

Miriam Blumers (Federal Statistical Office of Germany)

1. Overall structure and framing of SF-MST

Key questions for consideration

- 1.1. Does the introduction provide appropriate context and explanation of the role of the SF-MST? Are there other topics and issues that should be included in the introduction? Is the structure/logic of the introduction appropriate?

It might be helpful to give a brief definition of "tourism" itself.

"Tourism is a social, cultural and economic phenomenon related to the movement of people to places outside their usual place of residence, pleasure being the usual motivation." (UN 2010, p.1)

The part on page 10 does not fit under the heading "What is sustainable tourism". The part from "The ongoing interest in sustainable tourism" to "In broad terms, these milestone achievements highlighted the need to integrate advances for people, planet, prosperity, peace and partnerships." would fit better under 1.2.3 "a history of measuring tourism".

The following part about the SDGs is about the objective of the SF-MST. It might be useful to add a heading "Objective of measuring sustainable tourism" or "Policy context".

However, all in all, the introduction is quite long (31% of the entire document) and the structure is partly not consistent: 1. Introduction, 1.3. Overview of the SF-MST, 1.3.1 Introduction.

- 1.2. Are you happy with the conceptual framing of the SF-MST using a multiple capitals-based approach to the organisation of data on the different dimensions of tourism activity?

Yes. While an overall accounting approach to all three dimensions would be desirable from a conceptual point of view, the approach taken in the SF-MST is pragmatic given the availability of concepts and data.

- 1.3. Across chapters 2, 3 and 4 covering the economic, environmental and social dimensions, are there significant missing topics or themes?

- 1.4. This draft includes a new chapter, chapter 6, on indicators and analysis. Is this inclusion appropriate?

Yes. However, the interplay with the endeavours to put together a set of indicators (carried out by the SDG sub group) is still unclear. Will this set of indicators – once defined- be included in the SF-MST? If yes, will it be used as an example or as a core set of indicators?

- 1.5. Any other comments or questions on the overall coverage and structure of the draft SF-MST?

Throughout the SF-MST useful extensions are often outlined. Here the further process of the framework is unclear i.e. are these extensions meant to indicate future developments of the SF-MST? Or is the intention to point out interesting additional points to be considered when implementing SF-MST?

In general, we would consider identifying a core set from the abundant possibilities outlined within the SF-MST as very fruitful (while certainly being a challenging task).

We suggest including a sub-chapter on the concepts (i.e. territorial and residence principle) used in the SF-MST. Mr. Cesare Costantino elaborates on this topic in his paper "The demand perspective in measuring the sustainability of tourism with specific focus on environmental aspects" presented at the last Meeting of the Working Group of Experts on MST.

2. Employment aspects in measuring the sustainability of tourism

- 2.1. What are the key aspects concerning employment that are relevant in measuring the sustainability of tourism? You may wish to consider the [main issues identified by the sub-group on Employment](#) as well as the individual contributions of three experts to the Working Group meeting on this topic:
 - [Canada](#)
 - [Cardiff Business School](#)
 - [GJASD International](#)
- 2.2. What aspects of the concept of decent work are of most importance for policy and to what extent are they measurable?
- 2.3. In practice, what do you see as the main challenges in collecting additional detail on employment in tourism industries?

3. Measuring the environmental sustainability of tourism

- 3.1. Does the chapter on the environment dimension cover all of the relevant areas for the measuring the environmental sustainability of tourism?

In addition to the accounting for tourism related environmental assets and their use, it would be reasonable to involve the supply side. Accounting for tourism related environmental protection expenditure and the supply of environmental goods and services should be considered. To that effect, chapter 3.5 needs to be developed further.

Furthermore, we wonder why material flows are not considered.

- 3.2. Does the chapter appropriately describe the link between tourism activity and environmental assets?

Yes. However, certain knowledge of SEEA is needed and useful. It is understandable that the complex interrelations cannot be addressed in depth within the SF-MST.

- 3.3. What role do you see for ecosystem accounting approaches in the SF-MST?

Tourism benefits from services of ecosystems. Ecosystems provide space and landscape features, enabling people to enjoy landscape views or undertake activities such as hiking (recreation benefits). The service usually involves investments in the ecosystems (e.g. for building walking trails).

- 3.4. In practice, what do you see as the main challenges in collecting environmental data in relation to tourism activity?

In general, the availability of data and the disaggregation of data will be the most challenging part.

4. Measuring the social sustainability of tourism

- 4.1. Does the limited text describing the chapter on the social dimension cover all of the relevant approaches and aspects for the measuring the social sustainability of tourism? You may wish to consider the main issues identified by the sub-group on the social dimension: "[Statistical Tools to Measure Tourism from a Social Focus](#)" as well as the individual contributions of three experts to the Working Group meeting on this topic:
 - [Argentina](#)
 - [Italy](#)
 - [Visit Flanders](#)
- 4.2. What are the most important perspectives to consider in assessing the social dimension?
- 4.3. Establishing standard measures of social capital will be challenging in the short term. Is it sufficient for the SF-MST to focus on framing the measurement of the social dimension in terms of selected indicators?
- 4.4. In practice, what do you see as the main challenges in collecting social data in relation to tourism activity?

5. Defining spatial areas for tourism measurement

- 5.1. The SF-MST proposed 6 spatial scales from global to local levels. Is this appropriate and is the labelling of these levels suitable?
- 5.2. Are there particular themes that should be the focus of measurement at sub-national level?
- 5.3. The approach to defining spatial areas is based on establishing principles for measurement based on the idea of tourism concentrations. Is this an appropriate approach?
- 5.4. In practice, what do you see as the main challenges in collecting sub-national data in relation to tourism activity?

6. 6. MST connections to sustainable development indicators

- 6.1. Are the UN SDGs a good, useful or sufficient framing for determining a set of indicators on the sustainability of tourism?

The SDGs certainly are a good occasion for determining a set of indicators on the sustainability of tourism and also a good reference framework.

- 6.2. What are the priority themes for the development of indicators?

In our understanding such a set of indicators should cover all three dimensions of sustainability in a rather balanced way. With regards to the indicators we suggest a pragmatic approach based on SF-MST and already existing standards, concepts and methods.

- 6.3. What are the main barriers to the collection of data to derive indicators and what needs to be put in place to support the use of indicators in decision making processes?

7. Other comments

- 7.1. Do you have any other comments on the SF-MST at this stage?