

**COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT INSTITUTIONS: A STRATEGIC APPROACH
FOR COMMON-POOL RESOURCE PRESERVATION AND TOURISM
SUSTAINABILITY**

Ibrahim Baghdadi

Faculty of Tourism- Lebanese University, Postal Address: P.O. Box 6573/14 Badaro,
Museum, Beirut - Lebanon

ABSTRACT: *The abundance of common-pool resources on a territory, at zero cost, opens the appetite for egoists to abuse their utilization. Tourism, that is based on the exploitation of local resources, participates in their degradation over time. Hence, the necessity to control the access to these resource, a responsibility allocated usually to local authorities. However, experience has shown that the participation of communities in the management of common-pool resources leads to resource preservation, especially in small communities characterized by a strong social capital. This article aims to suggest community management institutions as an effective strategy to maintain common-pool resources and the well-being of the community, taking into consideration, their ability to create faith in the community what facilitates the internalization of community norms, enhances the self-control and increases the chances for local resources preservation. The effectiveness of common management institutions is illustrated by the case of Faqra in Lebanon.*

KEYWORDS: Tourism, Community Management Institutions, Common-Pool Resource Management, Sustainable Local Development.

INTRODUCTION

Sustainability is a broad concept that includes several definitions. Perhaps the most significant definition, stemming from the Brundtland Report, gives a primordial role to humanity in assuring a sustainable development. Hence, the necessity to participate all parties affected by tourism development in the elaboration and the implementation of strategies of land-resources management and local development. Obviously, the management of land-resources influences the environment and shapes the development whether at local, national and even at regional levels. To reach a sustainable development, tourism players should adopt management strategies that satisfy their actual needs and the needs of their stakeholders, while preserving and sustaining the natural resources that will be needed by future generations. According to Gabriel (2007), integrating sustainable development into an economic logic gives naturally a central role to organizations in the conception of both the problems and solutions of practical implementation of the concept. Therefore, the focus is on a type of management that enables the creation of synergies that boost territorial development while, on the other hand, assures the preservation of local resources for future generations.

Despite of all challenges, there is a possibility for sustainable tourism-based local development when concerned communities, represented by informal institutions, manage the common-pool territorial resources and monitor the behavior of tourism players to assure its adequacy to territorial values and norms. The success of community management institution in preserving

land resources is based on the characteristics of the resource, the type of user of this resource (cooperative, free-rider, etc), the strength of bonds that link community members, as well as, on the social capital represented by the set of values, rules and norms that govern the behavior and the commitment of all players on the territory. In addition to these factors, Ostrom (1990) adds the actions of government at the regional and national levels.

Taking these challenges into consideration, the purpose of this paper is to highlight the important role that community management institutions can play in generating a general commitment of tourism players, under a non-cohesive approach, to resource preservation. In order to reach its objectives, this paper studies the case of Faqra, a rural territory in Mount Lebanon, dynamic in tourism, rich in natural resources and characterized by a sustainable local development based on the effective management of land resources by the local community.

Sustainable Tourism and Resource Management

Sustainable tourism is the application of sustainable development in the tourism sector. The term “Sustainable Development” has first appeared in the report of the Brundtland (1987, p. 43) as :“A process of change whereby the exploitation of resources, the direction of investments, the technical and institutional changes, are in harmony and strengthen the current and future satisfaction potentials of humans”. From this standpoint, we can assume that sustainable development requires a rational management of local resources, an equity in its utilization and in the distribution of benefits resulting therefrom (Cazes & Lanquar, 2005). Five years after the Brundtland report, the action plan of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg, 2002) has suggested three dimensions or “pillars” of sustainable development that are now recognized and considered essential: 1) economic viability, 2) social sustainability and 3) environmental sustainability.

Based on these three dimensions of sustainable development, it is remarkable that social, economic and environmental dimensions are the basis of sustainable territorial development. Tourism, which is a consumer of natural resources and local heritage, has also some positive and negative impacts on space and society. Although the positive impacts of tourism are economic (income generation, job creation, foreign exchange inflows, infrastructure development, etc.), the costs of these benefits are, according to Merlin (2008), social; economic (seasonality and precariousness of jobs created) and environmental (pollution variety, damage of landscapes and environments).

Talking about natural resources, Le Roy (1999, p. 116) believes that “each space or territory has its own resources and patrimony”. According to this author, the patrimony may have several forms: natural, historical, cultural, scientific, technical and sociological. The way in which the patrimony is elaborated into local development studies (taking on its full significance in the synergies that are created at the local level) allows us to assimilate it to a resource. In the same vein, François, Hirczak and Senile (2006) addressed the issue of patrimony in terms of a territorial resource, for these authors: “in corresponding patrimony to territorial resources, we are able to balance two facets of the object: a tool of territorial development, and a founding element of local sociocultural dynamics that fit in the history of the community” (François, Hirczak, & Senile, 2006, p. 695).

