or management, meaning consumers do not have the knowledge to make decisions based on CTO disclosures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cost of producing information may be high.</td>
<td>• Risks may be so severe as to call for prohibition.</td>
<td>• Tourists may value price over environmental performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risks may be so severe as to call for prohibition.</td>
<td>• Policing of information quality &amp; fraud may be required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policing of information quality &amp; fraud may be required.</td>
<td>• Information may be in the form of undermining its utility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information may be in the form of undermining its utility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Direct Action & Design Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation Theory Strengths &amp; Weaknesses</th>
<th>Visitor Management Theory Considerations</th>
<th>Victorian National Park Case Study Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Zoning &amp; Temporal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Direct Action considerations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can separate infrastructure provision from operation.</td>
<td>• Designates areas for specific activities, controlling contact between conflicting activities &amp; environment</td>
<td>• Government should not build or operate new developments, but allow CTOs to take the risk of investment &amp; to innovate;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assures acceptable level of provision.</td>
<td>• Access to these zones can be controlled through permits &amp; licences</td>
<td>• Government should create a state nature-based tourism strategy &amp; build necessary infrastructure (for example road access);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Useful when small firms in poor position to behave responsibly.</td>
<td>• Temporal considerations of access to specific areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allows state to plan long-term investments</td>
<td><strong>Built facilities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Design Solutions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fairness of subsidies may be contentious.</td>
<td>• Types, level of &amp; location of built facilities,</td>
<td>• Essential to protect the natural setting of the National Park, specifically location; size; colour; building materials; access points;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding costly.</td>
<td>• Not building facilities can be a deterrent to visitors</td>
<td>• Extends to infrastructure needs. Needs to be considered early in design process, specifically: sustainable energy consumption design; &amp; ensuring the least impact on environment when building infrastructure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public sector involvement contentious.</td>
<td>• Building boardwalks, barriers or fences encourages visitors to stay on track</td>
<td>• Location should away from sensitive areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Innovations may not be market driven.</td>
<td>• Signage for both behaviour control &amp; education</td>
<td>• Locations should not be in the most desirable visitor areas if public access will be prohibited;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can affect the natural appearance &amp; cause damage</td>
<td>• Innovation from the market place should be encouraged through the EOI process, however essential design criteria (such as height) should be decided early in the process to re-assure stakeholders National Park ethos will be upheld &amp; to avoid CTOs wasting resources designing developments which will not be approved;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. Rights & Liabilities (Public Liability Insurance)

