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ABSTRACT

The National Tourism Municipalization Program (PNMT) is the instrument for the organization of the governmental endeavors for the furthering of tourism in the Brazilian municipalities, containing the norms and procedures for the actions of the three levels of govern: federal, state and municipality. This furthering of tourism should be based on the economical, social, environmental, territorial and political sustainability.

This paper has its origin in the fact that the set of actions that allows for the exam and measurement of the effects of PNMT is not formally known. Following the steps suggested by Vedung (2000), to make the Evaluability Assessment the National Tourism Program and the National Tourism Municipalization Program were analyzed, and the parameters pertinent to an evaluability assessment kind of study were established.

Used as a tool for verifying the possibility of evaluation of the PNMT, this Evaluability Assessment makes possible the harmonization of the theoretical concepts and the standardization of the procedures for future evaluations of tourism policies implemented at different levels of the Brazilian government.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper concerns pre-evaluation of public tourism policies in Brazil and it is a short version of a forthcoming book on the subject.

On researching recent papers on the National Tourism Municipalization Program (PNMT), by Viglus (1999), Bezerra e Carvalho (1999), Lobato (2001) and Endres (2002), among others, I have remarked that, although they describe aspects of the implantation and implementation of this public policy in several municipalities across the country, there are still no well-known parameters to define how this or any other public tourism policy in Brazil should be evaluated.

The still growing level of awareness of the topic indicates that there is a lack of in-depth studies on the subject, and that the parameters to evaluate the results obtained to date with the application of public tourism policies are still missing.

Theoretically, the attributions of government in the tourism sector involve a complex of inter-relations that encompass the different spheres of Federal, State and Municipal administration, and demand inter- and intra-governmental coordination and cooperation, in a close partnership with private ventures.
It should be noted the necessity for a wide involvement of public and entrepreneurial leaderships, as well as of the population of the municipalities and regions, in the process of implementing public tourism policies. The aim is to reach previously established goals such as making the localities sensitive to and aware of the tourism issue, as well as mobilizing local populations and making them more able to receive tourists.

The comprehension that the National Tourism Policy is the central focus from where the orientations that provide impulse and support to the actions concerning the sector must be originated, and that the development of touristic activity involves the administration and implementation of Public Tourism Policies has defined the master guidelines that oriented me in the elaboration of this paper.

Moreover, I propose here a framework, which allows verifying the measurability of a specific public tourism policy, the National Program of Tourism Municipalization (PNMT) and which also makes possible, in the future, to evaluate tourism policies implemented at different levels of the Brazilian government.

2. PUBLIC POLICY EVALUATIONS AND EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT

Evaluation is an indispensable part of the institutional decision-making process, because it generates information that is relevant to improving government decisions in the different stages that make up the basic cycle of state intervention, allowing for the monitoring of the implementation of public policies (NEPP, 1999: iv).

I consider, in this study, the definition proposed by Vedung (2000), that says that evaluation is a careful retrospective assessment of merit, worth and value of administration, output and outcome of government interventions, which is intended to play a role in future, practical action situations.

This definition is one among the many existing definitions for the subject and, according to the author himself, is not free from controversies. The methodological clarity of its presentation and the wide range of its affirmations are, however, adequate for this paper, which is aimed at setting parameters for evaluation in an area where there are no holistically formulated studies.

Silva and Melo (2000) and Vedung (2000), when drawing considerations about Public Policies, remark that the actions of modern State are so wide, their execution so complicated, and their potential consequences can have such long reach, that social science and research are needed to monitor these operations and establish the impact that is caused by them.

The Core Group of Studies for Public Policies (NEPP, 1999), from the Campinas State University, when considering the implementation of social public policies in Brazil, affirms that, apart from the unexpected results that might come up along the process, both the formulation and the implementation of social public policies are extremely complex activities: the challenges faced are multiple, be it due to the imbrications of these policies with the economical policy, be it as a function of the multiplicity of governmental organizations that intervene in the implementation of programs or even as a function of the multiplicity of partners called to participate in its development.

The same can be affirmed about public tourism policies.

Endres (2002), Lobato (2001), Viglus (1999) and Carvalho and Bezerra (1999), confirm the statements of the above quoted authors, by pointing out unexpected results in all the stages of the implementation of the National Tourism Municipalization Program, such as, for instance, what occasionally happens in the choice of tourism monitors. Since these monitors are fundamental elements in the philosophy of the program, their indication, when carried out according to exclusively political criteria, often makes impossible the continuation of the actions that had been planned.

Another example of an unexpected side effect, which arises during the implementation of the PNMT, is the lack of integration among the several partners which, sometimes, turns the cooperation into
competition. A negative effect, which is not predicted by the Program, is the allocation of meaningful shares of tourism-related income to other places than municipalities where this income is generated.

The definition of evaluation proposed by Vedung (2000) may be used for the various kinds of activities developed by the public sector.

The author uses a heuristic model, systemic government model, as a theoretical support instrument to outline the several aspects involved in public administration. Therefore, changes made in one area of the public service bring about changes in other areas, since all parts of the system depend on each other.

This theoretical analysis mechanism allows for the understanding of what happens at the end of a public policy’s application cycle and consequently helps to assess the implementation of the program and its effectiveness.
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Figure 1. Systemic Model, Adaptation Ana Maria Lorena Campos from Vedung (2000: 05)

A public policy has its beginning when an issue is defined as priority and starts to be debated by society, by pressure groups, by the several levels of public administration, by NGO’s, among others, and is in the agenda of governmental discussion. A problem is identified, the solution of which, in principle, depends on governmental action.

