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?

   *R*: The introduction is very good, it provides a general description of SF-MST, what are its purposes and its scope.

   I would simply make a modification when talking about what should be considered Sustainable Tourism, reference is made to Stable Employment, I think it would be necessary to add Stable and Decent Employment.

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?

   *R*: Completely satisfied, this facilitates interpretation and broadens the conceptual vision. Even anyone who isn't related to the subject, could get a clear and general vision.

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

   *R*: The chapters cover the economic, environmental and social dimensions.

   Particularly in the case of the environmental dimension when establishing the measurement of the use of energy, the distinction in the table between renewable and non-renewable energy is important. In the case of Uruguay, 100% of the energy matrix is renewable and there is legislation that forces new constructions to use solar panels for certain services, with which the measurement of self-generated energy is important, although very difficult to cover.

   In this new version some of the observations made at the last meeting of the working group in October have been saved, but I believe that the methodology that harmonizes the measurement of the social dimension is still somewhat diffuse. This dimension has many fronts (vulnerabilities, culture, equity, gender, employment, etc.) and it is not easy to unify criteria for the different realities and levels of progress that each country has. I think we should reach a consensus on a minimum of parameters that this number should cheapen.

   In addition, there is no mention of a social problem in many countries that live on tourism, the sexual exploitation of children and adolescents. The need to eradicate "Sexual Tourism" should be visible if we want sustainable tourism.

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

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

R: Key aspects related to employment relevant to measuring the sustainability of tourism:
- Formality
- Temporary employment
- Training / Education
  - Gender Equity in activities
  - Number of employees with some disability.
  - Salary / Position / Gender
  - Medical losses
  - Number of workers hired / working hours
  - Quantity of Employment generated by the green investment.
  - Employment outsourced to companies dedicated to the care of the environment (recycling, renewable energies, etc.)

2.3. In practice, what do you see as the main challenges in collecting additional detail on employment in tourism industries?

R: All aspects that are not associated with formality are difficult to measure. The training of employees, the link with the environmental part, the inclusion.

3. Measuring the environmental sustainability of tourism (this has already been answered)

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

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

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

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

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?

R. Yes it is

5.2. Are there particular themes that should be the focus of measurement at sub-national level?

R: Perhaps the environmental dimension is more relevant at the Sub national level. Exite Protected Areas and Ecosystems that are easier to abolish from a subnational than national perspective.

In the case of the evaluation of ecosystem services above all, they become more relevant if the context where the ecosystem is located is analyzed and the services it provides are closely related to a particular community. Social and economic dimensions tend to be more generalized and can be understood from a National perspective. Of course there are always different situations and in that sense it is that the possibility of a measurement at different levels is so important.

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?

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

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?

R: I believe that the UN SDGs are insufficient for a framework of tourism sustainability. We can not ignore that tourism is an industry that transcends a set of activities and that, therefore, sustainable tourism must be part of each of these activities. In addition to the characteristic activities of tourism there is a large network of activities that sustain tourism and that in turn tourism provides sustenance. It is one of the largest value chains that can be found in the economic activity and in each link of the chain value is added to the final product.

For this product to be sustainable, each link must be sustainable.

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

R: No comment
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?

R: No comment

7. Other comments

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

R: No comment. Simply congratulate for the result that is coming and thank everyone’s efforts to obtain a document that will serve as a guide for all of us who work in the visualization of sustainable tourism.