

Tourism Data Co-governance Options Report

Prepared for consultation with the Ministry of Business,
Innovation and Employment

October 2020

Final Report

Executive Summary

Building from the 2019 Tourism Information and Data Hui (the Hui), the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) recognised an opportunity to meet the data needs of the tourism sector and Government differently, by moving towards a more collaborative and dynamic use of data and information. PwC was commissioned in early 2020 to explore a possible co-governance model for publicly available tourism data (hereafter referred to as tourism data).

Following an interview process with identified tourism sector stakeholders and desktop research, two potential options for co-governance were identified as:

- **Option one:** a co-governance body centred on collaborative arrangements between the private and public sectors, with clear agreement on identified sector priorities to focus on.
- **Option two:** creation of a specific separate entity or unit to drive tourism data co-governance, with the specific mandate of this organisation to be determined.

Our conversations with stakeholders focused on a potential solution resembling option one, rather than a structural solution. It was the willingness and ability of organisations to come together to determine the priorities for tourism data, as well as ensuring the 'right' people were a part of that conversation, that interviewees generally indicated would drive good co-governance. Option two also had the potential to create further crowding in the tourism data environment, which already involves several Government agencies.

Based on best practice, information on current co-governance models in operation, and interviews/feedback from a select group of industry stakeholders, we have provided a range of recommendations as indicated in Table One below, which should be considered in the adoption of any co-governance approach.

The body of this report provides additional detail on each of these recommendations, co-governance best practice and what we heard from the sector.

Table One: Recommendations for tourism data co-governance

Topic	Summary
Purpose	<p>A Terms of Reference document for the co-governance group should include one of the following statements (or similar) as a purpose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Providing leadership and/or advice on data issues of agreed significance to the tourism industry;● Making recommendations on the associated collection of data, the formation of research and insights, and possible joint development utilising publicly available tourism data; or● Creating a collaborative forum to raise, discuss and advance perennial tourism data issues identified and agreed by the group of significance to warrant discussion.

Objectives	<p>Objectives should be agreed upon by the group, prioritised in order of importance and delivery, and include tourism data governance topics of interest the collective industry raised. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing a collaborative approach with the sector through co-governance; • Aligning the objectives of the co-governance group with existing strategies or aspirations (Aotearoa Tourism strategy, Tourism Data Domain Plan); • Developing and/or agreeing to a consistent and coherent approach to data management and standards; • Promoting improved access to existing publicly available tourism data sources; • Uplifting the sector’s capability, understanding and value of tourism data, insights and research; • Co-funding new data opportunities and projects in the tourism sector.
Decision making powers	<p>The decision-making remit of the group focuses on providing advice and recommendations to both industry (via members) and government at the strategic level.</p> <p>The co-governance group would not have the power to require organisations to follow any agreed approaches, rather, the group’s strength would be in its key linkages to industry, and its ability to influence the sector to take action in line with the agreed co-governance group approach.</p>
Principles of working together	<p>The adoption of principles used by effective co-governance groups which are focused on forming good relationships over time. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A willingness to work together, listen and learn from each other and to understand each other’s perspectives; • Adopting a solution focused and open data approach; • Participating, contributing and committing to working for the collective interest of the sector; • Being open and transparent around challenges and constraints; and/or • Being willing to be flexible, find compromises and reach decisions diplomatically, even if members of the group disagree.
Size	<p>A medium size group approaches 12 members to ensure the representation of sector views of the sector while maintaining responsiveness in the decision-making process.</p>
Mixed membership model	<p>The co-governance group should contain a diverse range of expertise and skills to allow it to respond to the challenges of the tourism industry. Membership should be focused first on ensuring specific representation and the ability to influence the government and the sector. Members with additional specific technical skill sets can add depth and breadth of understanding and decision making to the group.</p>
The role of an Independent Chair	<p>An independent Chair should be chosen in consultation with industry, with the groups the Terms of Reference clearly defining their role. The Chair will impartially facilitate discussions and mediate disagreements towards a shared understanding for the group. This position creates a stronger sense of partnership and trust than an industry or government sector lead, and ensures discussion, advice and recommendations remain at the strategic level.</p>