At this moment, the first efforts to outline the nature of the problem are carried out, with the intent to create a basis for future decision-making.

By analyzing Vedung’s systemic model, presented in figure 1, one observes that this initial phase of a public policy, its preparation and the decision to implement it belong to the stage called input.

After the debate where priority issues are specified, goals and alternatives are established for that which is being sought after, probable consequences are calculated and costs are estimated. Also, information related to alternative action courses are brought together and organized.

What follows is the study of the legal aspects related to the issue, and the availability of human, financial and managerial resources that allow for the effective implementation of a program bound to reach the established goals. This preparation moment must include considerations on how the future government actions will be evaluated.

This second stage, which corresponds to the phase called administration or conversion, happens within the administrative organ and relates to the unification and coordination of (human, material, financial, time and space, among other) resources, with view to reach the established goals in the most effective way, as well as to the specifications on how the intervention will be processed.
In order to help the analysis of a public policy, Vedung establishes that the following stage in his model, called *output*, means the phenomenon that is produced in government organisms in the form of prohibitions, authorized procedures, funds, subsidies, taxes, advice, guidance, moral persuasion, services and goods, in order to guide, clarify, encourage or restrain citizens, and thus achieve the established goals. It is a resource used by the author to help the analysis of public policies, since in systemic models, over all, the “outputs” are considered to be the production or income that take place in the target area.

The “outputs” issued by government organisms, on their turn, reach the target public, give rise to actions by these beneficiaries, reach the social environment that is beyond this target public and the natural world, and bring about 1, 2 or 3 more positive or negative outcomes.

*Results* is the word used by Vedung to summarize, in his theoretical model, the sum of the *outputs* plus the *outcomes*, occasionally referring to only one of these terms. The word *implementation* is used to designate the sum of the actions conducted by *administration* plus the *results* obtained.

Next, the evaluation of *results* offers the feedback that allows for the continuity of the lines drawn by the public policy concerned or for its reformulation, if necessary.

### 2.1 Evaluability Assessment

Vedung's work on evaluability assessment refers back to Wholey et al. (1977) and Rutman and associates (1977 and 1980).

The author emphasizes the appropriateness of this technique as an adequate resource to be employed in areas where the use of evaluation methods are so restrictedly employed as in the area of public tourism policies in Brazil. He also recommends that one begin by the evaluability assessment of the public policy, defining its current situation for, in the future, drawing a more adequate research design.

An evaluability assessment consists of a series of successive stages that include gathering information, studying and confronting material from several sources that provide the knowledge of the considered policy.

The process also enables one to verify if the information obtained is liable to a standardization of procedures that allows for generating a mature evaluation of the program in study.

The first stage of an evaluability assessment is called *program analysis* and determines the nature of the policy. It includes preparing an overview of the policy based on official material, administrative material, and normative instructions among others, issued by the government in order to outline its components, goals or expected effects.

*Program components* are defined after Vedung (2000) as the activities or sets of activities that, in one way or another, will impact the beneficiaries of the policy. The main purpose is to draw the flow that the policy should follow to produce its effects, according to the documentary evidence.

The second stage refers to determining the perceptions of the program by key people involved with it. And that supposes the pre-evaluator determining which stakeholders to interview, besides the program administrators.

A third stage is called *scouting the program* which supposes gathering more information in the field, in order to draw a wide vision of how the program actually works.

The final stage comprises developing an *evaluable program’s model*. In this stage the pre-evaluator determines which components and goals/effects of the program meet the preconditions of being evaluated.

The step that follows the final stage would be, according to that author, a feasibility analysis that supposes identifying the evaluation users and discussing with them the possibilities of developing a full-scale evaluation based on the data obtained with the evaluability assessment.
3. DEVELOPMENT OF AN EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT MODEL FOR THE NATIONAL TOURISM MUNICIPALIZATION PROGRAM (PNMT)

As I collected the materials and established the first contacts with stakeholders, in the different spheres of government and in the localities, I noticed the existence of a great discrepancy in the concept of tourism and, sometimes, even the unawareness of the basis of this activity. Then, I naturally outlined the first step to be taken for the elaboration of an evaluability assessment of the PNMT: to develop a conceptual model that established the approach of tourism, from which public policies in the area could be assessed.

Thus, I established a theoretical discussion about the grounds of tourism that allowed me to reach the consensus among various approaches from which tourism is focused, without which it was difficult to define parameters that could be used in the evaluation of the public policies in the area.

3.1 Theoretical Conceptual Model of the Tourism Approaches

I considered multiple angles from which the activity has been studied and, having listed the converging points in the various approaches, I established a Conceptual Model of the Tourism Approaches.

To study, get to know and define tourism has been the concern and target of the studies conducted by many specialists who look at the activity from different angles, in the attempt to turn it into a concept. In order to define the theoretical framework from which this *Evaluability Assessment* is processed, I present some of the focuses under which tourism has been studied, in a reading of the thought of authors who have worked on the topic. Any analysis made on tourism must bear in mind what Moesch (2000) calls *epicenter* of the touristic phenomenon: *man*.

![Conceptual Graphic Model: Approaches to Tourism](Campos, 2003)

Figure 2. Conceptual Graphic Model: Approaches to Tourism (Campos, 2003)
Be it as a tourist, be it as a resident, human being is the center of touristic activity, “a social practice” according to Cruz (1999).

This positioning, remarks Cruz (1999), “contradicts historically constructed approaches which put down the practice of tourism to an economic activity, allows for an advance towards busting some of the myths that surround studies on tourism over all, and for building scientifically guided knowledge on this practice, its meanings and developments.”

