

TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE TOURISM MANAGEMENT IN MALAYSIA

Siti-Nabiha, A.K¹, N. Abdul Wahid¹, A. Amran¹, H. Che Haat¹ and I. Abustan²

Abstract

Tourism industry is a key foreign exchange earner for Malaysia, contributing to over 40% of the country's balance of payment in 2005 (EPU, 2006). The industry provides an important source of income, employment and wealth to the country. Thus, there is a need to ensure that the tourism industry remains both environmentally and economically sustainable. However massive influx of tourists can also cause a detrimental environmental impact. Industry players and improper strategies in attracting more tourists could also add further destruction to the environment. Protection of the environment is vital in ensuring the sustainability of the industry. Hence, the purpose of this paper is to discuss the issues pertaining to sustainable tourism development in Malaysia. In so doing, policies, regulations and strategies to achieve sustainable tourism will be examined. The paper concludes with the arguments for having local agenda for sustainable tourism in Malaysia.

Keywords: *Environmental policy, Local Agenda 21, Malaysia, Sustainable tourism, Tourism policy*

INTRODUCTION

Tourism industry, a major contributor to the world economy, is continually growing at 4 to 4.5% annually (UNEP 2003). It has generated an estimated gross output of US\$3.5 trillion and employing 207 million people in 2001 and expected to increase to US\$7.0 trillion of gross output and employing 260 million by 2011 (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2006). The tourism industry contributed to economic development through among others, providing employment and business opportunities, infrastructure improvement and increased in foreign exchange and tax revenues.

Even though Malaysia is a relatively new entrant into tourism activities as compared to its ASEAN neighbours, the industry has grown tremendously over the years. By 2005, tourism industry is a key foreign exchange earner for Malaysia, contributing to over 40% of the country's balance of payment (EPU, 2006). The industry has provides an important source of income, employment and wealth to the country.

However, a massive influx of tourists can also cause adverse environmental impact due to increase in consumption of natural resources, consumerism and waste generation. An unsustainable tourism could lead increase in solid waste, degradation of heritage and cultural sites, reduction in biological diversity, destruction of wildlife and subsequently leads to river, lakes and sea pollution (APEC, 2002). Thus, it is not surprising that a palaeontologist has argued that tourist should watched nature on TV instead of going into areas of great biological important that cannot sustain large number of people (as quoted in Edmonds and Leposky, 1998).

Given the significant role of tourism in the economy and the potential benefits from it, there is a need to ensure that the tourism industry remains both environmentally and economically sustainable. In ensuring the sustainability of the industry, protection of the environment is of foremost importance. Furthermore, sustainable tourism development has

¹ School of Management, University Sains Malaysia, Minden 11800 Penang, Malaysia

² School of Civil Engineering, engineering campus University Sains Malaysia,

become an important criterion in attracting tourists. For example, Miller (2003) in his research interviews with tourism consumers at a Destination Travel Show, found that environmental considerations is one factor used by customers in choosing tourism product as he explained below:

“Consumer are already making decision based on environmental, social, economic quality for day-to-day products and are keen to transfer these habits to the purchase of the tourism products” (Miller, 2003).

In view of the adverse impact of the environmental and cultural degradation on tourism products, the Ministry of Culture, Arts and Tourism has formulated The Malaysian National Ecotourism Plan to ensure conservation of Malaysia’s natural and cultural heritage. It also aims to maximize the economic, socio-cultural and environmental benefits that can be gained from the tourism sector. Hence, the purpose of this paper is to discuss the issues pertaining to sustainable tourism development in Malaysia. In so doing, the governmental tourism and environmental management policy, regulations and guidelines will be examined. The implementation of Local agenda 21 is also explained in the paper together with the problems of coordination and issues constraining sustainable tourism industry in Malaysia.