<p>Membership composition – representation</p>	<p>The membership structure reflects the sector and provides a connection between the Government and the tourism industry. This will help to ensure there is buy-in from all parties, and a connection to central Government priorities and decision-making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The membership of the group should involve a range of tourism industry operators, key peak bodies, a data representative, an individual that can represent Māori interests, and MBIE, Statistics New Zealand the Department of Conservation. • Membership of organisations rotates to increase participation in the group at a Central Government, Peak body and industry level. <p>A potential co-governance membership configuration reflecting this concept is outlined below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="475 629 1509 1003"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="475 629 794 775"> Central Government  </th> <th data-bbox="794 629 1174 775"> Peak Bodies  </th> <th data-bbox="1174 629 1509 775"> Industry  </th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="475 775 794 1003"> MBIE Statistics New Zealand Department of Conservation Rotating agency </td> <td data-bbox="794 775 1174 1003"> Tourism Industry Aotearoa Regional Tourism Organisations NZ Māori representative/advisor Rotating peak body position </td> <td data-bbox="1174 775 1509 1003"> Large Business Operator Small Business Operator Data expert Rotating industry position </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Central Government 	Peak Bodies 	Industry 	MBIE Statistics New Zealand Department of Conservation Rotating agency	Tourism Industry Aotearoa Regional Tourism Organisations NZ Māori representative/advisor Rotating peak body position	Large Business Operator Small Business Operator Data expert Rotating industry position
Central Government 	Peak Bodies 	Industry 					
MBIE Statistics New Zealand Department of Conservation Rotating agency	Tourism Industry Aotearoa Regional Tourism Organisations NZ Māori representative/advisor Rotating peak body position	Large Business Operator Small Business Operator Data expert Rotating industry position					
<p>Communications</p>	<p>Co-governance group members should be responsible for communicating information to the industry group/s and members they represent. Consideration could also be given to using the existing Tourism Users Group and other forums to strengthen communications to the sector.</p>						
<p>Accountability and Reporting</p>	<p>Annual or short-term reports to the sector and MBIE. At minimum these reports should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and outline the funding of new projects; • Provide a benchmark of existing projects; and • Provide a snapshot of progress against the group’s overall strategy. <p>A long-term strategy report every five years should be developed, focusing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establishing the long-term strategy of the group and prioritised objectives; • reviewing the effectiveness of the group in achieving its purpose and objectives; • identifying where changes are needed to the Terms of Reference, memberships and/or overall strategy of the group; • the success of the group in working together and driving collaboration, as well as meeting tourism data needs; and • wider measures of success of the group to the sector. <p>Routine documents such as meeting minutes, agendas and background information should be made available to industry participants and officials.</p>						
<p>Resources</p>	<p>A co-funding approach to commissioning projects and initiatives is adopted. The constrained funding environment of the group and the sector requires projects and initiatives be prioritised accordingly.</p> <p>Additional support including a Secretariat and expert advice for the group could be considered in the future once the group has commenced operations.</p>						

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	6
Purpose, Context and Approach	6
Report structure	6
What is co-governance?	7
Overview	7
What we heard	9
Key elements for consideration for co-governance	11
Objectives are commonly held	12
Recommendations	13
Decision-making powers are non-binding	14
Recommendations	15
Principles focus on working together	15
Recommendations	15
Operational considerations for co-governance	16
Size of the co-governance group	16
Recommendations	16
Membership representation and rotation	16
Recommendations	17
The role of an independent Chair	18
Communications	19
Where the group would 'fit in'	19
Recommendations	20
Resourcing of initiatives	22
Recommendations	22
Additional support for the group	22
Recommendations	22
Appendix A: Overview of the industry	24
Appendix B: Interviewees	25
Appendix C: Interview Topics	26
Appendix D: Disclaimer and restrictions	27

Introduction

Purpose, Context and Approach

Purpose

This document provides a recommended co-governance model and other considerations in the context of the New Zealand tourism data environment. It is informed by best practice, information on current co-governance models in operation, and interviews/feedback from a select group of industry stakeholders.

Context

As the steward of the tourism industry, MBIE identified in early 2019 the need for a more inclusive approach to decision-making in the tourism data space. The new approach would aim to move the sector towards a more collaborative and dynamic use of its data to generate value for New Zealand.

The 2019 Tourism information and the Hui brought together government, industry and the tourism data community to consider the data needs of the sector. One of the next steps determined from the Hui was to establish a governance group to support further development in the tourism data system.