In fact, numerous authors such as Nicolás (1996), Cara (2001) and Knafu (2001), among many others, are unanimous in affirming that the phenomenon of tourism is analyzed mostly from the exclusively economic context, for several reasons.

Nicolás (1996) affirms that the most well-known tourism studies are the economic ones, because evident profitability can be derived from the activity. However, for this author, more than an economic activity, tourism is a practice that generates economical activity, just like religion, sport and war. Tourism, he affirms, is over all a collective social practice that integrates distinct mechanisms in relation to space, to identity and to other people.

According to Cara (2001), tourism is seen as a social phenomenon in time, varying from one society to the other. It is an activity that creates images and representations that are conveyed to the agents and the society in which the users and the market take part, apart from the receiving societies.

Knafu (2001) considers tourism to be particularly difficult to evaluate, because it is a multiform human activity which lies on an eccentric economical structure. Oscillating between under- and over evaluation, depending on the origin and interest of evaluators, this social practice is frequently assessed considering merely the activity’s economical focus, which results in partial reflections on a phenomenon the nature of which is still poorly defined.

Much more important, according to Knafu (2001), is the need to consider, when the talk is creating touristic activity and touristic sites, the three largest and most distinguished logics of touristification: the tourists, the market and the local planners.

Affirming that “the touristic phenomenon is a complex combination of inter-relationships between production and services, in the composition of which a social practice with a cultural basis and historical heritage integrates to a different environment, natural cartography, hospitality relationships and exchange of intercultural information”, Moesch (2000) points to the numerous variables that must be considered when studying tourism. To this author, the sum of this socio-cultural dynamics is the touristic product, which generates a thorough phenomenon of objectivity and subjectivity consumed by millions of people, the tourists.

A language that articulates an important set of values in modern life, and the means by which the possibility of meeting the other is experienced, tourism, a sign of status in present-day societies, is considered to be a need for health and welfare of individuals (URRY, 2001).

According to the above mentioned author, the condition of the tourist is that of someone who is intrinsically displaced, moving towards new and foreign situations.

Tourism thus reports to a phenomenon that involves the relations referring to the displacement of people and their permanence in different destinations, with the basic purpose of leisure. In those occasions, tourists carry out activities that they are not used to carrying out in their everyday lives and, at the end of a short stay, they return to their residences.

What drives tourists to displace themselves, says Moesch (2000), are “personal, subjective, intimate reasons, since the visit to the destination does not imply in profit purposes. Perceptions, interpretations, restrictions and encouragement, representing manifestations, attitudes and activities related to psychological, educational, cultural, technical, economical, social and political factors underlie this displacement”.

A
By displacing themselves, by interacting according to their personal goals and their will, tourists nowadays cater to their needs in face of a post-modern world in the search for leisure, culture, information, social inclusion, knowledge, meeting the other, health, welfare, and so forth.

These tourists, sensitive and concerned with the reality that surrounds them, must be attentive to the peculiarities of the environments they visit and to the particularities of local culture.

A counterpoint for those who displace themselves (tourists), the residents, settled in their territory, undergo personal transformations related to the presence of visitors, and these transformations also reflect in the localities where they live.

Here is presented the other side of the argument about this phenomenon called tourism.

Mathieson and Wall (1982) approach the issue of economic, physical and social impacts of tourism on the host locality. Other authors such as Pearce (1991), Cazes, Lanquar and Raynouard (1991) focus on the territory to which tourists displace themselves from the perspective of touristic development and the administration of the activity in the locality.

Authors such as Brunt and Courtney (1999) analyze the perception of socio-cultural impacts of tourism by residents.

Considering, like Cruz (1999) and Cara (2001), that the activities that are commonly associated with tourism are due to this practice that consumes basically space, and that, from the territorial point of view, tourism is a transforming agent, the next step is to draw some considerations on this other angle from which this social practice can be discussed.

In Santos’s (1997) wide concept, space is a set of object and action systems that cannot be dissociated. These systems do not function and have no philosophical reality if they are focused on their own. Touristic space, therefore, is a concrete and objective space, the recreational value of which varies in a function of certain circumstances that transcend it, such as accessibility, the existence of initiatives, the present legal-administrative norms, and the landscape appeal, among others.

Fúster (1991) reminds us that, finished the period when the concept of tourism was only related to the movement of people, the attentions shifted focused to the nucleus that receives tourists. That is when tourism shows all of its potency and the complexity of the actions and reactions it produces on the territory.

For Rubio (1986), tourism has the capacity to organize the territory, like industry or urbanization. The author considers that the analysis of tourism contemplates the provenience places for the cyclical migrations that are bound to it, the means of transportation used and, especially, the destinations where tourism creates peculiar forms of space usage and habits, and gives birth to forms, no less peculiar, of organization of human settlements.

I can though affirm, at the end of these considerations, that if sectorial tourism policies do not consider the richness of elements that are mobilized by this social practice, they run the risk of becoming partial and ineffective.

3.2 Public tourism policies in Brazil

The issue of Public Tourism Policies in Brazil is very recent.

Between 1938, when tourism is first mentioned in the National Constitution, and 1966, several legal norms come up that concern tourism, however, without presenting the features of a state action that is planned for the sector (FERRAZ, 1992: 16).