SUSTAINABLE TOURISM IN MALAYSIA

A poorly planned and managed tourism development, besides being detrimental to the environment and the local communities, could result in decrease in market share (APEC, 1996). As a result, a more sustainable tourism development is needed. Sustainable tourism development has three inter-related major components, i.e., the environmental, economic and social cultural. It is defined by UNEP (2001) as follows:

“Sustainable tourism development meets the needs of the present tourist 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 need can be fulfilled, while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems”, (WTO)(UNEP,2001)

Besides ensuring the preservation of the environment, tourism activities should preserve the culture of the local communities and provide adequate economic opportunities for the locals whilst guarding them against exploitation (Moore 1996, Leposky 1997). A sustainable tourism development should:

- (i) optimise the use of environmental resources while preserving the natural heritage and biodiversity
- (ii) respect the local culture of the host community through conserving the living cultural heritage
- (iii) ensure sustainable and equitable economic operations and employment opportunities and social services to local community while contributing to poverty alleviation.

(UNEP, website)

Due to nature of the tourism industry, a sustainable tourism development should be based on coordinated actions between the different sectors involved (APEC, 2002). Constant monitoring of the impact of tourism is needed together with the use of preventive and

corrective measures (UNEP, website). Integrated and meaningful multi-stakeholders participations from a broad spectrum of the host communities are needed. The partnership should be at the federal, states and local level and should be back by strong political leadership.

The role of the Malaysian government in promoting sustainable tourism is evident in the existing legal and institutional framework. There is evidence that indicate that Agenda 21 have been adopted in the national master plan. To speed up the development of tourism industry, the Malaysian Tourism Policy was formulated in 1992. The policy had identified ecotourism as one form of tourism to be expanded and sustained. It was followed by a more specific national ecotourism plan three years later. The National Ecotourism Master Plan was drafted in 1995 and was accepted by the government in 1996.

The national ecotourism plan was intended to provide a general framework to assist the government in developing the country's ecotourism potential. Under the plan, the definition of ecotourism follows that of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). Ecotourism is defined as responsible travel and visitation to relatively undisturbed natural areas in order to enjoy and appreciate nature that conserves the environment and sustains the well-being of local people. As a result, quite a number of the tourism destinations in Malaysia as been gazetted terrestrial or marine protected areas in various categories such as forest reserves, wildlife reserves, sanctuaries, wetlands and marine parks.

In order to ensure the success of the eco-tourism plans, joint efforts between the various levels of government, the private sector and the local communities were planned and carried out to maximize the economic, socio-cultural and environmental benefits it has to bring. Although MOCAT (Ministry of Culture, Arts and Tourism) acts as a single coordinating body to spearhead the overall implementation of the National Eco tourism plan, the Ministry recognizes the imperative role of the private sector and specifies roles for all sectors of Federal, State and Local Authority (LA), private business, NGOs and other players, (APEC, 2002).

Under the 9th Malaysia a more integrated approach to tourism planning and management are to be undertaken (EPU, 2005) through preserving as well as enhancing the existing and natural and cultural assets. In addition, the role of the State Tourism Action Councils (STAC) will be further expanded to include regular monitoring and evaluating of project outcomes. At the local level, local authorities and communities are encouraged to have a more active role from the beginning of the projects so as to minimise environmental destruction. For businesses, such as hotels and resorts, they "will need to incorporate, among others, water and energy conservation as well as waste disposal aspects in the implementation, management and maintenance plans" (EPU, 2005, pg 201). More emphasis will be given to the preservation of the natural attractions to enhance eco-tourism as well as preservation of the heritage tourism such as historical sites, buildings and artefacts that are categorized under preservation of the natural attractions. In addition, more value added activities are incorporated in the agro-tourisms and home stay programmes (EPU, 2005)

There are the arguments that sustainable tourism should not be left to market mechanism and industry self regulation but should be backed with policies and legislations. Thus, sustainable tourism needs to be backed by environmental policy and legislation.

MALAYSIA ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY AND LEGISLATION

As earlier mentioned, tourism industry could lead to negative impact both to the environment and local population if not monitored. Malaysia is one of the 12 mega-diverse countries in the world that accepts the importance of preserving its social, environmental and cultural wealth heritage. Given that Malaysia is banking on the natural environment for the

tourism attraction, various actions have been taken by Malaysian government to protect the environment.