Despite the fact that local resources could sometimes be abundant and at zero cost, Landel and Senil (2009), consider that maintaining these resources and the development of a patrimony is not easy, two conditions are hence necessary: “the overcoming of the private-public dilemma

and the acceptance of a mixed logic, allowing to overcome the strict public and private logics” (Landel & senile, 2009, p. 5), what refers us to the concepts of local governance and to territorial management of local resources.

At the level of the development of the historical and cultural patrimony, the UNWTO and UNEP (2006, p. 41) considering the following measures:

- a. The preservation of the historical and cultural character of patrimony. The level of protection varies from one country to another. It would be appropriate in some cases to encourage the registration of sites on the World Heritage list in order to protect them;
- b. Effective management of the visitors. Several techniques can be used as the distribution and the diversion of demand, the physical management of the sites, etc.;
- c. Measures to prevent or manage the consequences of invasive activities. Some sites suffer from the intrusion of nearby urban development, of parallel trade as curios stalls or street vendors, etc.
- d. Some solutions to get more money from visitors for conservation purposes. To do this, it is possible to promote a greater attendance, stress on the management of revenues, to open well managed stores, or to encourage voluntary donations, etc.;
- e. The search for ways that ensure positive impacts for the communities living near the sites of patrimony. This can positively affect the conservation and improve the livelihoods of local populations.

On the other flip, Pecqueur considers that “resources are not evenly distributed in space, but that all spaces have “potential” resource [...] provided that they make them emerge and develop” (Pecqueur, 2002, p. 124). The question is then about the efficient management style of these resources, the relationship between management style and resource type, and the relationship between that management style and sustainable local development. According to the same author, there are two main types of territorial resources: generic and specific.

- Generic resources are transferable and are not linked in their utilization, to a space constraint.
- Specific resources are not transferable nor repeatable.

In an attempt to determine the link between resource type and efficient management style, Colletis and Pecqueur (2004, p. 124) consider that only specific resources can achieve sustainable differentiation through collective management which activates the participation and collaboration of tourism players (public and private) and local stakeholders. Such a collective management can achieve positive externalities and simultaneously reduce any negative effects of tourism. In the same vein, Zergout (2007) stresses on the importance of specific resources for local sustainable development. For this author, specific resources may be compensated, if they are insufficient, through a collective mobilization of local skills and capabilities. These refer to intangible resources that have a socio-cultural character, a collective knowledge specific to local areas, on which partners will be enticed to implement relatively ambitious and proactive sustainable management strategies.

Considerably, to assure the sustainability of local development, a particular attention should be given to specific territorial resources, as well as, to territorial strategies of resource management. These strategies should address the vital relations between efficient management of local resources and tourism players who exploit them, and should ensure sustainable economic returns to local community

Management Strategies for Sustainable Territorial Development

Sustainable management strategies encompass the establishment of best management practices of local resources and the elaboration of necessary policies and procedures that prohibit their irrational exploitation. Whether being forced by international organizations or not, the public action, in supporting sustainable development, should build an appropriate institutional framework that may stimulate its implementation.

Regretfully, experience has shown that tourism development is usually accompanied by environmental degradation, which implies, in addition to establishing necessary policies and procedures, an ethical responsibility for all players in terms of land-resource exploitation, what recalls us to the concept of “Corporate Social Responsibility” that, according to Helen Clark, the Administrator of United Nations Development Program (2012), it contributes significantly to achieving sustainable development across its dimensions.

The influence of different players, on land-resource preservation or degradation, is studied by Billaudot (2004) who distinguished between "intentional" and "unintentional" resources. This distinction of resources spots the light on the role of local actors who “intentionally or not intentionally participate to the genesis of resources, their implementation and their renewal” (Samaganova & Samson, 2007, p. 5). Departing from here, tourism players can be assimilated to stakeholders in that they share the common concern of resource preservation and sustainable development. These stakeholders must then be encouraged to collaborate on a strategy of sustainable management of territorial resources which, according to J.B. Marsat (2008, p. 196) goes through three phases: “problematization” (problem setting), guidance (direction setting), and “implementation” (implementation). In the same vein, UNWTO & UNEP (2006, p. 11) consider that the elaboration of sustainable development strategies requires the involvement of all stakeholders in strategy formulation, and a strong political will to ensure broad cooperation and implementation. For Bensahel (2009), the elaboration of resource management strategies for sustainable development is done in negotiation with the various stakeholders who are involved in the development of diagnosis and solutions. For this author, the State plays the role of a referee in finding means of cooperation with local stakeholders in order to formulate a feasible collective resource management strategy. However, the difficulty resides in achieving a collective commitment on a common strategy, especially when some players refuse to participate or to cooperate. In this case, resource-management contracts could be a solution, especially when paired with public support, under a public-private partnership.