It can be said of a National Tourism Policy for the first time after the issuing of Decree-Law number 55 on Nov. 18, 1966, when the Brazilian touristic legislation starts to have the contours of a sectorial regimen. It was on that occasion that the National Tourism Policy got its concept and the official structure for its formulation and execution was instituted (FERRAZ, 1992: 140).
During the 1970’s, several tax incentives were channeled especially towards the expansion of the hotel industry and, later, other actions were triggered, through tax and credit incentives, for investments and quality control of the private services, as well as for the ordination of usage and occupation of the touristic patrimony (PNT, 2001: 7).

The Brazilian Constitution of 1988 mentions tourism in two dispositions: articles 24 (sections VII and VIII) and 180.

Article 24 informs that it is bestowed upon the Union, the States and the Federal District to concurrently legislate about:

“VII. protection of the historical, cultural, artistic, touristic and landscape patrimony;

VIII. liabilities for damages done to the environment, to consumers, to private assets and the right to artistic, touristic and landscape value.”

Article 180 specifies that the Union, the States, the Federal District and the Municipalities will promote and encourage tourism as a factor for social and economical development.

In 1992 the Decree No. 448 regularizes Law 8.181/91 and disciplines the National Tourism Policy.

The analysis of the history of public tourism policies in Brazil shows that these policies, besides not having been made totally clear, only dealt with partial aspects of the activity. (Cruz, 2000: 9).

Cruz (2000) and Hall (2001) remind us that, for a long time, it was ignored that, without the reference of a national policy, tourism policies and plans in the state, regional and municipal scales do not integrate or interact with each other, and neither do they establish bonds with the other sectorial policies.

With the publishing, in 1995, of the document “Guidelines for a National Tourism Policy 1996 – 1999”, there is, for the first time, a script for actions that represent a commitment of the Federal Government with the adoption of measures that are necessary for the sector.


On April 29, 2003, the “National Tourism Policy” for the period of 2003 to 2006 is launched.

Paraná State Tourism Policy was issued, for the first time in 2003 and as far as I know there are no municipal policies of tourism issued yet in Brazil

Somarrida and Dulci (1997) affirm that the Brazilian Constitution of 1988 transferred a big share of its attributions to the municipalities in the areas of education, health, urbanism, among others, through the municipalization process. Municipalities’ financial bases were enlarged, as well as the capacity of self-organization (through organic laws) and the restoration of the power of the Councilmen’s Chamber. The constitution disposition that refers to the incorporation of representative associations, in the formulation and implementation of public policies has opened a path for effective forms of participation of citizens in municipal management.

As a probable consequence of this process, the National Tourism Municipalization Program (PNMT) was created in March 1992, in order to improve the quality of the Brazilian touristic product, through a work of improving municipalities’ awareness as to the economical and social importance of tourism (Rejowski, 1996:5).

The basic components that define the philosophy of the PNMT and that determine its form of implementation are found in the main documents issued: Guidelines (1999), Procedures (1999), Guide for ‘Multiplier-Agents’ and Monitors Training Workshops (1999) and the document Development of Sustainable Tourism: Manual for Local Organizers (1994). Documents consulted, produced by the State of Paraná, complement the information that is available to stakeholders.
The published material still provides guidance about the relations that must occur between the beneficiaries and the Program administrators, and the relations among the beneficiaries themselves, during the implementation process.

The first component presented is the issue of municipalization of tourism that is part of the name of the policy here concerned. Let it be known that municipalization is a process of touristic development through the awareness of the population that benefits from the actions conducted in the municipality itself.

The general objective of this policy, implemented between the years of 1994 and 2004\(^1\), consists in encouraging sustainable touristic development in the municipalities based on the economic, social, environmental, cultural and political sustainability.

The specific objectives listed, to make society aware and sensitive to the importance of tourism; to de-center the actions related to the activity, in order to drive stakeholders to elaborate the Municipal Tourism Plan; to provide municipalities with the technical, organizational and managerial conditions needed to develop the activity; to encourage the strengthening of bonds between the different levels of government and private ventures, and to raise the levels of quality, efficiency and effectiveness of services rendered in the tourism area guide the achievement of the PNMT’s general objective.

The National Program of Municipalization of Tourism establishes, as general principles, the de-centering of tourism, the identification of partnerships and the mobilization of community, skill/trade training and sustainability.

The strategic actions defined contemplate the creation of the State PNMT Committee, and the training of state multiplying agents and municipal monitors to develop the actions proposed for each stage of implementation of the policy. These actions include, apart from the orientation and encouragement of the municipal government to the formation of the Municipal Tourism Council, the assistance to municipalities in the implementation of the Municipal Touristic Plan.

Other strategic actions defined, such as orienting the government in the creation of legal mechanisms, in the elaboration of incentive policies for the tourism and in the organization of touristic activities, ensure the continuity of the development of sustainable tourism in the municipality, just like the action of encouraging the public and private institutions to the formation and skill training of the professionals who render services to the touristic sector ensures the quality and excellence in the services offered.

For a municipality to be considered as engaged in the PNMT, it needs to have properly trained tourism monitors in the first two stages of the training workshops offered by the Program, its community needs to be aware of and mobilized towards the tourism issue, and the processes for the creation of the Municipal Tourism Council and the Municipal Tourism Fund need to have been started within the proposed philosophy.

Among the results expected is the participation of the community in the elaboration and management of the Municipal Sustainable Tourism Development Plan (PNMT, 2001:09).

### 3.3. Strategic Axes of the National Program of Municipalization of Tourism

Once listed, from the consulted material, the components (activities or sets of activities that cause impact in the focus areas and the beneficiaries) of the policy in question, I have elaborated an

\(^1\) The change of presidents in 2004 (Fernando Henrique Cardoso/Luis Inácio Lula da Silva) determined the change of the NTMP to a public policy focused on the regional aspects of the development of tourism. This new policy maintains the basic concepts of the NTMP, now with a focus in the different regions of the country.
Implementation Chain of the National Tourism Municipalization Program, which describes the PNMT’s route from the federal level, going through states and reaching municipalities. This Implementation Chain, besides checking the coherence between the objectives defined for the National Tourism Policy and the PNMT, makes it possible to visualize the way this policy should be implemented and the results expected.

