The Zambia crisis management and resilience model (Z-CMRM): Developing and validating a context-specific framework for sustainable tourism resilience

Bruce Ernest[1]
Norman Kachamba[2]
Chaste Nsama[3]

[1]bruceernest80@gmail.com
[2]normankachamba@yahoo.com
[3]chastensama@gmail.com

[1,2,3]The University of Zambia

https://doi.org/10.51867/scimundi.6.1.24

ABSTRACT

The absence of context-specific, empirically grounded crisis management models for tourism in sub-Saharan Africa has been identified as a primary constraint on sectoral resilience in the region. Existing frameworks, predominantly derived from developed-economy tourism contexts, fail to account for the distinctive vulnerabilities, institutional realities, and resource constraints that characterise tourism crisis management in developing countries. This study presents the development, empirical validation, and implementation design of the Zambia Crisis Management and Resilience Model (Z-CMRM), a holistic, five-component framework for sustainable tourism resilience grounded in mixed-methods evidence from 137 stakeholders selected through stratified purposive sampling across government institutions, private sector operators, community-based organisations, and tourists in Zambia's major tourism regions. The Z-CMRM comprises five interdependent components: (1) integrated information and early warning systems; (2) preparedness and institutional capacity building; (3) crisis response and coordination protocols; (4) recovery and business continuity frameworks; and (5) mitigation, sustainability, and long-term resilience. The model is structured across three implementation phases — institutional foundation (years 1–2), capacity building (years 2–4), and systems integration (years 4–7) — designed to progressively close the 1.60-point awareness–preparedness gap documented in the empirical analysis. Empirical validation draws on four-construct quantitative analysis (crisis awareness M = 4.58; resilience building M = 3.97; preparedness capacity M = 2.98; policy governance M = 2.88), qualitative thematic analysis identifying fragmentation, resource constraints, and policy implementation failures as primary structural challenges, and tourist demand-side analysis confirming strong preference alignment with the model's sustainability pillars. The Z-CMRM represents both a theoretical contribution to tourism crisis management literature and a policy-relevant implementation roadmap for Zambia's tourism sector governance. This study recommended that the Ministry of Tourism and Arts should formally adopt the Z-CMRM as Zambia's National Tourism Crisis Management Framework through a ministerial directive or Cabinet memorandum, providing the political mandate necessary for cross-institutional coordination.

Keywords: Crisis Management Model, Implementation, Sustainable Tourism, Tourism Resilience Framework, Zambia, Z-CMRM

I. INTRODUCTION

Crisis management model development for tourism destinations has been a productive area of scholarly investigation since Faulkner's (2001) seminal Tourism Disaster Management Framework established the multi-phase crisis lifecycle as the foundational architecture for tourism crisis governance. Subsequent model development has generated a rich portfolio of frameworks including Ritchie's (2004) Strategic Crisis Management Model, Paraskevas and Arendell's (2007) intelligence-based approach, and Glaesser's (2006) tourism crisis risk management framework. However, a persistent critique of this literature is that the majority of its models have been developed primarily from analysis of tourism crisis events in developed economies — Europe, North America, Australia, and East Asia — and their transferability to developing-country tourism contexts is constrained by significant contextual differences in institutional capacity, resource availability, and the nature of crisis risks.

Sub-Saharan Africa presents a distinctive tourism crisis management context characterised by several features that collectively distinguish it from the environments in which dominant crisis management models have been developed. First, the crisis risk landscape in sub-Saharan Africa is characterised by the compounding of global crisis risks — pandemics, economic downturns — with region-specific risks including climate-induced natural disasters, energy insecurity, and infrastructure vulnerability, creating a multi-layered crisis exposure that requires more robust and adaptive resilience architectures than single-risk models can provide (Saarinen et al., 2022). Second, institutional capacity for tourism crisis governance in sub-Saharan Africa is substantially more limited than in developed economies,

characterised by fragmented governance, weak enforcement capacity, and resource constraints that prevent the application of resource-intensive crisis management models (Lachhab et al., 2023).