In presence of an increasing degradation of land resources in the countries of the south due to tourism activities, accompanied with a lack of resource-management strategies that support sustainability, territorial development would be unbalanced, and management of local resources would remain subject to personal judgments of local players. At this point, we can question on the effectiveness of local institutions in the development of a territory, as well as, on their degree of autonomy in decision making and significantly on the efficiency of public policy and the effectiveness of local governance. As we all know, local governance requires a compromise between private businesses and public authorities (who are supposed to support

and promote the needs and expectations of local communities) prior to articulating the overall institutional and productive business forms. Thus, the degree of involvement and participation of local community and tourism players in policy formulation and resource-management strategies' elaboration depends on the public policy itself (feasibility, fairness, reliability...) and on the type of governance (participative, self, good, etc.) that prevails. In all cases, the participatory dynamism is crucial for the successful implementation of a collective strategy of sustainable development based on a shared vision for resource management.

The necessity for a collective strategy over individual efforts is justified by Marsat (2008, p. 20) who considers that "amenities often have many providers and recipients, and are associated with other amenities of the same territory for their development". In the research for effective strategies to the environmental problems of tourism, the choice of a particular management strategy depends on the characteristics of local resources, the expertise of local players, the type of relationships and networks that link these players, the social capital that characterizes the territory, the effectiveness of community institutions and the type of governance in place. In the same vein, Vanhove (2005, p. 241) considers that managing for sustainable development can have five objectives (economic, social, ecological, cultural and political) as well as three guidelines: quality (types of visitors, types of services requested...), quantity (number of visitors, average spending per visitor...), and locality (local land resource conservation, protection of the cultural heritage...). According to the UNWTO and UNEP (2006, p. 48): "to save resources in the field of tourism, the patterns of consumption of tourists and tourism companies must be changed first. We must encourage them to adopt environmental management systems to minimize their impacts and engage in a process of continuous improvement". Therefore, local resource-management strategies should take into consideration the needs of local communities, the conservation of specific local resources and the implementation of local policies. In this context, a new current of thought was born, around the concept of sustainable development, through the work of Ollagnon (Patrimonial Management) in 1987, Margerum in 1999 and Born in 1995 (Integrated Management), Ostrom (Community Management) in 1990 and Méral (Participatory Management) in 2004.

Common Patrimony-Management Strategy:

Managing a common patrimony, such as natural resources has been studied by different economic currents. On the first hand, the neoclassical economists, represented by Hardin (1968), consider that "what belongs to everybody ends up belonging to nobody", in other terms, it is impossible to manage common patrimony efficiently. On the other hand, institutional economists, represented by Ciriacy-Wantrup & Bishop (1975), consider that common property management is very effective. In the same context, Ollagnon (1989, p. 265) considers the patrimony as "the set of tangible and intangible elements that contribute to maintaining and developing the identity and the autonomy of its holder over time and space by adapting to an evolving environment". Given this point, the notion of common patrimony attempts to surpass the dialectic of being and, having that, brings out the intangible nature of common patrimony, even when applied to natural resources that have a tangible aspect (Mendieta, Petit, & Vivien, 2017).

In the same vein, Ollagnon (1979) distinguished three types of patrimony (and management of this patrimony): individual or family type, collective and community types. The collective type refers to organizations (local communities, organizations, associations, etc.) that coordinate their individual members and carry out operations, on behalf of a group of individuals. As for the community type, it concerns the patrimony where management cannot be achieved by

individuals or by a single collective organization. Finally, the common-patrimony management approach has opened the debate on the collective management process that necessitates the participation and the collaboration of local players and stakeholders in initiatives to solve the problem of degradation of resources. Such a collaboration, regardless of the reason, requires a strong interdependence in the form of conflict resolution, or the construction of a shared vision (resulting in a common action).

Participatory Management Strategy

The concept of participatory management stems from two distinctive currents. The first studies the limits of technology transfer on rural development, while the other criticizes the management of natural resources by local authorities (Ballet, Koffi, & Komona, 2009). The concept of Participatory Management considers that local institutions and local communities should participate in the management of local resources due to their significant role in resource preservation. For instance, it is the argument of communities' social capital that supports the concept of participatory management, the social capital plays a significant role in strengthening the collective action, encouraging the participation of local communities and institutions in decision making, as well as, in discouraging free riders due to the establishment of values, norms and a climate of trust between players (Ostrom, 1990).

For instance, Méral (2004) has distinguished five categories of participatory management:

Village and Use Planning: the concept of village management is based on the establishment of mechanisms to involve local population in planning of a collective action.

Community Based Natural-Resources' Management: this concept is based on the delegation of authority to a group of players to manage the natural resources of a territory.