To close this stage of the analysis, and considering the organization of the next step, which is to determine the perception of key people about the Program, I have defined four strategic axes for National Program of Municipalization of Tourism.

Inspired by the work of Vila (2003), I have conceived the National Tourism Municipalization Program as a public policy with an implementation process distributed over four axes, linked to each other by cause and effect bonds — the PNMT’s Strategic Axes, which allowed me to comprise the conception of the Program as a whole.

Axis 1 – Binding Structure, Axis 2 – Implementation, Processes and Activities and the De-centering of Tourism, Axis 3 – Tax Management, Infrastructure and Resources and Axis 4 – Results refer to the ideological ground stones of the PNMT, to the different stages of the implementation process for a tourism policy and to the consequent actions and events that must occur in the municipalities where the policy is implemented.

Besides offering a systemic view of the Program, the Axes are used as tools designed to guide the identification, selection and later definition of the variables that will allow evaluating how the implementation of this tourism policy was developed in the several phases of the program, and the results obtained.

For each axis I identified, therefore, a set of variables, and for each variable I identified a further set of indicators that made possible to become the variable concerned operational.

The nominal and operational definition of the variables and the choice of indicators related to Axes 1, 2 and 3 was done basically from the components identified in the official literature concerning the Program. However, for those components that were not sufficiently detailed as to allow for the nominal definition of variables, I have used data obtained in case studies related to the PNMT, conducted in several municipalities of the country, and in the existing academic literature on the subject.

Terms used to describe the Program or its related actions, terms related to the theoretical comprehension of the touristic activity and that were not clearly expressed, in my opinion, such as, community, municipalization, efficiency, effectiveness and de-centralization of tourism, among others, were also defined so that I was able to establish a common dialogue framework with respondents interviewed in the following step of this work and for the interpretation of the responses obtained.
In its turn, the identification and nominal and operational definition of the variables for Axis 4 have included the consultation to literature related to the norms for classification and evaluation of the results of sustainable tourism.

3.4. Standardization of Procedures: Characterization of Axis 1

Axis 1 - Binding Structures concerns the inter-relations that are established in the beginning of the PNMT's implementation in a locality, and checks for effects that occur from the moment when the population is exposed to the conceptions related to sensitization, awareness and mobilization for the development of sustainable tourism. The term binding structure refers to the reunion of the elements that compose the PNMT’s ideological ground stones and its inter-relations with the policy as a whole.

Besides, Axis 1 concerns the implementation of the participative process for the development of tourism in the Municipality, the training for those involved in the Program and the action of partners. Moreover, it checks whether potential beneficiaries are exposed to the information that come from the PNMT, whether they take part in the activities proposed, whether they develop interests related to the messages conveyed, by understanding them and getting insights on them. It also allows to observe how this information have an influence on the attitudes of stakeholders and give rise to consequent actions and decisions, as they are assimilated.

This axis encompasses the aspects related to the satisfaction of inhabitants and of public and private organizations with the paths trodden by the development of touristic activity in the locality, and the issues that concern the satisfaction of tourists and visitors with the tourism that is presently offered or that is planned to be offered in the area.

I have identified in this axis five variables that characterize triggering actions and events of the policy - as shown in table 1, without which the implementation process loses its basic features as specified in the governmental documents.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sensitization and Awareness for Tourism Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Skill Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mobilization of Community: Integration and Satisfaction of Public and Private Organizations and Integration and Satisfaction of Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Participative Process – participation of Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Satisfaction of Tourists and Visitors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Axis 1 - Variables

3.5. Standardization of procedures: Sensitization and Awareness for Tourism Issues

Next, I present the process for the nominal and operational definition of variable 1, Axis 1: Sensitization and Awareness for Tourism Issues. The other variables of the first axis, the characterization of Axes 2, 3 and 4, and the definition of the variables related to each of them will not be detailed hereby, due to the length restrictions established for the papers to be presented at this symposium.

To allow for the classification of the variable Sensitization and Awareness, I once more reported to the components of the PNMT and, defined it based on those components which I have considered priority.

I have considered that the PNMT is a participative process that envisages sensitization, awareness and the encouragement and training of local community, especially its representatives, so that they are able to recognize the importance and dimension of tourism as a generator of jobs and income and as an instrument for preservation, valuation and maintenance of natural, historical and cultural patrimonies.
To sensitize the community, according to the views of the Program, is to vividly impress and attract the attention of the community so that they realize the importance of the purposes and actions related to sustainable tourism.

Thus, the PNMT works so that the local multiplying agents stand up to recognize the importance of tourism in the social-economic development of their region, consider the need to conciliate economic growth with the preservation and conservation of natural, historical and cultural patrimony, and encourage the participation of their communities in the management of their own resources.

In its turn, the awareness process is triggered by the sensitization and must lead the local population to perceive the true political, social and economic reality, so as to give rise to actions of development of tourism to be executed in the circumstances of the current world.

Furthermore, according to the PNMT detailed information, researches and papers on the nature of tourism, its effects on the human and cultural environment must be available before, during and after the development process, so that people can participate and exert the largest possible influence on the process of developing sustainable tourism and on its impacts.