#### 7. Public compliance & Insurance Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation Theory</th>
<th>Visitor Management</th>
<th>Victorian National Park Case Study Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights &amp; Liabilities Strengths:</td>
<td>Rights:</td>
<td>Rights:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-help;</td>
<td>• National Parks are for public recreational use, &amp; therefore the public right for access must be upheld;</td>
<td>• ‘Good’ National Park users could be rewarded with special access to areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low intervention &amp; low cost to state.</td>
<td>• ‘Good’ National Park users could be rewarded with special access to areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights &amp; Liabilities Weaknesses:</td>
<td>Public Liability Insurance:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May not prevent undesired resulting from accidents &amp; irrational behaviour;</td>
<td>• Reduced insurance cost an effective incentive to induce good behaviour;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individuals may not enforce due to costs;</td>
<td>• Can be costly to business, pricing structure needs to be reviewed by government to ensure this remains accessible to all CTOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidential difficulties &amp; legal uncertainties reduce enforcement;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Victims may lack resolve &amp; information to proceed, so deterrence is sub-optimal;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficult for courts to deter efficiently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insurance may temper deterrent effects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Schemes Strengths:</td>
<td>Not mentioned, except in form of visitor safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insurers provide economic incentives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low intervention in management &amp; low danger of capture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourages accurate reporting’s of incidents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Makes employers aware of costs of activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good coverage, applied to all employers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No need to legislate each individual harm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Schemes Weaknesses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incidence levels may be too low to allow risk discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tension of loss-spreading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inspection &amp; scrutiny of performance expensive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May operate in very similar manner to command &amp; control mechanism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8. Self-Regulation (Firm-self regulation; Industry regulation; Government required accreditation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation Theory Strengths &amp; Weaknesses</th>
<th>Visitor Management Theory Considerations</th>
<th>Victorian National Park Case Study Stakeholder Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Self-Regulation:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strengths:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High commitment to own rules;</td>
<td>• Activity Codes of Conduct;</td>
<td>• National Park CTOs held positive environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well informed rule making;</td>
<td>• General codes of Conduct;</td>
<td>values &amp; went beyond government requirements for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low cost to government;</td>
<td>• Voluntary, &amp; therefore rely upon</td>
<td>conservation outcomes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coincidence of regulatory standards &amp;</td>
<td>effective communication to first be</td>
<td>• Allowed self-management &amp; induced innovation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the standards that industry sees as</td>
<td>aware of such codes, &amp; secondly to</td>
<td>• Could create competition in the market;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasonable;</td>
<td>action them.</td>
<td>• Co-regulation whereby user groups design regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enforcement efficiency;</td>
<td></td>
<td>with government increased compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comprehensive rules;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Visitor Education:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weaknesses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High cost of approving rules;</td>
<td>• Often used to compliment regulations</td>
<td>• Industry accreditation was to arduous to obtain &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rules may be self-serving;</td>
<td>to explain or educate visitors of</td>
<td>did not offer benefit over cost;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legalism not necessarily avoided;</td>
<td>their potential impacts &amp; as to why</td>
<td>• Consumer awareness of industry accreditation is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rulemaking procedures may be</td>
<td>their behaviour is important;</td>
<td>needed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closed to public or consumers;</td>
<td>• Often used to ‘soften’ regulations in</td>
<td>• National Park visitors need more education on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enforcement may be weak or favour</td>
<td>an effort to improve visitor</td>
<td>acceptable National Park behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the industry.</td>
<td>experience;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Used to communicate regulations,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>through signage, brochures, websites,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or in person through rangers &amp; staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at visitor centres, within National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park, outside talks;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be delivered by both CTOs &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Appendix C: Participant Information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet

‘REGULATING COMMERCIAL TOURISM IN VICTORIA’S NATIONAL PARKS’

Dear Participant,

My name is Erica Randle and I am completing a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) at La Trobe University (Bundoora) under the supervision of Professor Russell Hoye and Associate Professor Dr. Warwick Frost.

The research is focusing on the regulation of commercial tourism operators in Victoria’s National Parks, with particular interest in the recent regulatory reform allowing private tourism development and investment within National Park borders. Great Otway National Park Wilsons Promontory National Park and Point Nepean National Park have been chosen as two case studies due to their high current and proposed levels of commercial tourism activity.

The research involves two stages both of which have received ethics clearance from La Trobe University. The first stage, which has already been completed, involved a detailed analysis of the Victorian Competition and Efficiency Commission (VCEC) report and submissions, and of the media articles surrounding the issue. From this data each stakeholder’s values and attitudes towards National Parks and tourism were ascertained. During this analysis your group was identified as a key stakeholder within the debate.

The second stage of the research is to explore stakeholder’s opinions toward the efficacy of the specific regulatory strategies. As these opinions are not present within the VCEC submissions or media articles, I am writing to invite you, or an alternate representative from your organisation, to offer your opinions by participating in a face-to-face interview with myself, toward the end of July or early August, at a time and location of your convenience.

ABN 64 804 735 113
CRICOS Provider 00115M

Appendices
Due to the extensive knowledge already gathered this interview includes eight short regulatory topics and should not take any longer than half an hour, depending on your answers. Participation is entirely voluntary, and should not inconvenience you in any way as I will travel to you, at a suitable time and location. The responses you give will be confidential and anonymous. Data collected will be identified only under the names of each stakeholder group and associated National Park (e.g. Wilsons Promontory National Park Commercial Tourism Operator), and your specific details shall remain anonymous. Please be assured your identity and any information you provide will not be shared with any third party as we value your privacy. There are no known risks associated with this research project and you are not expected to be subject to any risk, harm or discomfort by participating in this research. People under the age of 18 are not eligible to participate; you must be aged 18 years or older to participate.

Your participation would greatly assist me in completing my PhD thesis, as your group is an important part of my analysis, and of the greater National Park setting. Further to this, your organisation will have the opportunity to voice their detailed opinions in an alternative forum and contribute to a greater understanding of how government regulation can be utilised to achieve National Park objectives.