Joint Forest Management: this concept implies a joint management of local forests by a group of players and forest-preservation bodies.

Co-management: This concept, in which local communities manage resources under rules that they develop in collaboration with the government share power and responsibility with it, is one of the promising new ideas in environmental resource management (McCay, 1993).

Adaptive management: this type of management refers us to the concept of co-management in that it is based on the collaboration of diverse players in an adaptive decision making process.

Finally, according to Taylor (1996) the success of a participatory management strategy is based on the models of interaction among community members (bonding and bridging) and on the relationships between community members and local authorities (vertical social capital).

Community Management Strategy

Community management or *common-pool resource management* is the management of a common-resource community through the collective action of volunteers and stakeholders. Successful community management strategies are dominated by norms that control resource exploitation by insiders and outsiders. These norms should take into consideration the choice of tourism players who must, not only abide by them, but have the possibility to participate in making and modifying them. From a sociological point of view, participation and fairness increase the likelihood that people will internalize the norms and obey them without coercion, in contradiction to Hardin's assumption which considers that only government action could

restrain individual selfishness and prevent the tragedy of the commons (Hardin, 1968). In fact, tourism players may view norms as fair if :1/ these norms have, more or less, the same effect on all those who are asked to abide by them, 2/ they are congruent with the resources they are designed to manage, and 3/ are adaptable to changing conditions.

In general, community strategies are more likely to be successful in small communities that are characterized by widely shared norms. These norms are, according to Ostrom (1990), a kind of “social capital” that facilitate the creation of institutions that efficiently preserve local resources at minimum cost. At the same time, Ostrom found some community management strategies, based on “nested enterprises”, that served large numbers of people.

In all cases, tightly-linked communities find it easier to create new norms that community members will follow. Members of these communities, who comply with social/industry norms, establish reputations as reliable community members. In other terms, if tourism players, on a particular territory trust each other and commit to what they all agreed on with local community, they can be confident that none of them will abuse the agreement if he wants to be considered a reliable community member. In order to increase compliance with norms, successful common management strategies should be accompanied with incentives, in a way that complying with norms should generate benefits that exceed the temptation to overexploitation. However, when norms are violated, graduated penalties would be necessary.

Finally, an important characteristic of community management strategies is that they are based on self-imposed rules that become, overtime, shared social norms to which community members and tourism players adhere. When most players internalize the community's norms as their own, minimal monitoring and control is needed and collective objectives, including resource preservation, become achievable.

Integrated management Strategy

The Integrated Management Strategy of resources is suggested as a mode of management that promotes the concept of sustainable territorial development. According to the UNWTO and UNEP (2006, p. 60): “it is increasingly recognized that the surest way to achieve sustainability is to adopt an integrated development and management of tourism at the destination level. It is indeed at the local level that tourism is more directly linked to and penalized by the environmental and social problems”. Integrated management can be done at the local, regional, national and international levels, as for the objectives of integrated management, they have been clarified by the European Union in the context of a debate on the management of coastal areas. “It is essential to implement a coastal-zone management that is environmentally sustainable, economically equitable, socially responsible and adapted to the cultural realities, and which preserves the integrity of this important resource” (European_Parliament, 2002).

Being a common goal, sustainable territorial development requires the collective action that integrates local actors and stakeholders. According to Leloup, Moyart & Pecqueur (2005, p. 329): “sustainable development is no longer presented as the sole responsibility of public authorities (local, regional or state) but as the result of a process of cooperation and coordination that integrates many actors and operators, in which the local community has a quadruple role of orientation, animation, control and regulation”. To achieve the envisaged development, tourism players on a territory should be acknowledged of policies and instruments that affect the nature of tourism development and influence sustainability. However, attempts to integrate ecological and environmental dimensions in the modes of

collective territorial resources, can be defeated by a few actors who seek to achieve their own goals on the detriment of the community. To cope, a corrective action must be taken by local authorities to put things into order. This action can take many forms, one of which resides in the analysis of the principles of “Polluter Pays”.

From an economic point of view, decisions for allocation of resources require, first, a good economic assessment of alternative uses. Pigou, in his famous book *Welfare Economics* in 1928, advocates that the economic value of the resources can be monetary. In this sense, based on the idea that prices do not allow to achieve the social optimum, Pigou recommends the intervention of public authorities through a system of taxation and subsidies (Dwyer & Forsyth, 2006, p. 359):

Taxes to penalize those who cause disturbances to the environment and grants to reward those whose actions generate environmental benefits. From the perspective of Pigou, the aim is to reconcile the global or collective interest with individual or private interests.