The first initiative of environmental management in Malaysia commenced formally in 1974 when a regulatory agency known as the Department of Environmental (DOE) was set up. It was during the 1980s, in tandem with the global trend attributed primarily to the alarming scientific findings on environmental degradation, that DOE function was seen as important (Mohammad, 2002). Later environmental issues dominated discussions in many international forums and among the salient outcomes of such discussions were the Langkawi Declaration on Environmental and development at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) in 1989, the Bio-diversity Conversation during the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) meeting held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992 and the Montreal Protocol on the reduction of non-essential chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) usage (Mohammad, 2002). Among the noticeable action is the environmental awareness campaigns carried out by the DOE and other relevant agencies as well as active participation of the non-governmental organizations.

Locating specific legislation that discuss about sustainable tourism might be frustrating. Nevertheless there are many policies and acts which were formulated by the Malaysian government that are favoured to the environmental issues. Among others are the Environmental Quality Order, 1987; National Parks Act, 1980; The Protection of Wildlife Act of 1972, The Fisheries Act, 1985; The National Forestry Act, 1984 and the establishment of Marine Parks Malaysia Order of 1994. Each of these policies falls under different jurisdiction of the government authorities which might impede smooth implementation of sustainable tourism due the bureaucratic obstacles.

Acknowledging the need to have a more holistic guide, the Malaysian government has come out with the Malaysian National Conservation Strategy (NCS):

The intention of the NCS is to set out plans and suggestions which can be used to integrate more fully the many existing efforts toward natural resources management for conversation and development, to build on the strength of existing institutions and mechanisms, and to incorporate additional future efforts into the process of conservation as a key to successful and sustainable development

(Mohd Nawayai 2008, pg 70).

The strategies outlined by the NCS seemed to have close similarity with what are prescribed in the Agenda 21 toward achieving sustainable tourism. This evidence lends strong support for the implementation of Agenda 21 in the national policy. This implies that the Malaysian government is serious in making their way toward achieving sustainable tourism.

LOCAL AGENDA 21

In the context of eco-tourism, local authority, which comprises the City Hall, the municipalities and district councils are the main players in the implementation stage of sustainable tourism development agenda. They are also responsible in providing proper maintenance as the tourism destinations fall under their area of jurisdiction. Chapter 28 of Agenda 21 clearly binds them to take lead in the implementation of the sustainable development at a local level. It is an approach through which a local community defines their strategy and the action program to be implemented. The whole process of the

implementation of Agenda 21 can be summarized into three components of strategy and action plan. The three components are as follows:

- *Establishing effective structures for multi-stakeholder participation, both in setting the direction for tourism in the community and in working together to develop and manage it.*
- *Identifying a strategy for sustainable tourism within the context of a wider sustainable development strategy that reflects stakeholders views and that allows tourism management to be integrated with other management functions in the destination.*
- *Identifying and implementing a set of actions, in line with the strategy, that address the economic, social and environmental sustainability of tourism in the area.*

(Cited from Tourism and local agenda 21, UNEP, 2003)

Each of the above strategies will be further elaborated in the following paragraphs. The first component discusses about setting up effective structures for multi stakeholder participation. Effective multi stakeholder structure needs direction and leadership and local authorities are usually well placed to provide the leadership (UNEP, 2003).

The local authority is expected to coordinate and facilitate the participation processes. This includes providing training to the various stakeholders involved. As the process touches so many aspects of society, and cuts across wide range of local authority functions, it may require high level of political engagement. This will help effective coordination across department as well as various interests are safeguarded. At this participatory stage, commitments from the various stakeholders are crucial. This will involve customers, local community, tourist agents, small retailers and various departments in the local authority. Their initiative and contribution will definitely make a difference to the whole participatory process.

The second component touches on the sustainable tourism strategies and the local management tools. It is important to ensure that sustainable tourism is integrated within the overall policies and actions towards sustainable development in the area. The process involves using the stakeholder groups to identify issues, agree on an overall vision, identify strategic priorities and establish an action programme. Other issues that may not be directly related should also be considered in formulating the strategies. The strategy should be based on sound analysis and specifically address the economic, social and environmental impacts of tourism. This is different compared to the traditional practices which focus only on the economic impact. In order to ensure the vision is translated into reality, it requires setting goals, targets, indicators and monitoring procedures.