I have then listed the concrete observable facts that made possible to identify the concepts of sensitization and awareness, and that have served as indicators for the process of operational definition of the variable concerned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sensitization and Awareness for Tourism Issues | a) Knowledge of the Program’s components; existence of personal and institutional aspirations and values of those involved with the development of sustainable tourism; knowledge and interpretation of these values;  
|                                         | b) Number of sensitization campaigns – target public;                         
|                                         | c) Number of awareness campaigns – target public;                            
|                                         | d) Dissemination of activities conducted by the Municipal Tourism Organ and the Municipal Tourism Council;  
|                                         | e) Dissemination of activities to be conducted by the Municipal Tourism Organ and the Municipal Tourism Council;  
|                                         | f) Importance of sensitization and awareness campaigns for the development of tourism. |

Table 2. Sensitization and Awareness for Tourism Issues

3.6. Standardization of procedures: classification related to the variable Sensitization and Awareness for Tourism Issues

In this step, I set up criteria that allowed me for verifying if the stakeholders were sensitized and aware of the tourism issues in their municipalities. I also established the criteria for verifying if the municipal tourism administration organs reflected sensitization and awareness for the issues related to the development of tourism.

I elaborated therefore a certain number of statements that included elements which I considered pertinent to evaluating if a stakeholder was sensitized and aware about the issues of tourism or not, and I attributed grades to the different kinds of answers I could obtain.

As for example, to the set of statements related to sensitization for the tourism issues I attributed the following grades:

1. Respondent explains what tourism is:
   Yes (2)   Sort of (1)   No (-1)   N/A (0)

2. Respondent explains what the PNMT is:
3. Respondent identifies advantages of the PNMT for his/her municipality:
Yes (2)  Sort of (1)  No (-1)  N/A (0)

4. Respondent identifies disadvantages of the PNMT for his/her municipality:
Yes (2)  Sort of (1)  No (-1)  N/A (0)

5. Respondent explains what sensitization for tourism is:
Yes (2)  Sort of (1)  No (-1)  N/A (0)

6. Municipality has conducted sensitization campaigns during the implementation process for the NTMP:
Yes (1)  No (-1)  N/A (0)

7. Respondent has taken part in sensitization campaigns:
Yes (1)  No (-1)  N/A (0)

8. Respondent identifies results of sensitization campaigns:
Yes (1)  No (-1)  N/A (0)

9. Number of sensitization campaigns conducted in the municipality:
1-5 (1)  6-10 (2) More than 10 (3)

10. Target public of campaigns
    Partners: Yes (1)  No (0)
    Government: Yes (1)  No (0)
    Entrepreneurs in the sector: Yes (1)  No (0)
    Workers from the tourism support areas: Yes (1)  No (0)
    Residing population: Yes (1)  No (0)
    Others: Yes (1)  No (0)

11. Means of communication used for sensitization:
    1 means of communication (1)  2 means of communication (2) 3+ means of communication (3)

I was then able to locate the object of study: sensitization for the tourism actions, in a continuum in order to verify whether the representatives of the municipality were sensitized to the sustainable tourism issue.

The respondents’ degree of sensitivity may vary in a continuum that goes from -5 to 19, indicating representatives that are very sensitized, somewhat sensitized, intermediately sensitized, little sensitized or non-sensitized as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 to 19</td>
<td>Class 1: Municipality with very sensitized representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 16</td>
<td>Class 2: Municipality with somewhat sensitized representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>Class 3: Municipality with intermediately sensitized representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>Class 4: Municipality with little sensitized representatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Classification of municipality representatives according to sensitization for issues of tourism

Still in axis 1, variable 1, I repeated the same procedures for verifying the awareness of the stakeholders about the issues of tourism and if the municipal organization reflected its concern about the issues related to the development of sustainable tourism.

Therefore, in axis 1, the municipality representatives were classified according to:
1) Their degree of sensitization of tourism development issues in the municipality.
2) Their awareness to sustainable tourism development issues in the locality.
3) The actions developed in the municipality related to the development of sustainable tourism.

This process was also repeated for each of the variables identified in the other three axes of the National Program for the Municipalization of Tourism (PNMT).

4. CASE STUDY IN DEVELOPMENT

In the last step of this evaluability assessment I sought to determine, in a case study I am conducting in two municipalities in the State of Paraná, Brazil, the perception of the PNMT by the stakeholders and their comprehension of the concepts that define it. I also verified how the implementation of the Program was done in the municipalities and some of the results obtained.

With this objective in mind I elaborated a set of questions to orient the interviews conducted.

The list of key people to be interviewed, in the three levels in which the program is developed, has included the program’s decision-makers and administrators. In this category, the interviews were conducted with public employees that are responsible for the elaboration of the PNMT and administrators in charge of the intervention on national, state and municipal levels.

The list also includes the president of the Municipal Tourism Council, monitors of tourism trained by the PNMT, municipal legislators and partners of the program, entrepreneurs in the sector, tourists and residents.

The municipalities of Palmeira and Paranaguá were chosen for the case study by the indication of the Coordinator for Touristic Planning from State Tourism Office of Paraná, and responsible for the Program in the State.

Both localities had been engaged in the Program since the beginning of its implementation and had completed the several stages predicted for the program.

The State Tourism Office, also, wished to know the effective possibilities for the evaluation of the PNMT by parameters that were specifically elaborated for such.

The field research in course tests empirically the significance of each of the PNMT’s axes, and verifies, in loco, the availability of necessary and reliable information for the evaluation of the policy concerned, by confronting the actions developed with the principles and objectives preached by the Program.