The work of Pigou paved the way for the Economist Hotelling (1895-1973) who proposed, in 1931, in his article “The Economics of Exhaustible Resources”, a reflection on the social optimum through the issue of non-reproducible resources. Consequently, according to Hotelling, to achieve the collective optimum, there is no need of a system of taxes and subsidies, it is necessary and sufficient that the prices of non-renewable resources should be fixed, not simply according to market equilibrium, but taking into account the quantities remaining for each of them. This method, which implies that the price of a given resource is inversely related to its available quantities, represents the advantage of taking into account the scarcity of the resource at time of usage.

Putting it together, although the success of resource management strategies, according to Hardin (1968), ultimately depends on controlling the behavior of individuals which is closely associated with public regulations, community-management strategies increase the feelings of belonging and responsibility towards the community and shape self-control, Ostrom (1990). This is why a strong community is a prerequisite to successful resource-management at the local level.

Community Management Institutions and Resource Preservation

The problem of common-pool resource management has been the subject of a debate among economist for years. Departing from the conception of Hardin (1968) that people put group needs ahead of self-interest and overriding human motives are always self-centered, successful community management of common-pool resources cannot occur and tragedy would unavoidably follow. As previously mentioned, for Hardin, self-centered human motives burden the functioning of community management institutions and the only solution, for him, is through government- institutions’ coercion. On the other flip, the research of Ostrom (1990) about common-pool resource management considers a relationship between, on the first hand, the collective control of resource usage by local communities and, on the other hand, resource depletion. Departing from the fact that communities can get individuals to control themselves well enough to protect common-pool resources, Ostrom assumes that, under some conditions, when people recognize that acting in the collective interest will also benefit them as individuals, social intervention motives win out over selfishness and just very limited coercion will be needed, but is this true for any type of situations?

The answer is no. In absence of rules and norms, selfishness wins due to the structure of the situation that might cause irresistible pressures on individuals to take from resources more than what the common pool can offer. A good example is when a fisherman is never satisfied with his catch, not because of the quantity caught, but as other fishermen, who caught greater quantities, are still fishing and that if he decides to stop fishing, he is not sure the others will do the same. However, some communities manage to create their own system of norms, social pressures and sanctions that restrain free riders and give individuals the assurance they need. Ostrom refers this system to *management institutions* which are able to create faith in the community, what entice local players to comply with its norms and participate, when necessary, in modifying them in order to maintain the common-pool resource and the well-being of the community.

In small communities, characterized by a strong social capital and located on a common territory, we usually find community management institutions that assure the economic and social interdependence among group members, facilitate the monitoring of resource exploitation and enforce shared norms. Moreover, in absence of community management institutions, the risk of resource depletion is greater, what obliged public officials in several countries to impose specific resource-management rules and to nationalize these resources, like in Nepal¹. However, the results were regretfully to the detriment of the resource.

A close look at the reasons for the failure of governments in imposing management rules and development policies for local resources leads us to distinguish the important role of local communities in opposing the new system that contradicts their way of life and threatens their long-standing social traditions. In the same stream, community management institutions are integrated into the community what facilitates the monitoring of common-resource exploitation from within and organize the management of these resources at the community level, not to forget the positive externalities that could be generated due to collective action, especially when community management institutions are capable to internalize these externalities over time. Finally, when local communities participate, even informally through community management institutions, in the formulation of local strategies for common-pool resource management, the sense of community increases, what facilitates the internalization of community norms, enhances the self-control and increases the chances for local resources preservation.

The case of Faqra

Faqra is a rural territory located in Mount-Lebanon, it is distinguished by its economic and social specificities that favor territorial development, namely the geographical proximity from Beirut, the large land space (most of it is barren) and a strong social capital. Talking about the social capital, the local community at Faqra stems from the same ethnicity and religion, and shares the same values and concerns, which is at the base of development of strong bonds between community members and the creation of informal land-management institutions whose main objective is to preserve common-pool resources and to avoid their depletion or pollution.

The economic activities in Faqra have developed in a rural environment, characterized by a peasant society where sericulture and agriculture (specifically apple production) were

¹ Due to the nationalization of forests in Nepal, local communities in villages found that they lost control over the woods and started, instead of protecting, to destroy them.

dominant. After the opening of Suez channel in 1869, the Indian silk-based products have invaded the middle East, what affected, in turn, the production of silk in Lebanon and participated in its abolition. On the other hand, the massive investments in apple production in Bekaa Valley (where lands are very cheap and water is abundant compared to Fakra) have generated a surplus of production into the local market and have expelled local apple producers in Fakra, who lost their competitive advantage, out of the market. The importance of apple production in Faqra is not only related to its capacity to generate the main source of income for local community, but to the social and cultural significance that the apple tree represents for this community. Despite of the high costs related to apple production, the implantation of apple trees continued at a low pace and was mainly limited to personal usage while the search for another economic activity to supplement troubled farming was accelerated. At the time, skiing appeared in late sixties as a new promising economic activity on the territory.