Third, the role of community-based tourism in sub-Saharan Africa's tourism economy gives the community dimension of resilience a significance that is greater than in tourism contexts where commercial enterprises dominate. CBT organisations in Zambia and comparable contexts provide both economic functions — distributing tourism revenue to local communities — and governance functions — linking national parks, conservation areas, and tourism destinations to the local communities whose support is essential for sustainable conservation and tourism development. Any crisis management model that fails to explicitly address the crisis vulnerability and resilience-building needs of CBT organisations will be inadequate for the sub-Saharan African context.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Zambia's tourism sector lacks a context-specific, evidence-based crisis management framework capable of addressing the distinctive vulnerabilities, institutional realities, and resource constraints of the country's tourism landscape. Existing generic crisis management guidance documents from international organisations — the UNWTO's crisis communications toolkit and the WTTC's crisis readiness framework — provide useful reference points but are insufficiently specific to Zambia's institutional architecture, the particular crisis risks most relevant to its tourism regions, or the governance reform priorities that the empirical evidence identifies as most urgent. The absence of a dedicated national tourism crisis management model leaves each stakeholder category to develop preparedness approaches independently, perpetuating the fragmentation and inefficiency that the awareness–preparedness paradox documents.

1.2 Research Objectives

i. Synthesise the quantitative and qualitative empirical findings from the broader study into an integrated, evidence-based crisis management model architecture;
ii. define the five components of the Z-CMRM and their interrelationships;
iii. Validate the model architecture against the empirical evidence and international best-practice frameworks;
iv. present a three-phase implementation roadmap for progressive model deployment; and
v. Establish a framework for ongoing monitoring, evaluation, and adaptive management of model implementation.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

2.1.1 Crisis Management Theory and Resilience Theory

The Z-CMRM is anchored in an integrative theoretical foundation that draws on three complementary frameworks. Crisis Management Theory, as systematised by Faulkner (2001) and extended by Ritchie and Jiang (2019), provides the lifecycle architecture for the model, distinguishing the pre-event, prodromal, emergency, intermediate, long-term recovery, and resolution phases that define the temporal structure of crisis management responses. Faulkner's (2001) framework is particularly influential in establishing that effective crisis management requires proactive investment in preparedness during pre-event and prodromal phases rather than reactive response during the emergency phase alone.

Resilience Theory, drawing on Holling's (1973) ecological resilience framework and its socio-economic extensions by Folke et al. (2010), provides the overarching conceptual orientation for the model. Resilience is conceptualised as a dynamic capacity with three inter-related dimensions: absorptive capacity (the ability to withstand shocks), adaptive capacity (the ability to adjust in response to change), and transformative capacity (the ability to create new systems when existing ones become untenable). The Z-CMRM's five components are designed to progressively build all three resilience capacities. Sustainable Tourism Development theory, as articulated by Bramwell et al. (2017) and the UNWTO's sustainable development framework, provides the normative orientation for the model. The integration of sustainability as an explicit fifth component of the Z-CMRM — rather than treating it as a background condition — reflects the theoretical principle that resilience and sustainability are co-constitutive: genuine long-term resilience requires sustainable practices, and sustainable tourism development requires the resilience capacity to maintain core functions through increasingly frequent disruptions.

2.2 Empirical Review

2.2.1 Existing Tourism Crisis Management Models: Contributions and Limitations

A systematic review of existing tourism crisis management models reveals both valuable conceptual contributions and significant limitations for sub-Saharan African application. Faulkner's (2001) Tourism Disaster Management Framework remains the most widely cited model, providing the lifecycle phase architecture that most

subsequent models have adopted or adapted. Its primary limitation in the Zambian context is its assumption of a relatively centralised governance architecture with clear institutional mandates, which does not reflect the fragmented multi-stakeholder governance landscape documented in this study.