The last component is on the identification and implementation of a set of actions which is in line with the strategy that addresses the economic, social and environmental sustainability of tourism in the area. The actions taken should benefit all three and are mutually reinforcing rather than discrete actions. Listed below are actions proposed by UNEP (2003).

1. Improve environmental planning and management in the destination
2. Promote more sustainable transport
3. Conserve and promote natural and cultural heritage resources
4. Help tourism enterprise to be more sustainable
5. Use appropriate certification schemes
6. Promote the use of local product and integration with other sectors
7. Strengthen communication with the visitors and local residents

Malaysia as one of the signatories of the Agenda 21 is therefore expected to oblige with the concept of sustainable development. Thus, Local Agenda 21 was implemented by

four local authorities in 2000. They are the Miri City Council, Petaling Jaya City Council, Kerian District Council and Kuantan Municipal Council (Awang Kepli, 2006).

LA 21 committees, comprising members from the civil society; local authority and business community, were formed. Their functions are to develop action plan and raised awareness on sustainable development issues, promote cooperation between stakeholders, and establish and monitor sustainable development indicators (MHLG website). By 2005, LA 21 was implemented in 47 local authorities in Malaysia. Sixteen of them launched action plan for sustainable development covering social, environmental and economic issues. The LA 21 will be implemented in all local authorities during the 9th Malaysian Plan period (EPU, 2006).

However, the LA 21 initial projects are not focusing on the issue of tourism specifically but instead on other environmental issues such as solid waste management that is considered as critical in the country. Although having clean cities can help promote tourism locations, unless the local authority can identify and promote attractive locations, the impact to the tourism industry can be minimal. For example, the LA21 programme in Miri City Council mainly relates to waste management system, pollution of river and public places and better drainage network (Awang Kipli, 2006). The activities undertaken did not have a significant impact on waste reduction but it has created awareness and education on waste reduction activities among the community (Awang Kipli, 2006).

Similarly, LA 21 activities in Kota Kinabalu mainly relates to waste reduction and creating awareness on environmental issues (see DBKK website). The implementation of LA 21 in Petaling Jaya clearly illustrated that the local concern rests mainly with daily issues faced by residents such as crime, vandalism, safety and service delivery. The same is true for Kerian Municipal Council. The LA 21 activities for that local authority cover areas related flood and drainage irrigation system, environmental pollution, road and traffic, community facilities and social problems and poverty and housing.

Even in cases when the citizens and local community are concern about sustainable development, the long term political commitment left much to be desired as happened in the case of Penang island. Penang is one of the major tourist attractions in Malaysia. Tourists have been flocking to Penang for its sea, sun and shopping expeditions. However, rapid development in the island has been detrimental to environment and has led to multitude of problems such as air, water and coastal pollution, loss of natural eco-system, traffic congestion and so on (Nasution, 2002). Thus, there were calls made to have a more balanced development to the extent that Sahabat Alam Malaysia, an NGO, had called for the banning of all hill development in the island (Buang, 2005).

Sustainable Penang Initiative (SPI) was launched with the purpose of ensuring a more balance and holistic development in Penang with consultative partnership with the government, the business community and civil society (Nasution, 2002). The outputs from the consultation process were to be channelled to the relevant authorities as an input in their development planning (Nasution, 2002). However, there is not much political commitment to the SPI. For example, the cutting and hill clearing along the famous Tanjung Bungah Batu Feringgi tourist belt to be used especially for high end housing development are left unchecked. This is contrary to the spirit of SPI. The whole system made a mockery of LA 21.

Another example is the case of coastal land reclamation project in Tanjung Tokong. The land is to be used for high end housing projects and will subsequently lead to the gentrification of the area. Sustainable development and public participation is just lip service. The loss of beach to the population and the long term ecological damage were not considered in the development plan. This is also reflects the short term orientation of the relevant parties. The sea, sun and sand tourism are the attractions of tourists to Penang. The

sea pollution, traffic congestion and a host of other issue have lead to loss of Penang competitive advantage to the tourism consumers. Thus, the participatory approach as in the case of SPI does not lead to real effective input the development planning process.