Since the emergence of ski, small farmers, small entrepreneurs and the local elite have all played a significant role in its development, each at his level, with a more or less active participation. This process takes us back to the theory of “Development from Below” which gives a central role to the local community to achieve change and evolution of the territory. Due to ski dynamism, local development at Faqra was obvious with an amelioration of the living standards of local community and the apparition of a mid-class society. To accelerate tourism dynamism, the local community in Faqra has formed an informal land-management institution (composed of senior citizens, experts in agriculture, land owners and highly educated community members) whose purpose is to assist tourism developers and facilitate their acquisition of barren lands in order to construct ski-tourism annex services on (lodging, restaurants, amusement and entertainment centers, gardens, parking’s, etc.). On the other hand, the main concern for the community land-management institution was to let the local community benefit from the tourism dynamism, not only financially, but also environmentally. In this context, the focus was on transforming the barren lands into inhabited gardens of apple trees and other type of trees. To achieve its objective, the institution has convinced the local municipality to impose on tourism developers the construction of their projects according to the traditional local architecture (stone walls, bricks roof and a front garden) and to provide facilities for those who develop green spaces. The result was amazing, as more than forty percent of Faqra barren lands were transformed into inhabited traditional-style houses with apple trees, cedar trees and greenery everywhere.

Although tourism development has improved the living standards of local community and enriched the ecological system in Faqra, the exploitation of local river, in service of tourism, has been economically unsatisfactory and environmentally unfair, what affected in turn the sustainability of this development (even the benefits themselves have had economic and social costs). The negative effect of tourism which resulted from the high concentration of tourism activity during summer and winter seasons can be perceived, mainly, in terms of high pollution of local river due to the bad waste-management system.

According to the UNWTO and UNEP (2006), to conserve resources in tourism, we must first change the consumption patterns of tourists and tourism players. In addition, we must encourage the latter to manage resources rationally, to minimize the negative impacts and to engage a process of continuous improvement. It is therefore an integrated and streamlined approach to management that meets the needs of local communities and the tourism industry at the same time.

To eliminate these negative externalities, the land-management institution has raised an awareness about the needs for a collective action to preserve the rivers. In this context, the local municipality has rapidly promoted the appropriate behavior for rivers' preservation and asked tourism stakeholders and players to cooperate on finding a definite solution for this problem. The participation of local community, represented by the land-management institution (committee of river protection), and tourism players in problem solving (collaborating with them in the development of diagnostics and solutions to the problem of river pollution, while ensuring trustful relationships among them, etc.) has generated a new practice of waste management that is based on the commitment of all players to avoid discarding any left overs into the rivers with respect to local values and norms. Although some tourism players refused, at the beginning, to participate in the collective action, they were convinced, later, to accept the participation due to: 1) the fruitful monitoring and control of deviant behaviors by the committee who announced the names of polluters to the public so that community members will stop dealing with them, 2) the social pressure exerted by the committee and the community, and 3) the general commitment of all other players to the collective action. The success of community land-management institution in solving the problem of river pollution, in increasing the green spaces and in preserving the local culture (traditional architecture and apple gardens) was not due to a cohesion. On the contrary, it is due to the strong bonds (values, traditions, religion, trust and culture) linking community members that the collective action was successful and tourism players were convinced, not obliged, to cooperate on sustainable resource management practices.

CONCLUSION

For the last fifty years, the attention given to the environment has increased worldwide due to the increasing degradation of natural resources, the problem of global warming and the environmental disasters. The importance of this global concern in the public arena is accompanied by political, social and administrative initiatives to find a suitable framework for managing the environment.

Generally speaking, the valorization of natural resources worldwide is, in general, economically unfair and environmentally unsatisfactory. Tourism, for instance, is an economic activity that requires heavy access to local resources. Insofar as access to these resources is free of charge, in most cases, the risk of overexploitation from an economic point of view still exist, causing a non-optimal allocation. Hence, the importance to preserve the natural resources, both for the well-being of the environment and the host communities, departing from the conception of solidarity with future generations. According to Mermet et al. (2005, p. 128), this ecological concern has resulted in two types of gains. On one hand, it created commitments for the public in terms of management of the environment (the laws on the protection of nature, the protocols of reduction of gas emissions for the protection of the ozone layer, etc.). On the other hand, it has made available the management tools that can change the practices of actors, for a better management of the environment (Parafiscal taxes for the management of waste, protected areas...)