Ritchie's (2004) Strategic Crisis Management Model advances Faulkner's framework by explicitly incorporating strategic management concepts — environmental scanning, competitive analysis, stakeholder engagement — into the crisis management lifecycle. This strategic orientation is directly relevant to the Z-CMRM's emphasis on proactive resilience building but assumes institutional capacity for strategic planning that is currently absent in much of Zambia's tourism sector. The World Travel & Tourism Council [WTTC's] (2019) crisis readiness framework provides the most operationally detailed guidance available, specifying concrete preparedness requirements across six domains: governance and leadership, operational readiness, communication, human resources, financial resilience, and supply chain management. Lachhab et al. (2023) investigation of crisis management frameworks for SMEs in Zimbabwe provides the most contextually relevant existing contribution for the sub-Saharan African context, documenting the resource constraints, institutional limitations, and governance challenges that distinguish crisis management in this region.

2.2.2 COVID-19 as a Model-Building Context

The COVID-19 pandemic provides both the most severe test case for tourism crisis management in Zambia's recent history and the richest source of empirical learning for model development. The pandemic's impact on Zambia's tourism sector — 75% decline in international arrivals in 2020, estimated USD 800 million in revenue losses, 80% of sector jobs at risk — revealed the sector's systemic vulnerabilities with unprecedented clarity (World Bank, 2023; WTTC, 2022). Qualitative analysis of the COVID-19 response experience identifies five primary lessons: (1) the absence of pre-established communication channels between the Ministry of Tourism, ZTA, DMMU, and tourism enterprises created an information vacuum in the critical early weeks; (2) the absence of sector-specific financial resilience mechanisms meant enterprises had no financial buffer against sudden revenue collapse; (3) the lack of coordinated response protocols created a fragmented safety landscape that confused tourists; (4) the absence of business continuity planning meant enterprises struggled to restart operations efficiently; and (5) the digital infrastructure deficit significantly disadvantaged Zambian enterprises relative to competitors in markets with stronger digital infrastructure. Each lesson directly informs a component of the Z-CMRM.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Study Design and Participants

The Z-CMRM was developed through a four-stage iterative process integrating empirical evidence with theoretical frameworks and international best-practice guidance. The empirical foundation was established through a convergent parallel mixed-methods study (Creswell & Poth, 2018) involving 137 stakeholders selected through stratified purposive sampling from five categories — government institutions, private sector tourism operators, CBOs, NGOs, and tourists — across Zambia's major tourism regions (Livingstone, Lusaka, South Luangwa National Park, and Kafue National Park). Yamane's (1967) formula confirmed the sample's adequacy at a 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error. The sample comprised 46 quantitative questionnaire respondents, 41 qualitative questionnaire respondents, 50 tourist questionnaire respondents, and 16 key informant interview participants.

3.2 Model Development and Validation Approach

Stage one involved systematic synthesis of quantitative and qualitative findings from the three data collection instruments to identify primary structural vulnerabilities, governance gaps, and resilience opportunities. Stage Two involved mapping these empirical findings onto the theoretical frameworks to generate the model's conceptual architecture. Stage Three involved review of international best-practice tourism crisis management frameworks to identify transferable elements applicable to Zambia's context. Stage Four involved integration of these inputs into a coherent, operationally specified model architecture. Empirical validation drew on five categories of evidence: the four-construct quantitative analysis, inferential statistical analysis of awareness–preparedness and endorsement–implementation gaps, formal crisis plan existence analysis, qualitative thematic analysis, and tourist sustainability preference data.

IV. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

4.1 Model Architecture and Foundational Principles

The Z-CMRM is structured around five interdependent functional components, each addressing a distinct dimension of tourism crisis management while maintaining strong operational linkages with the other components

(Table 1). The model is underpinned by four foundational principles: (1) the systems principle — effective tourism resilience requires systemic, multi-level interventions addressing enterprise, sector, and national governance dimensions simultaneously; (2) the integration principle — crisis management and sustainability are co-constitutive, requiring integration into a single framework; (3) the stakeholder principle — effective crisis governance requires genuine multi-stakeholder participation including community organisations, women, and youth; and (4) the adaptive management principle — crisis risks and governance capacities evolve continuously, requiring monitoring, evaluation, and framework adaptation as core ongoing functions.