It also allows knowing the views, comprehension and yearnings of the target public, through the eyes of a participative tourism policy, so that this public’s criteria can be incorporated and will contribute to the elaboration of the variables and indicators for future research that evaluates public tourism policies in Brazil.

The analysis of the possibility that the data gathered about the Program is appropriate to be evaluated according to a model focused on the effective results of government interventions, considering the views of the people involved as targets or as administrators of the program, is still in course.

It is worth remarking that the list of variables and indicators established in this paper, to evaluate the PNMT, is not complete, and was never intended as such.
Once verified the coherence of this Evaluability Assessment, the ideal is to look for a consensus among scholars, researchers, public policies and tourism administrators, teachers and other people involved in the process of developing sustainable tourism in Brazil, for revision, perfecting and assembling of a research model for specific evaluation, thus closing the cycle with a feasibility analysis as suggested by Vedung.

5. FINDINGS AND COMMENTS

I could observe from the critical analysis of the material issued by the federal government and by the government of the State of Paraná that the consulted materials refer to the components of the PNMT with different levels of specificity.

As to Axis 1 – Binding Structure, I have observed that some of its components, which were not sufficiently clear in the document “Guidelines for the PNMT”, were redefined in materials later issued by the federal and state administrations. This theoretical redefinition of the component, however, did not always have practical reflexes in the municipalities.

Thus, for instance, the municipalization component was defined, in the document “Guidelines for the PNMT”, as a process of touristic development by means of developing the awareness of the population that benefits from the actions conducted in their municipality.

In this case, this component is approached from a perspective that unbinds it from the implications of the political process of municipalization, which takes place in the country since the elaboration of the Brazilian Constitution of 1988.

This political process, by means of which the federal and state government transfer responsibilities and resources to municipalities, has profound implications, that reflects on the relation between the public administration and the inhabitants. The co-management of the destinies of the municipality can become real, by the organization of municipal councils, as long as pro-active attitudes for both parties involved are developed.

Since the PNMT has not emphasized, from the beginning, the political responsibility of the public administration in the process and the necessary institutional arrangements for its implementation, that has allowed breaches so that the decisions concerning the development of sustainable tourism in the municipality were taken in a unilateral way. Either by the public administration, which imposes their points of view and disregards the population or by the stakeholders who get organized to install the Municipal Tourism Council and Fund, and even to elaborate the municipality’s tourism plan, but who do not know how to get the political backing necessary to implement them.

In that case, public administrators and stakeholders, in general, ignore the functions of government organisms of tourism, municipal councils and normative actions provided by law and the relationship between the parts starts to depend on personal, rather than managerial factors.

The Program makes no references to the municipal tourism policy, the elaboration of which must precede the municipal tourism plan. In case this policy is not elaborated, the goals to be achieved by means of the participative planning of tourism may be unattainable as they may be subject to changes of direction imprinted by periodically elected governors.

Apart, therefore, were the considerations on the new relationship rules that must be established between stakeholders and the municipal public administration, and that must culminate not only in the elaboration of the municipal tourism plan, but also in the elaboration of the municipal tourism policy itself.

“... the policy should be permanent, even if there are political and party changes.” (Respondent stakeholder).

“... we have talked to the Mayor, we have our work plans. We have made 10,500 manuals for a tourism project, a fantastic project, to be developed in three phases. We have implemented the first
phase and the new Mayor did not continue the work that had already been started.” (Respondent stakeholder)

This issue, which represents a big obstacle for the development of tourism in municipalities nowadays, is a reflex of the lack of a national tourism policy that properly defines the functions that the public administration must carry on in its different levels.

Although the mechanisms are settled through constitutional norms and the existence of national, state and municipal councils and forums there is a lack of a thoroughly definition on how new institutional arrangements should be designed to deal with the necessary partnership between the public administration and the stakeholders involved in the process.

A second factor that causes great difficulties during the implementation process is that the national and state policies make no distinctions between the conception of the policy as rules and the strategic orientation that should be followed at the operational level were the procedures should be implemented.

The general objective of this policy, encouraging sustainable touristic development in the municipalities based on economic, social environmental, cultural and political sustainability is not followed of the necessary explanation for the stakeholders to take the steps to achieve this goal.

The sustainability of the touristic activity that is also considered as a general principle of the program is only dealt with in the Training Workshops Guide. The reference to this complement includes the concept and the principles of sustainable development, identifies the elements that must be present in a sustainable tourism development plan, and lists the benefits of the activity when it is developed in a sustainable manner.

However, the approach to the sustainability the touristic activity is not sufficient, considering the actions that are necessary to ensure the sustainability of the activity in the municipality. In this case, I had to elaborate a Sustainable Tourism Diagram to identify the focus of attention to be paid to this item in the policy.

The field interviews have shown that the sustainability component was incorporated by the stakeholders, who, in one way or the other, have referred to the topic with higher or lower accuracy. Even so, what I could observe in the municipalities were several actions of a non-sustainable nature, implemented in function of the touristic development.

The previous identification of the PNMT’s problems, based on academic papers, has allowed me also to identify implementation difficulties for the program in each one of the areas related to the Program’s basic components such as decentralization, mobilization, capacity building, among others. Nevertheless, no mention of difficulties faced due to the sustainability of the activity were found, what points out that issue sustainability is not very well discussed.

The same problem goes for the objective which concerns sensitization and awareness of the society for the importance of tourism as an instrument of economic growth, creation of jobs, improvement on the population’s life quality, and preservation of natural and cultural patrimony. Although the words sensitization and awareness are not formally defined in the documents issued, the sensitization and awareness processes which tourism stakeholders and monitors undergo in the skill training workshops are extremely efficient in the preparation of these stakeholders that must disseminate the program.