Even though environmental laws and policies are put in place, sometimes there are no real enforcements. During the EAI process, feedback and input from the public affected by the project are needed. But, public participation is not really emphasised since EIA can be submitted and approve even without the community affected by the project knowing about it (Kwong, 1996). Even when the local authority did not give planning permission for hillside development, it could be overturned as in the case of development in Paya Terubung, a hill land in Penang. The developer has managed to de-gazette the hill land. When the developer appeal to Penang's Appeal Board against the local council withholding of the planning permission, the Board stand is that planning permission should be given since the land now is not officially considered as a hill land (Buang, 2005).

Beside the lack of political commitment, another constraints faced in sustainable tourism development is due to the lack of trained and skills personnel together with the lack of financial resources both at the state and local level to maintain tourism products, facilities and infrastructures. Thus, even though Malaysia has incorporated sustainable tourism principles into her tourism master plan, the diffusion of such philosophy to the local level has been quite slow (Cruz, 2003). There is dire need to introduce and effectively implement local agenda 21 for sustainable tourism to ensure more responsible tourism practices. Tourism should be integrated in with the overall policies and the strategies and there should political commitment to implement the strategies and enforce the policies and regulations. There is a need to have a local agenda for sustainable tourism put in place in Malaysia

THE NEED FOR LOCAL AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

Any policy that is developed will be carried out by government agencies located at both federal and states as the arms to implement it. In many cases, it is the LA that is given the responsibility to see that the policy implementation is carried through. Unless the LA is serious, committed and have specific directions on how to go about implementing the policy, success cannot be associated with. In Malaysia, land use is considered a state matter and therefore comes under the purview of respective state governments. In this context, each state government is directly involved in developing and promoting land-based tourism. Tourism product is unique in the sense that customers have to come to the particular location in order enjoy it (in marketing, this is known as the 'pull' strategy).

Due to this uniqueness, the state and local authorities must play significant role in formulating, organizing and coordinating the appropriate policy to ensure the tourism they develop and promote is saleable. The implementation of tourism development in general or the ecotourism development in particular can be seen to vary within the different states in terms of focus and speed of implementation. For instance, Perak state has been lagging behind other states such as Selangor, Wilayah Persekutuan and Penang in competing for tourism market in Malaysia due to its perception that tourism is secondary to commodities. Perak state's economy has been highly dependent on its commodities such as tin, rubber and palm oil (Mohd. Zuhri, 2003). It was only in the 1980s that it started to put priority in developing the state's tourism industry. Even then, it took a few more years to see the state to identify its ten tourism products that emphasized on the state's ecotourism, culture and natural heritage.

Although the state has realised its mistake and has since worked to rectify it, implementation wise, it has a lot to answer for. For example, when Perak State Tourism Action Council developed its strategic action plan to develop tourism industry for the state,

Taiping is promoted as the heritage city of Perak and is listed as one of the ten attractions for tourists. As argued by Abdul Wahid et al. (2007), the declaration of Taiping as a heritage town by the State Tourism Action Council (STAC) is “insignificant unless the state or municipal is serious at promoting it as such. The status given via ‘heritage’ should be respected and acted upon fittingly”.

The reason is due to the placement of a landfill within the area of tourist interests in Larut-Matang. One of the heritage attraction of this place is the Makam Dato’ Sagor, a grave belonged to a famous Malay warrior who was hanged in 1871 as he was accused as one of the mastermind in the assassination of J.W.W. Birch, the first British Resident in Perak. His grave unfortunately is located just 100 meters from Larut-Matang landfill. Not too far away is another famous location i.e. Kota Ngah Ibrahim, the residence of Ngah Ibrahim as Menteri Larut that also act as the court that deliberated on the fate of Dato’ Sagor’s and two more of his accomplices. The common complaints associated with the landfills from local residents are: bad smells especially during rainy and windy days, the increase number of flies, dusts and other waste residues that fall from the vehicles carrying waste to the landfill, noise from the vehicles, etc. (Abdul Wahid et al, 2006).