Table 1

Z-CMRM Components, Functions, and Measurable Targets

Z-CMRM Component	Primary Function and Target Metrics
1. Integrated Information and Early Warning Systems	National crisis monitoring dashboard; mobile alert system; tourism data exchange platform. Target: early warning availability score from 2.52 to ≥3.97
2. Preparedness and Institutional Capacity Building	Mandatory crisis planning; training programmes; Tourism Crisis Resilience Fund. Target: preparedness capacity score from 2.98 to ≥3.97
3. Crisis Response and Coordination Protocols	NTCCC establishment; standardised response protocols; inter-institutional communication. Target: governance score from 2.88 to ≥3.50
4. Recovery and Business Continuity Frameworks	Enterprise continuity planning; destination marketing recovery; community livelihoods recovery. Target: formal crisis plan existence from 23% to ≥60%
5. Mitigation, Sustainability, and Long-Term Resilience	Conservation endowment; renewable energy programme; CBT resilience; digital innovation. Target: preparedness ≥3.97 (current endorsement level)

4.1.1 Component One: Integrated Information and Early Warning Systems

The first component addresses the most critical and urgently needed infrastructure gap identified in the study: the near-absence of functional early warning and crisis information systems for the tourism sector (early warning availability M = 2.52, the lowest governance dimension score). This component encompasses three interrelated sub-systems: a National Tourism Crisis Monitoring Dashboard that aggregates real-time data on crisis risks and impacts across all four crisis categories; a Mobile Alert System that distributes timely crisis warnings and response guidance to all registered tourism enterprises; and a Tourism Sector Data Exchange Platform enabling rapid information sharing among government institutions, industry associations, and tourism enterprises during crisis events.

The monitoring dashboard draws on existing data streams from the Zambia Meteorological Department (natural disaster and climate risk data), ZESCO and the Zambia Energy Regulation Board (energy availability data), the Ministry of Health (disease outbreak and pandemic data), and the Bank of Zambia (macroeconomic stability indicators). The mobile alert system requires a dedicated tourism sector emergency communication channel, accessible via SMS and a low-bandwidth mobile application, providing alerts at three levels: early warning (risk emerging), threat (risk imminent), and all-clear (risk resolved). In line with Lachhab et al. (2023) this three-level architecture mirrors international best-practice emergency communication frameworks.

4.1.2 Component Two: Preparedness and Institutional Capacity Building

The second component directly addresses the awareness–preparedness gap ($\Delta = 1.60$) through mandatory crisis planning with technical support, training and capacity development programmes, and financial resilience mechanisms. Mandatory crisis planning requires legislative or regulatory amendment establishing formal crisis management planning as a legal requirement for all registered tourism enterprises, with graded requirements proportional to enterprise size and risk profile. Small enterprises — lodges with fewer than 20 beds, CBT organisations, small tour operators — should maintain simplified crisis plans covering basic emergency protocols, communication trees, and business continuity arrangements. Medium enterprises should maintain comprehensive plans covering all four crisis categories, with documented staff responsibilities, tested protocols, and annual review requirements. Large enterprises should maintain full-spectrum plans aligned with international standards, subject to ZTA inspection and audit.

Conforming with Saarinen et al. (2022) research, inancial resilience mechanisms encompass three primary instruments: a Tourism Crisis Resilience Fund providing grant and concessional loan support for preparedness investments, renewable energy adoption, and digital technology; a sector-level insurance pooling mechanism aggregating insurance demand across enterprises to access commercial insurance products at affordable rates; and an emergency credit facility providing rapid-disbursement, low-interest crisis liquidity support. These instruments directly address the lowest-scoring preparedness items in the study (financial reserves M = 2.24, insurance coverage M = 2.28).