To de-center the actions related to the touristic activity, in order to drive the stakeholders to elaborate the municipal tourism plan and to provide municipalities with the technical organizational and managerial conditions needed is an issue very well discussed during the workshops conducted in the municipalities. However, this basic principle also faces the problem of absence of definition of the attributions of the several stakeholders involved in the process.

The specific objectives, to encourage the strengthening of bonds between the different levels of government and private ventures and to raise the levels of quality, efficiency and effectiveness of
services rendered in the tourism area, have not reached their goals at present. There are a great number of stakeholders dealing with capacitating for the tourism activity, all of them developing almost similar programs, with the same beneficiaries and no cooperative bonds are established in order to increase the potential of those actions.

The PNMT’s general principles: partnerships, mobilization and training are components that are indispensable for the execution of the objectives proposed, are defined in an accurate manner, which helps the comprehension of the concepts, the triggering of actions necessary to implement the program and to establish patterns of evaluation.

In order to reach the objectives proposed, the PNMT defines five large strategic actions that are also coherent with the objectives set, and which contribute to the quantification and qualification of results.

It is worth to observe, considering the in loco visits, that the strategic actions of training the state multiplying agents and municipal monitors to develop the actions proposed for each stage and the orientation and encouragement of the municipal government to the formation of the Municipal Tourism Council, the assistance to municipalities in the implementation of the Municipal Touristic Plan are coherent with the goals that the program wishes to achieve, which enlarges the basis of observable data needed for establishing a coherent research drawing for the PNMT.

The participative focus methodology that was used by the program is extensively detailed, and it is used in all of the different stages of the process. As a consequence, the participative process is part of all the activities that are conducted in the municipalities, and is being integrated in the vision of the stakeholders as the appropriated method to be used in the locality for the building of the sustainable tourism.

There is no orientation in regards to the implementation and evaluation of the Municipal Tourism Plan, which does not provide guidelines for this important aspect related to the continuity of the actions implemented by the policy, and hinders the evaluation of the kind of effective results that must be obtained with the development of tourism in the municipality.

The components of Axis 2, Implementation, Processes and Activities, are detailed in the Guide for Multiplying Agents and Monitors Training Workshops, and in documents issued by the State of Paraná such as the Municipalization Manual. The stakeholders therefore, possess the necessary information to conduct the several stages of the process for the implementation of the policy considered in this Axis.

The components related to Axis 3, Tax Management, Infrastructure and Resources concern activities that are being effectively normalized by the federal government, which forces municipalities to get adequate to the norms valid in the country. If they fail to do so, they do not become eligible to receive federal subsidies. These are, therefore, activities that in some way already have their rules outlined.

Axis 4, Results, is the one that currently presents the biggest verification difficulties. Although the economic evaluations have their well-defined rules, the State of Paraná and its municipalities don’t possess, yet, the data concerning the tourism production chain, so as to allow for the comparison between the activity existing in the municipality and that which is a result of the implementation of the PNMT.

As for the results obtained with the development of the sustainable tourism in Brazil, the actions to be implemented in order to attain this goal are not very well defined yet.

**6. CONCLUSION**

Based on the analyses conducted, I can affirm that the National Program of Municipalization of Tourism is a policy that is coherent in its presentation and that encompasses many of the aspects necessary for its implementation and the consequent achievement of its objectives.
The Program nearly takes up almost the whole of the components related to the sustainable development of touristic activity:

“... it was such a wide program that, on the occasion when it was launched, not even the organ that was responsible for its elaboration could evaluate its extension. Because in fact, the program adapted itself according to the receptivity shown by the municipalities”. (Respondent).

In the opinion of another stakeholder, the policy is a major watershed in terms of public tourism policies.

“In Brazil, before the arrival of PNMT there had never been a process this big. The PNMT was a big, very well-articulated and elaborated program as a theory and as a multiplication methodology”. (Respondent).

However, even though it has undergone several modifications during the time when it was implemented in the country, due to the periodical evaluations conducted in federal and state levels, this policy has not predicted methodological norms that allowed for the evaluation of the results of the program as a whole.

Even if the Program draws brief considerations on the need for the engaged municipalities to elaborate the parameters for verification of the results obtained with the implementation of the touristic development plan according to its specific reality, the issue was not treated with the importance it deserves.

Therefore, the presentation of general evaluation parameters for the program could have served as a guideline so that each municipality could elaborate their evaluation scripts, from variables and indicators that are meaningful to their specific realities.

Lastly, it can be said that this study contributes to the debate of the evaluation of public tourism policies in Brazil, providing what Vedung calls “clearly expressed judgments, based in solid empirical reasons to be used in future decision making” (VEDUNG, 2000: 13).

One of the advantages of establishing the Strategic Axes of a Public Policy of Tourism is the fact that this resource clearly permits to identify all the components present in the process of implementation of the policy that are related to each other, in one way or another and that must be evaluated in a systematic way.

I could observe that the theoretical framework developed established a ground support for the evaluation of tourism policies based on substantive results of government interventions in one hand. It was also clear that the variables and indicators chosen could measure if the basic concepts of the policy were well internalized by the stakeholders.

Moreover, it provides information for those who are the target and the constructors of the National Tourism Municipalization Program – the local dwellers and the tourists - who, albeit, as Vedung (2000) and Hall (2001) point out, are the starting point of the control chain of governing people at the National, State and Municipal level, and rarely have their perspectives mentioned in the evaluation discourse.
LITERATURE