On the territorial level, in order to minimize the problems caused by tourism and ensure the sustainability of the tourism industry, we must pay more attention to proper planning and better integration of tourism in local development, bearing in mind that conflicts and negative impacts are mainly due to the ignorance of environmental and socio-cultural needs. On the first hand,

we conclude that community's management of land resources can provide solutions to the problem of sustainability. But it should, first of all, be based on solid bonds between community members and a strong set of values and norms that frame the work of tourism players and assure their commitment to policy. To arrive there, community land-management institutions have a key role to play in the coordination of stakeholders towards the implementation of this policy. In other words, the management of land resources for sustainable local development requires: 1) the involvement of all local stakeholders in a process of information, awareness and education on respect of nature and resource preservation and local values and norms, 2) a good knowledge of the physical environment and the identification of current and potential uses of available resources, 3) the development of plans and integrated strategies that offer a good solution for a more socially-development process and environmentally sound.

On the other hand, the social capital promotes a sense of trust between actors, which is likely to reduce the behavior of free riders (without eliminating it) because of the constraints that bound local actors and risks associated with deviance with regard to shared values and collective rules of the game. Hence, the need to train local actors to the set of rules, contracts and agreements that are derived from sustainable resource management.

Finally, in the presence of a "weak State" (Myrdal, 1969) and an inefficient private property, the control of access to national physical environment is unsatisfactory and local resources become exposed to the private appetites and predatory behavior. However, the management of common-pool resources by community institutions has proven to be effective in controlling and monitoring the behavior of local players and represents a feasible solution for resource preservation and sustainable local development, based on a non-cohesive approach of participation that generates a broad commitment of all players.

REFERENCES

- Ballet, J., Koffi, K., & Komona, B. (2009). Co-Management of Natural Resources in Developing Countries: The Importance of Context. *Economie Internationale*, 120, 53-76.
- Ballet, J. (2007). *La gestion en commun des ressources naturelles: une perspective critique*. Varia: Développement durable et territoires.
- Bensahel, L. (2009). *Aménagement du territoire, tourisme et externalités* (Master "EIG" ed.). Grenoble: UPMF.
- Billaudot. (2004). Quatrièmes Journées de la Proximité. *IDEP-LEST-GREQAM*. Marseille: Groupe de Recherche Dynamique de Proximité.
- Briassoulis, H. (2002). *Sustainable tourism and the question of the commons*. Great Britain: Elsevier.
- Cazes, G., & Lanquar, R. (2005). *L'aménagement Touristique et le Développement Durable*. Paris: Que Sais-je?
- Cicin-Sain, B., & Knecht, R. (1998). *Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management Concepts*. Washington: D.C Island Press.
- Ciriacy-Wantrup, S., & Bishop, R. (1975). Common Property as a Concept in Natural Resources Policy. *Natural Resources*, 14(4), 713-727.
- Clark, H. (2012, May 18). *Corporate Social Responsibility: A Gateway to Sustainability*. Retrieved March 5, 2014, from UNDP: www.undp.org/presscenter/speeches

- Colletis, G., & Pecqueur, B. (2004). *Révélation de ressources spécifiques et coordination située*. Marseille: 4es journées de proximité.
- Development, W. C. (1987). *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dwyer, L., & Forsyth, P. (2006). *International Handbook on the Economics of Tourism*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- EC. (2011, 10 25). *Corporate Social Responsibility*. Brussels: European Commission. Retrieved 3 4, 2014, from European Commission: www.ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies
- European Parliament. (2002). Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2002 on the implementation of an integrated management strategy for European coastal zones. *EU journal*, L148, 24-27.
- European Parliament. (2002). Integrated management strategy of costal zones in Europe. *Journal Officiel des Communautés Européennes*, 24-27.
- Ferguène, A. (2010). State, Economic Policy and development. *Argumenta Oeconomica Cracoviensia*.
- François, H., Hirczak, & Senile. (2006). Territoire et Patrimoine: La Co-construction d'une Dynamique de Ses Ressources. *Revue d'Economie Régionale et Urbaine*, 5, 683-700.
- Froger, G., Méral, P., & Herimandimby, V. (2004). The expansion of participatory governance in the environmental policies of developing countries: The example of Madagascar. *Int.J.Sustainable Development*, 7(2), 164-184.
- Gabriel, P. (2007). Les enjeux stratégiques du développement durable. *XVIe conférence Internationale de Management Stratégique* (p. 23). Montreal: AIMS.
- Gilly, J.-P., & Pecqueur, B. (1998). Regolazione dei territori e dinamiche istituzionale di prossimità. *L'industria*, 19(3), 501-525.
- Hardin, G. (1968, 12 13). The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science, new series*, pp. 1243-1248.
- Healy, R. (2006). The commons problem and Canada's Niagra falls. *Annals of tourism research*, 33(2), 525-540.
- Huteau, S. (2002). *Le management public territorial*. Paris: Papyrus.
- Jenkins, T., Oliver, T., & al. (2001). *Tourisme intégré: cadre conceptuel*. France: Programme SPRITE.
- Knoepfer, P., Olgiati, M., & Warin, P. (2006). Analyse de politiques publiques. *IDHEAP*.
- Landel, P., & Senil, N. (2009). *Patrimoine et territoire, les nouvelles ressources du développement*. France: Développement durable et territoires.
- Le Roy, A. (1999). Tourisme et dynamiques territoriales rurales. In L. Bensahel, & I. Samson, *Perspectives et problèmes du développement touristique dans les économies en transition* (pp. 107-118). Grenoble: UPMF.
- Leloup, F., Moyart, L., & Pecqueur, B. (2005). La gouvernance territoriale comme nouveau mode de coordination territoriale? *Géographie Economie Société*, 7, 321-332.
- Magerum, R. (1999). Integrated Environmental Management: the Foundations for Successful Practices. *Environmental Management*, 24(2), 151-166.
- Mancur, O. (1978). *Logique de l'action collective*. Paris: PUF.
- Marsat. (2008, June 27). J.B. *Valorisation et gestion des aménités naturelles: Comment construire des stratégies d'alliance entre acteurs d'environnement et acteurs de tourisme?* France: Thèse.
- Marsat, J., & al. (2004, January). *Supporting and promoting integrated tourism in Europes' lagging rural regions*. Retrieved from Research gate: www.researchgate.net/publication/233361882
- Mate, K. (2002). *Communities, Civil Society Organisations and the Management of Mineral Wealth*. England: MMSD & IIED.