4.1.3 Component Three: Crisis Response and Coordination Protocols

The third component establishes the coordination architecture for systemic crisis response, addressing the institutional fragmentation identified by 87% of qualitative respondents as the primary structural challenge. The National Tourism Crisis Coordination Centre (NTCCC) is the institutional centrepiece of the Z-CMRM's governance architecture, providing the permanent institutional home for tourism crisis coordination that currently does not exist in Zambia's institutional landscape. The Centre requires establishment through statutory instrument, with a Board of Directors representing the Ministry of Tourism, ZTA, DMMU, private sector operators, community organisations, and independent experts. Its functions encompass: intelligence and monitoring (operating the early warning systems from Component One); coordination (convening and facilitating inter-institutional crisis response); support (providing technical and logistical assistance to tourism enterprises); and learning (systematic documentation and dissemination of crisis response lessons).

In agreement with Folke et al. (2010), standardised sector-wide response protocols address the fragmentation problem at the operational level: the absence of shared protocols means that each entity responds to crises independently, creating the coordination failures documented in the COVID-19 response analysis. Standard protocols should be developed for each of the four primary crisis categories — natural disasters, pandemic events, energy crises, and economic shocks — with differentiated guidance for enterprise types ranging from small lodges to international operators and CBT organisations.

4.1.4 Component Four: Recovery and Business Continuity Frameworks

The fourth component addresses the post-crisis recovery phase, providing the institutional mechanisms and enterprise-level tools necessary for rapid, coordinated recovery. Enterprise-level business continuity planning is addressed through the mandatory crisis planning requirements in Component Two, which should include specific business continuity annexes covering staff reactivation protocols, supplier management during disruption and recovery, cash flow management, and customer communication. The financial resilience mechanisms in Component Two — particularly the emergency credit facility — provide the liquidity support necessary for enterprises to maintain operations through the initial recovery phase.

Destination-level marketing recovery requires coordinated action by the ZTA, the Tourism Council of Zambia, the Ministry of Tourism, and international marketing partners. The COVID-19 recovery experience demonstrated that destination image recovery requires rapid, credible communication of destination safety and operational status to source markets, backed by third-party validation through international media partnerships and tourism industry associations (WTTC, 2022). The Z-CMRM includes a pre-designed destination recovery marketing playbook that can be rapidly deployed following crisis events, adapting key messages and channels to the specific crisis type.

4.1.5 Component Five: Mitigation, Sustainability, and Long-Term Resilience

The fifth component represents the Z-CMRM's transformative dimension — the long-term investments in environmental, institutional, and community sustainability that build the absorptive and adaptive capacity of the tourism system as a whole. Environmental conservation investments strengthen the natural resource base underpinning Zambia's tourism competitive advantage. The Z-CMRM recommends that a defined percentage of tourism revenues be allocated to conservation investment through a Tourism Conservation Endowment Fund, governed through the Department of National Parks and Wildlife (DNPW), community resource boards, and conservation NGOs, prioritising habitat restoration, wildlife corridor protection, and climate adaptation investments in the major tourism ecosystems.

According to Becken and McLennan (2017) renewable energy investment provides the infrastructure resilience addressing Zambia's most distinctive tourism vulnerability: the energy deficit disrupting operations during load-shedding events. The Z-CMRM recommends a renewable energy adoption programme combining Tourism Crisis Resilience Fund concessional financing with technical advisory services and regulatory simplification to accelerate solar and battery storage adoption across the enterprise landscape, with a target of 80% of registered tourism enterprises having primary or backup renewable energy capacity within ten years. Community-based tourism empowerment requires investments in CBT organisation governance capacity, crisis planning support, access to NTCCC information and coordination systems, and eligibility for the Tourism Crisis Resilience Fund. The Z-CMRM recommends a dedicated CBT Resilience Programme within the ZTA, with a target of raising the CBT formal crisis plan existence rate from 12% to 70% within five years.

4.2 Three-Phase Implementation Roadmap

The Z-CMRM is designed for progressive deployment across three implementation phases (Table 2) that build institutional capacity, enterprise readiness, and system integration incrementally rather than attempting comprehensive reform simultaneously.