The Wahid et al. (2007) study showed that the complaints do not come only from local residents but tourists as well. The discomfort can be experienced from as far as Matang Historical Complex which is 1km away from the landfill. Unfortunately, although this is the case, actions to help ease or solve the problem have not been taken up by anyone. The local community and LA like Majlis Perbandaran Taiping (MPT) should work together to solve this problem

Thus, the suggestion to use an integrated approach to tourism planning and implementation with emphasis and preserving existing natural and cultural assets as had been outlined in the 9th Malaysian Plan to be closely followed. Proper act and support by both local authorities and communities can ensure the Malaysian tourism industry remains both economically and environmentally sustainable, in particular for Taiping town itself (Abdul Wahid et al., 2007).

The state and local authorities should take genuine interest in places like Tasik Chini and Royal Belum that possess special characteristics like: conscientious, low-impact visitor behavior; sensitivity towards, and appreciation of, local cultures and biodiversity; support for local conservation efforts; sustainable benefits to local communities; local participation in decision-making and educational components for both the traveler and local communities. It is very important to understand what characterizes an ecotourism that will separate it from the other types of tourism, i.e. heritage, rural, extreme sport, health, etc. and to continue promoting it as such. This is because today, ecotourism has become a ‘buzz’ word in tourism development because it is believed to be a rapidly expanding sector of the tourism industry (Tisdell, 1988; House, 1996). This is due to an increase of variety of existing market segments due to increased tourists’ education background, awareness of environmental issues, different life styles and taste, etc.

Furthermore, the growing number of eco tourists has inspired most conservation groups to see ecotourism as a brand new solution to achieve ecologically sustainable development. Tasik Chini for instance boasts having a navigation lockgate that functions not only to maintain the water level of the lake so that people can navigate their boats easily in both wet and dry seasons (for both sight seeing and other water related activities) but also to fix the water level to minimize bank erosion (Abustan et al., 2002). Abustan, et al. (2007) study had identified both its scenery and water quality as the main attractions that pull tourists to the lake. The problem the lake is currently facing i.e. aquatic weeds, colour and water turbidity, and litter must be solved together by the stakeholders. It is not enough to let the LA

alone to do the job. But the community will not be able to help out unless they are given support by the LA.

It is still quite unfortunate to find that although many environment stakeholders such as the governments, ministries of education, school districts, and educators in Malaysia are interested in promoting sustainable tourism in the country, many of them are working individually instead of together. Not having a model of Local Agenda for Sustainable Tourism (LAST) that can be applied or replicated within the traditional environment setting makes the decision of how to implement it a problem. Without a model of which the community can adapt and/or adopt, they are left with the task of having to define what sustainable ecotourism is with respect to their local context (e.g. according to traditions, culture, etc.).

The local authorities need to play active part in setting vision, mission of sustainable tourism in particular the ecotourism itself. The community should be informed and invited to play an active role in maintaining control of tourism development that they want for the community at all stages of the implementation. The community should have local ownership of the product they are offering. Sustainable tourism development is only considered successful if and when the tourism is able to provide quality employment to its community. It should be a win-win situation for all i.e. it should sustain the well being of the local people, supports efforts to conserve the environment, and contributes to biodiversity.

The local authorities along with the community must establish a code of practice to follow (includes guidelines for tourism operations, impact assessment – i.e. to minimize environmental impacts using benchmarks, monitoring of cumulative impacts and limits to acceptable change that is to take place due to the tourism activities). A Local Agenda for Sustainable Tourism (LAST) Model should be developed. LAST model must possess the following characteristics:

- (i) must be locally relevant and culturally appropriate, reflecting the environmental, economic, and social conditions of the community in question.
- (ii) created through a process of public participation in which stakeholders from across the community can express their visions for a sustainable community and their choice of the type of ecotourism orientation to address sustainability should include.
- (iii) every stakeholder can contribute to LAST according to the strengths of the model.
- (iv) communities and local government systems should work together to achieve community sustainability goals.

LAST can be an important "bottom-up" driver of community-based sustainable development through the shaping and encouraging of behaviors and ethics supporting an informed, knowledgeable citizenry with political will to achieve a sustainable future.