The results from the interview will be available for viewing in March 2014, upon request. The raw data collected will be stored electronically on a secure hard drive, and will only be shared between those directly involved with the research as listed below. The results will be utilised in completing my PhD thesis, and in the presentation at conferences and publication in academic journals. As per university guidelines, the raw data will be destroyed five years after the completion of the research.

There are no disadvantages, penalties or adverse consequences for not participating in the research. “You have the right to withdraw from active participation in this project at any time and, further, to demand that data arising from your participation are not used in the research project provided that this right is exercised within four weeks of the completion of your participation in the project. You are asked to complete the “Withdrawal of Consent Form” or to notify the researcher by email or telephone that you wish to withdraw your consent for your data to be used in this research project.
Any questions regarding this research may be directed to

Erica Randle (PhD candidate La Trobe Business School) –
   P: (03) 9479 6030 E: e.ranlde@latrobe.edu.au
Professor Russell Hoye (Supervisor La Trobe Business School) –
   P: (03) 9479 1345 E: r.hoye@latrobe.edu.au
Associate Professor Warwick Frost (Supervisor La Trobe Business School) –
   P: (03) 9479 3315 E: w.frost@latrobe.edu.au

If you have any complaints or concerns about your participation in the study that the researcher has not been able to answer to your satisfaction, you may contact the Secretary, Faculty Human Ethics Committee, Faculty of Business, Economics and Law, La Trobe University, Victoria, 3086, (P: 9479 5164, E: m.morgan@latrobe.edu.au). Please quote FHEC application reference number 41/13PG.

Thank you for your participation
MEMORANDUM

To: Ms Erica Randle, School of Business, Department of Management
Cc: Professor Russell Hoye, Associate Dean (Research)
From: Professor Timothy Marjoribanks, Deputy Chair, Faculty Human Ethics Committee
Subject: Final Approval of Human Ethics Committee Application No. 41/13PG
Title: A stakeholder perspective on regulating commercial tourism operators in Victoria’s National Parks
Date: 29/07/2013

Dear Ms Randle,

Thank you for your recent correspondence in relation to the research project referred to above. The project has been assessed as complying with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. I am pleased to advise that your project has been granted ethics approval and you may commence the study now.

The project has been approved from the date of this letter until 28 October 2013.

Please note that your application has been reviewed by a sub-committee of the University Human Ethics Committee (UHEC) to facilitate a decision before the next Committee meeting. This decision will require ratification by the UHEC and it reserves the right to alter conditions of approval or withdraw approval at that time. You will be notified if the approval status of your project changes. The UHEC is a fully constituted Ethics Committee in accordance with the National Statement under Section 5.1.29.

The following standard conditions apply to your project:

- **Limit of Approval.** Approval is limited strictly to the research proposal as submitted in your application while taking into account any additional conditions advised by the FHEC.

- **Variation to Project.** Any subsequent variations or modifications you wish to make to your project must be formally notified to the FHEC for approval in advance of these modifications being introduced into the project. This can be done using the appropriate form: Ethics - Application for Modification to Project.
which is available on the Research Services website at http://www.latrobe.edu.au/research-services/ethics/HEC_human.htm. If the UHEC considers that the proposed changes are significant, you may be required to submit a new application form for approval of the revised project.

- **Adverse Events.** If any unforeseen or adverse events occur, including adverse effects on participants, during the course of the project which may affect the ethical acceptability of the project, the Chief Investigator must immediately notify the FHEC Secretary on telephone (03) 9479 1443. Any complaints about the project received by the researchers must also be referred immediately to the FHEC Secretary.

- **Withdrawal of Project.** If you decide to discontinue your research before its planned completion, you must advise the FHEC and clarify the circumstances.

- **Monitoring.** All projects are subject to monitoring at any time by the Faculty Human Ethics Committee.

- **Annual Progress Reports.** If your project continues for more than 12 months, you are required to submit an Ethics - Progress/Final Report Form annually, on or just prior to 12 February. The form is available on the Research Services website (see above address). Failure to submit a Progress Report will mean approval for this project will lapse.

- **Auditing.** An audit of the project may be conducted by members of the FHEC.