Table 2

Z-CMRM Three-Phase Implementation Roadmap

Phase	Focus	Key Actions	Success Indicators
Phase 1 (Years 1–2)	Institutional Foundation	Establish NTCCC; develop mandatory crisis planning regulations; secure Resilience Fund capitalisation; deploy first-generation early warning system	NTCCC operational; regulations in force; Fund capitalised; early warning system deployed
Phase 2 (Years 2–4)	Capacity Building	Enterprise-level crisis planning support; training programmes; renewable energy financing; destination recovery marketing playbook	≥60% private operators with formal plans; ≥30% renewable energy adoption; ≥70% staff trained
Phase 3 (Years 4–7)	Systems Integration	Integrate into DMMU architecture; establish Conservation Endowment Fund; CBT resilience programme; second-generation digital systems	Tourism in DMMU planning; preparedness scores ≥3.97; policy governance scores ≥3.50

4.3 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adaptive Management

The Z-CMRM's adaptive management system is grounded in the measurement instruments developed in this study. Annual stakeholder surveys using the four-construct quantitative questionnaire instrument will track changes in crisis awareness, preparedness capacity, policy governance quality, and resilience building endorsement over time. The awareness–preparedness gap (currently 1.60 points) and the endorsement–implementation gap (currently 0.99 points) serve as primary outcome metrics. Implementation progress metrics — formal crisis plan existence rates, early warning system availability scores, renewable energy adoption rates, CBT resilience programme enrolment — provide the process indicators through which implementation progress is tracked. The NTCCC's learning function is responsible for systematic documentation of crisis response experiences, identification of model adaptation needs, and annual reporting to the Ministry of Tourism and the ZTA Board.

4.4 Quantitative Validation: Four-Construct Evidence Base

The Z-CMRM's five components are each directly validated by specific elements of the four-construct quantitative analysis. Component One (integrated information and early warning systems) is validated by the lowest individual governance dimension score (early warning availability $M = 2.52$) and the near-universal demand for real-time crisis information (97.8% support identification). Component Two (preparedness and institutional capacity building) is validated by the statistically neutral preparedness capacity mean ($M = 2.98$, $t = -0.40$, $p = 0.689$), the lowest preparedness item scores (simulation drills $M = 2.11$, financial reserves $M = 2.24$, insurance $M = 2.28$), and the 23% formal crisis plan existence rate among domestic private operators. Component Three (response and coordination protocols) is validated by the institutional fragmentation theme (87% qualitative endorsement) and the near-significant governance deficit ($M = 2.88$, $p = 0.066$).

Component Four (recovery and business continuity) is validated by the COVID-19 impact analysis documenting the recovery challenges arising from absent business continuity planning, and by the tourist confidence data showing that 73% of tourists cite crisis management preparedness information as a revisit likelihood determinant. Component Five (mitigation, sustainability, and long-term resilience) is validated by the highest individual resilience endorsement scores (environmental conservation $M = 4.32$, multi-stakeholder collaboration $M = 4.21$), the tourist sustainability preference data (84% community support preference, 79% environmental commitment preference), and the resilience endorsement–implementation gap of 0.99 points.

4.5 Theoretical Validation: Framework Coherence Assessment

The Z-CMRM's theoretical coherence was assessed against the three foundational frameworks. Against Crisis Management Theory, the five components map comprehensively onto Faulkner's (2001) lifecycle phases: Component One (pre-event monitoring), Component Two (prodromal preparedness), Component Three (emergency response), Component Four (intermediate and long-term recovery), and Component Five (resolution, learning, and mitigation). This mapping confirms full lifecycle coverage rather than concentration on the emergency response phase. Against Resilience Theory, the three resilience capacities are each addressed: absorptive capacity by Components One and Two; adaptive capacity by Components Three and Four; and transformative capacity by Component Five. Against Sustainable Tourism Development theory, the model's fifth component explicitly integrates environmental, economic, and social sustainability objectives, confirming that resilience is treated as co-constitutive with sustainability.

V. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

The Z-CMRM represents the primary practical contribution of this research programme: a context-specific, empirically grounded, and theoretically coherent crisis management framework for Zambia's tourism sector. The model addresses the structural vulnerabilities documented throughout the study — the 1.60-point awareness–preparedness gap, the 0.99-point endorsement–implementation gap, the near-absent early warning infrastructure, the fragmented governance architecture, the inadequate financial resilience mechanisms — through a five-component, three-phase framework that is simultaneously ambitious in its scope and realistic in its acknowledgement of implementation constraints and resource realities.

The model's validation across quantitative evidence, qualitative themes, and theoretical frameworks confirms its internal consistency and empirical grounding. Its three-phase implementation design acknowledges that the institutional transformation required cannot be accomplished rapidly and provides a sequenced roadmap for progressive capacity development. Its adaptive management provisions ensure that the framework can evolve in response to new evidence, emerging risks, and changing institutional conditions.

5.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations are advanced for the implementation of the Z-CMRM. First, the Ministry of Tourism and Arts should formally adopt the Z-CMRM as Zambia's National Tourism Crisis Management Framework through a ministerial directive or Cabinet memorandum, providing the political mandate necessary for cross-institutional coordination. Second, the Ministry of Finance should allocate dedicated budget lines for Phase One implementation — NTCCC establishment and Tourism Crisis Resilience Fund capitalisation — in the 2026–2027 national budget, with supplementary development partner co-financing sought from the African Development Bank, UNDP, and bilateral donors. Third, the ZTA should establish the NTCCC as its first-order institutional reform priority, securing Board approval and initiating competitive recruitment for NTCCC senior staff within 90 days of this study's presentation to government. Fourth, the Ministry of Tourism should commission legislative review to establish the mandatory crisis planning requirements and Tourism Conservation Endowment Fund provisions necessary for Component Two and Five implementation. Fifth, all development partners and NGOs with tourism and disaster management portfolios in Zambia are invited to align their programming with the Z-CMRM architecture, ensuring that external technical assistance and co-financing reinforce rather than fragment the national framework.

REFERENCES

Becken, S., & McLennan, C. (2017). Evidence of the water–energy nexus in tourist accommodation. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 144*, 173–181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.167

Bramwell, B., Higham, J., Lane, B., & Miller, G. (2017). Twenty-five years of sustainable tourism and the *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*: Looking back and moving forward. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 25*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1251689

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Faulkner, B. (2001). Towards a framework for tourism disaster management. *Tourism Management, 22*(2), 135–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00048-0

Folke, C., Carpenter, S. R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., & Rockström, J. (2010). Resilience thinking: Integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecology and Society, 15*(4), 20. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-03610-150420

Glaesser, D. (2006). *Crisis management in the tourism industry* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 4*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245

Lachhab, S., Šegota, T., Morrison, A. M., & Coca-Stefaniak, J. A. (2023). Crisis management and resilience: The case of small businesses in tourism. In M. E. Korstanje, H. Seraphin, & S. W. Maingi (Eds.), *Tourism through troubled times: Challenges and opportunities of the tourism industry in the 21st century*. Emerald Publishing.

Paraskevas, A., & Arendell, B. (2007). A strategic framework for terrorism prevention and mitigation in tourism destinations. *Tourism Management, 28*(6), 1560–1573. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.02.012

Ritchie, B. W. (2004). Chaos, crises and disasters: A strategic approach to crisis management in the tourism industry. *Tourism Management, 25*(6), 669–683. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2003.09.004

Ritchie, B. W., & Jiang, Y. (2019). A review of research on tourism risk, crisis and disaster management. *Annals of Tourism Research, 79*, 102812. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.102812

Saarinen, J., Fitchett, J., & Hoogendoorn, G. (2022). *Climate change and tourism in Southern Africa.* Routledge.
World Bank. (2011). *What would it take for Zambia's tourism industry to achieve its potential?* World Bank Group.
World Bank. (2023). *Project information document (PID): Zambia tourism development project.* World Bank Group.
WTTC. (2019). *Crisis readiness: Are you prepared and resilient?* World Travel & Tourism Council.
WTTC. (2022). *City travel is back: Economic impact 2022.* World Travel & Tourism Council.
Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row.