The stakeholders like the government, the industries and the society should be encouraged to take part in leading the sustainable tourism. While appropriate ministries can jointly help in developing suitable policies, other stakeholders can take part in supporting the push and lobbying of the policies apart from trying to help organise sustainable tourism related programs themselves, finding partners to organise the programs or sponsoring the events. Bringing the programs to local councils, NGOs, schools or other learning institutions and the industries will be one good way of how this can happen. Conducting the 'Training the Trainers' programs for administrators, teachers, etc. who act as role models and opinion leaders in society is also essential to be carried out continuously. Different issues emerge everyday with different solutions to provide. Trainers need to be well equipped with knowledge and means to understand the issues:

What – What sustainable tourism program should we promote?, What will be the focus of the program?, What do we get out of this?, etc.

Who - Who should start the program?, Who are the targets?, Who should sponsor?, etc.

Why – Why we choose this program, not others?, Why those targets, not other segments?, etc.

When – When do we start (now, yesterday, tomorrow)?, etc.

Where – Where to start (geographic location, type of organisation, etc.)?, etc.

How – How do we go about doing this?, etc.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

For the tourism sector to be sustainable, strategy to achieve it need to be integrated with the wider strategy sustainable development strategy with effective multi-stakeholder participation. Moreover, actions in line with the strategy should be implemented. Besides effective participation from the various stakeholders, the tourism strategy should be integrated with the wider strategy for sustainable development. The tourism management should be integrated with other management functions and actions in line with the strategy should be implemented

The success of achieving sustainable tourism depends very much on how we define each issue, their scope and seriousness and the full support and commitment from all stakeholders. The planning design of sustainable tourism must be made and presented at every level, especially the national level to ensure consistent understanding of the concept. By brainstorming the idea of sustainable tourism (program-, policy- and practice- wise), the local community needs will be identified and thus, can be properly addressed.

References

1. APEC and PATA. (2002), APEC/PATA code for Sustainable Tourism, meeting of APEC_TWG and the Fiftieth PATA Conference, Malaysia.
2. APEC TWG. (1996), Environmentally Sustainable Tourism in APEC Member Economies, APEC Secretariat, Singapore.
3. Badariddin, M. (2002). *The Development of Ecotourism in Malaysia. Is it Really Sustainable?*. Paper presented at the International Year Ecotourism 2002, Regional Conference in Chiang Mai, Thailand, 3-7 March 2002.
4. Cruz, R.G. (2003). *Towards Sustainable Tourism Development in the Philippines and other Asean Countries: An Examination of Programs and Practices of National Tourism Organizations*. PASCN Discussion Paper No 2003-06.
5. Awang Kipli, D.S.N., (2006). *Local Agenda 21 Initiative in Waste Minimization For Miri City*. Forth Sabah-Sarawak Environmental Convention 2006.
6. EPU Malaysia, (2006). *Economic Instruments for Environmental Management in Malaysia*. Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department, Kuala Lumpur.
7. International Council on Local Environmental Initiatives. (1999). *Sustainable Tourism: A Local Authority Perspective*. Commission on Sustainable Development 7th Session, New York.
8. Abustan, I., Abdul Wahid, N. & Abdul Malik, N. (2007). *The Effect of Perceived Water Quality Towards Eco-tourism at Tasik Chini*. Proceeding 3rd International Conference: Sustainability In Service Industry, Jakarta, Indonesia.
9. Edmonds, J. & Leposky, G. (1998). *Ecotourism and Sustainable Tourism Development in Southeast Asia*. Third International Conference.
10. Johor Bahru. *City of Johor Bahru Profile*. Malaysia.
11. Khoo, S.N. (2001). *The Sustainable Penang Initiative: Creating State-Society Partnership for Sustainable Development*. International Institute for Environment and Development, London.
12. Langkawi, (2007). *Green Tourism*. Malaysia: Features.
13. Leposky, G. (1997). *Globalization and Sustainable Development*. Vocation Industry Review, March/April, 10.
14. Majlis Daerah Kerian. *Local Agenda 21*. <http://mdkerian.perak.gov.my>.
15. Majlis Perbandaran Petaling Jaya. *Local Agenda 21 Implementation*. www.adb.org/documents/books/urbanization-sustainability/chapter09.pdf.
16. Majlis Perbandaran Subang Jaya. (2007). *Seminar Jawatankuasa Penduduk dan Bengkel LA 21 MPSJ*. <http://jkpsj.org.my/node/105>.
17. Miller, G. (2003) Consumerism in sustainable tourism: a survey of UK consumers. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. 11(1), 17-39.
18. Ministry of Housing and Local Government Malaysia. (2001). *Country Report of Malaysia*. Istanbul+5 Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly, New York.
19. Mohamad, R.S. (2007). *Sustainable Living in Malaysia: Living Well Within the Ecological Limits of Our Planet*. Workshop on Introduction to Ecological Footprint. University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
20. Mohammed, M.D. (2002). *The Ecotourism Development in Malaysia, chapter in Linking Green Productivity to Ecotourism: Experience in the Asia Pacific Region*. Published by Green Productivity, Tokyo.
21. Mohd, Nawayai, Y. (2008). *Environmental Management of Tourism Development in Malaysia*. Article downloaded on 19 February 2008 from http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TPTS_pubs/pub_1748/pub_1748TP-C.pdf.
22. Mohd Zahuri, A. (2003). In Perak the Land of Grace – Harnessing the Potential of the State's Tourism and Hospitality Industry. Paper presented at the *Perak Economic Summit: Repositioning for Competitiveness & Growth*. 8-9 September 2003.
23. Moore, W. (1996). Address. Miami Conference on the Caribbean and Latin America. Miami, Florida.
24. Abdul Wahid N., Abustan I. and Abdul Rahman T.A. (2007). *Heritage Town Tourism: The Effect of Landfill*. Proceedings 3rd International Conference: Sustainability in Service Industry, Jakarta, Indonesia.
25. Abdul Wahid, N., Abustan, I. and Abdul Rahman, M.T. (2006). *Social Impact Study of Municipal Landfill: The Case of Larut-Matang Landfill*. Report submitted for IAEA.
26. Abdul Wahid, N., Siti Nabiha, A.K., Ali, A., Nasurdin, A. (2005). *Perak as an Attractive Tourist Destination: Analysis and Recommendations*, in The 6th International Asia Academy of Management Conference Proceedings, Ipoh, Perak, Malaysia.
27. Ninth Malaysia Plan (2006). *Realising Tourism Potential*. Government of Malaysia Printer: Kuala Lumpur.