- **Final Report.** A Final Report (see above address) is required by **28 November 2013**.

If you have any queries, or require any further clarification, please contact the FHEC Secretary on 9479 5164, or via e-mail: FBEL.ERGS@latrobe.edu.au

On behalf of the Faculty Human Ethics Committee, best wishes with your research!

Yours sincerely,

Professor Timothy Marjoribanks
Deputy Chair, Faculty Human Ethics Committee
Appendix E: Interview Schedule

Regulating commercial tourism in Victoria’s National Parks:
Interview Schedule for Stakeholder interviews

Welcome:
Hello and thank you for taking the time to participate in this interview about your opinions of commercial tourism in Victorian National Parks. My name is Erica Randle, and I am a PhD student from LaTrobe University. Would you mind please reading over the Participant Information Sheet (PIS) and signing the Individual and Organisation Consent forms agreeing to the interview and for the audio-recording? Do you have any questions from the PIS?

Overview:
Throughout this interview I will be concentrating on your opinions relating to commercial tourism operators (CTOs), private companies who operate for profit providing facilities such as tours, transport, accommodation, food etc. to visitors of National Parks. I am seeking to understand how government can best regulate these operators to ensure they achieve National Park objectives. I will start by trying to ascertain what your ideal outcomes would be from CTOs in National Parks, and any potential issues you see arising from proposed activity. Finally your opinions on how government can regulate to best achieve these outcomes and control issues.

Ground Rules:
The questions are designed to establish your personal opinion, therefore there are no correct or incorrect answers, please feel comfortable to answer your questions as honestly as possible.

1. Opening questions:
   - How long has your organisation been around? How many employees?
   - What are the main activities of your organisation and what National Park locations you are in proximity to or conduct activities in?
   - Overall, in general, what do you think the main National Park objectives are?
   - What sort of recreation or visitor experience do you think is most appropriate in National Parks?

2. Transition questions:
Let’s talk about the new proposals for CTDNP and investment.
   - Are you aware of the changes the government are putting in place?
   - Have you thought about what sort of development you would find acceptable? And why?
   - What are the biggest issues you see from the proposed government proposal of allowing CTOs to develop and invest in National Parks?
   - Are there any other positive benefits you see?

3. Key questions:
I want to now explore some of the ways government can control, through regulation, these issues and deliver the positive outcomes. In talking about these issues you can relate your answers to
your own experience, which regulations work in your opinion, and which do not, and any possible regulations you would consider appropriate.
- Thinking about the issues we talked about (_____ ) how do you suggest government or CTOs could regulate to control this?
- What sort of regulations do you see not working in this issue?
- What are the best ways government can assure environmental controls?

4. Regulatory topics:

Command and Control
- How do you think Parks Vic and the DPI can remain objective in their management of tourism and conservation so not to respond to interest group pressure?

Incentive Based
- Government control vs. Incentive based regulations?

Market Harnessing Controls
- The government proposes to find suitable tourism development partners by putting out an Expression of Interest. Are you familiar with the five step process proposed?
- Do you think this will attract the right type of CTOs to achieve desired outcomes?
- Do you see CTOs as an acceptable or even possible form of alternative funding or resources?
- The measure will be ‘net community benefit,’ is there a possible balance or an acceptable trade-off between the negative and the positive?

Disclosure
- Is there any information you feel government or visitors need to be made aware of by law?

Direct Action
- Do you think private accommodation or tourism is a legitimate use for heritage buildings?
- Would you prefer if private operators were allowed to build and invest themselves, or that government build and then lease out?

Design Solutions
- What is your idea of acceptable development?
- What would not be acceptable?

Rights & Liabilities, Public compliance & Insurance schemes
- Are you comfortable if there were areas restricted to paying visitors?
- How important is it that National Parks be made accessible for everyone?
- To what extent would you allow CTD to go to improve access?

Self-regulation
- How you feel about self-regulation versus government control, which do you see as more effective and why?
- Does this change when you think about built development specifically?
- How does environmental education fit within the National Park visitor experience?

5. Ending questions:
- Are there any other comments you would like to make?

6. Thank you:
Thank you for your time today, you have offered valuable information. A transcript of our conversation will be available later in the year if you would like a copy, and a report of the results and conclusions available next year.
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