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General comments

Congratulations for the consideration of the scale. Balance between national, regional an local

These are guidelines mainly for statisticians
   Then we have the analysts (consultants, universities, research units, lobbies, ONGs,...)
   Finally, we have public and private decision makers (using information from analysts)
   But the aim is to align the work of statisticians and decision-makers at all the scales.

The relevance of the local scale is present throughout the paper.

Focus on keeping, as far as possible, consistency of local statistics with regional and national statistics.

The gradualism of the document. This is a toolkit that can be used as you need it.
   You do not need to complete all the tables. You are invited to measure what counts in your place

Flexibility, it establishes common principles but it allow for adaptation

Recognition of the opportunity to introduce georeferenced data.

Focus on the host community. Traditionally forgotten in tourism statistics

The framework opens a period of flowering of research on the sustainability of tourism.
• General guidelines, but it is the state of the art on measuring sustainability of tourism

• We will need an implementation manual and more pilot experiences.

• I would add a paragraph mentioning the possibility of establishing other spatial zones:
  Not only local destinations and ecosystems.
  Also points of interest visited by tourists, dormitory towns, tourism mobility paths, etc.

It is important to promote the use of common methodologies and sources among local destinations within countries or groups of countries.
Questions

Is the chapter clear about the applicability of SF-MST at different spatial scales?

Does the chapter provide adequate guidance for delimiting sub-national tourism destinations? Can clear boundaries and comparability between the spatial scales be secured?

How might the relationship between spatial scales and ecosystem accounting (Chapter 3) be best reflected?

Should the chapter provide guidance on which data is most relevant at which spatial scale?
1. Is the chapter clear about the applicability of SF-MST at different spatial scales?

The document does not oblige, even it does not recommend, measuring everything at every scale.

It is adequate to consider only two subnational scales.

   The **regional scale**, administrative delimitation

   The **local destination scale**: delimitation considering certain criteria

Two concepts, **exclusive and exhaustive** boundaries guarantee complete and non-overlapping coverage.

The indicators at the regional scale can be quite similar to the national scale, and sometimes a **top-down** distribution method can be followed.

In the case of local destinations the problem of the size of the samples must be addressed:

   Census type statistics (bottom-up)

   Big data (bottom.up)
2. Does the chapter provide adequate guidance for delimiting sub-national tourism destinations? Can clear boundaries and comparability between the spatial scales be secured?

The document recognizes that municipalities can be easier and sometimes enough.

When this is not the case, criteria must be used for delimitation
  Supply (tourism establishments-employment) or demand (visitors-expenditure)
    Supply is often easier and more stable
    Some characteristics of the supply can also be introduced (age, type of construction, …)

The document also recognizes that the delimitation must support decision-making.
  Pure statistical methods of delimitation are not adequate
  Expert consensus must be considered

For consistency reasons the local destination information must be provided along with the rest of the municipality, region or country
3. How might the relationship between spatial scales and ecosystem accounting (Ch. 3) be best reflected?

Ecosystems, as Natural Protected Areas with tourism interest, can be used as another functional zone related with tourism, beyond local tourism destinations.
4. Should the chapter provide guidance on which data is most relevant at which spatial scale?

INSTO areas and indicators can be a good starting point. Thus, INSTO developments can be a natural way of traducing the data of the framework into indicators for decision-making.

The chapter also provides a set of indicators that are **mainly relevant at the local destination scale**

- Air and water quality, biodiversity, congestion

The chapter should not give a closed set of indicators, but
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