- McCay, B. (1993). *Management Regimes. Property rights and the performance of natural resource systems*. Stockholm: Beijer Institute of Ecological Economics.
- Mendieta, I., Petit, O., & Vivien, F. (2017). Common Patrimony: A Concept to Analyze Collective Natural Resource Management. The Case of Water Management in France. *Ecological Economics*, 137, 126-132.
- Méral, P. (2004). *Indicateurs économiques pour l'évaluation des transferts de gestion. Rapport, service de coopération et d'action Culturelle*. Madagascar: Embassade de France.
- Merlin, P. (2008). *Tourisme et Aménagement Touristique: des Objectifs Inconciliables*. Paris: La Documentation Française.
- Mermet, L., Bille, R., Leroy, M., Narcy, J.-B., & Poux, X. (2005). L'analyse stratégique de la gestion environnementale: un cadre théorique pour penser l'efficacité en matière d'environnement. *EDP Sciences*, 13, 127-137.
- Mors, M. (1993). Le principe de subsidiarité et la politique de l'environnement dans la communauté. *Insee Méthodes*, 39, 235-248.
- Myrdal, G. (1969). L'Etat mou en pays sous-développés. *Revue Tiers-Monde*, 10, 5-24.
- OECD. (2006). *Le nouveau paradigme rural: politiques et gouvernance*. Paris: CFC.
- Ollagnon, H. (1979). Proposition pour une gestion patrimoniale des eaux souterraines: expérience de la nappe phéatique d'Alsace. *Bulletin Interministériel pour la R.C.B.*, 36, 33-79.
- Ollagnon, H. (1987). *Une nécessaire rencontre des approches théoriques et pragmatiques de la gestion de la nature: l'audit patrimonial de type système acteur* (12 ed.). France: Cahiers du Germes.
- Ollagnon, H. (1989). Une approche patrimoniale de la qualité du milieu naturel. In N. Mathieu, & M. Jollivet, *Du rural à l'environnement. La question de la nature aujourd'hui* (pp. 258-268). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pecqueur, B. (2002). Dans quelles conditions les objets patrimoniaux peuvent-ils être support d'activités? *Revue Montagnes Méditerranéennes*, 123-129.
- Roussel, S. (2007). Ressources naturelles en propriété commune et durabilité de l'exploitation: quel rôle joué par l'information privée. *LAMETA*, 1-43.
- Samaganova, A., & Samson, I. (2007). Les Dynamiques Territoriales. *XLIIIe Colloque de L'ASRDLF*. Grenoble-Chambéry: CREPPEM.
- Taylor, M. (1996). Good Governance: On Hierarchy, social Capital and the Limitations of Rational Choice Theory. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 4(1), 1-28.
- UNWTO & UNEP. (2006). *Making tourism more sustainable: A guide for policy makers*. Paris & Madrid: UNEP DTIE and UNWTO.
- UNWTO, & UNEP. (2006). *Making tourism more sustainable: A guide for policy makers*. Paris & Madrid: UNEP DTIE and UNWTO.
- Vanhove, N. (2005). *The Economics of Tourism Destinations*. UK: Elsevier.
- Walters, C. (1986). Adaptive management of renewable resources. *MacMillan*, 374.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our Common Future*. Retrieved from <http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf>
- Zergout, S. (2007). *Les démarches stratégiques des collectivités territoriales: une vue d'ensemble*. Rabat: REMALD.