28. Ninth Malaysia Plan. (2006). *Providing Quality Housing and Urban Services*. Government of Malaysia Printers: Kuala Lumpur.
29. Peggy, T. (2002). *Striking a Balance for Sustainable Tourism: Implications of the Discourse on Globalisation*. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol.10, No.6. National University of Singapore, Singapore.
30. Salleh Buang. (2005). *Our Hills Still in Jeopardy*. Property Times 24 September 2005 issue.
31. Terry, D. L., Marion B., Stewart M., Steve N. (2002). *Public/Private Partnerships for Sustainable Tourism: Delivering a Sustainable Strategy for Tourism Destinations*. APEC Publishing, Australia.
32. United Nation. *Managing Sustainable Tourism Development*. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.
33. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Industry and Environment and International Hotel & Restaurant Association (IH&RA). (1996). Environmental Good Practice in Hotel – Case Studied from the International Hotel & Restaurant Association Environmental Award, Green Hotelier. Paris, France: UNEP and IH&RA.
34. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). (2003). *Tourism and Local Agenda 21, The Role of Local Authorities in Sustainable Tourism*. UNEP France.
35. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). *Sustainable Tourism, Local Authorities and Local Agenda 21*. www.unipie.org/pc/tourism/sust-tourism/home.htm.
36. Victor, V. (2007). *World Tourism Conference: Tourism Success Stories and Shooting Stars*. Shangri-La Hotel, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
37. World Tourism Organisation (WTO). (1994). *Sustainable Tourism Development: A Guide for Local Planners*. Madrid, Spain.
38. World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC), International Federation of Tour Operators (IFTO), International Hotel & Restaurant Association (IH&RA), International Council of Cruise Lines (ICCL) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). 2002. *Tourism: Industry as a Partner for Sustainable Development*. UK: The Beacon Press.