In the current COVID-19 environment, there is a need for clearly mandated information governance for the tourism industry. An opportunity exists to build upon the learnings of MBIE's engagement to date by implementing a co-governance approach. This approach would deliver strong data governance, supporting New Zealand tourism operators to be part of an environment that supports an informed and cooperative approach to the management of data priorities and usage.

PwC were engaged to assess the suitability of a co-governance approach to tourism data that is underpinned by consistency and collaboration and incorporates the views of industry.

Approach

We undertook a desktop review to understand the current data landscape of the New Zealand tourism industry as well as the broad challenges and opportunities within it. Existing co-governance practices and approaches in New Zealand were also reviewed to identify best practice. An overview of the tourism industry is provided in Appendix A.

We interviewed a selected group of 14 stakeholders during June and July 2020, who each represented an area of the tourism industry. These included stakeholders from industry associations/peak bodies, major employers and central government. The full list of interviewees (Appendix B) and interviewees questions (Appendix C) are appended to this document.

Report structure

This report is divided into the following sections:

- An overview of what co-governance is and associated best practice principles ('What is co-governance?');
- A summary of feedback given by our interviewees ('What we heard');
- The possible purpose, objectives and principles of a proposed co-governance group ('Key elements for consideration'); and
- Operational considerations when developing a co-governance group ('Operational considerations').

What is co-governance?

Overview

Co-governance is an arrangement in which strategic decisions are shared between stakeholders. While the term generally refers to formal agreements for the sharing of decision-making powers, it does not necessarily include responsibility for implementing, regulating, or enforcing the actions agreed to by the group.¹ In New Zealand, co-governance and co-management are used relatively interchangeably, with co-governance usually being more common in the strategic context, and in identifying joint approaches between the Crown and Māori.

The strength of a co-governance model is that it allows multiple stakeholder groups to discuss, collaborate and co-design a path to achieve shared outcomes. A 2016 review of co-governance models in the natural resources sector by the Office of the Auditor General found successful co-governance relies on effective relationships, which parties needed to 'value and prioritise.'²

Co-governance is an emerging and developing model of decision-making.

In New Zealand, co-governance is increasingly used to support the effective governance of natural resources, where iwi, hapū, and community groups along with local or central government have a strong and ongoing interest. This is particularly prominent in areas mandated under the Treaty of Waitangi.

Co-governance and/or co-management holds promise as a means of moving past conflict and towards developing more effective and resilient methods of managing resources, particularly natural resources³. The Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims (Waikato River) Settlement Act 2010 (Settlement Act) is an excellent example of this, creating a robust co-governance and co-management regime, with statutory mandates for resource monitoring and reporting, and periodic reviews and adjustments based on results.⁴ Regardless of sector, there are learnings from current co-governance arrangements which should be considered in the creation of any future model.

No set rules to co-governance

In its 2016 review, the Office of the Auditor General found there were no 'set rules' to follow when setting up a co-governance arrangement. Instead, parties wanting to enter a co-governance arrangement were advised to focus on establishing practices to support successful co-governance, focused around collaboration, decision making powers, relationships and the development of a joint approach or strategy. The review identified ten best practice elements which we consider to be universally applicable regardless of sector and that should be considered through the establishment and operation of any co-governance group.

¹ Hughey, K. F. D., Jacobson, C. & Smith, E. F. (2017). A framework for comparing collaborative management of Australian and New Zealand water resources. *Ecology and Society*, Vol. 22, No. 4.

² Office of the Auditor General (2016). *Principles for effectively co-governing natural resources*. Retrieved online from <https://www.oag.govt.nz/2016/co-governance/docs/co-governance-amended.pdf>

³ Baker, J. (2013). *The Waikato-Tainui Settlement Act: A New High-Water Mark for Natural Resources Co-management*. Retrieved online from <https://www.colorado.edu/law/node/1915/attachment>

⁴ Ibid.

To guide our discussion of what a potential co-governance group Terms of Reference could include

We reference the best practice elements outlined below - along with other best practice elements identified through our research - within the purpose, objectives, decision-making, principles and operational considerations sections of this report.

Best Practice elements to be considered in co-governance

1. Develop good relationships.
2. Be prepared to work together, listen and learn from each other, and go the extra mile to understand each other's perspective and reach compromise where needed.
3. Take the time to plan and set up processes.
4. Work out a shared understanding of purpose and check understanding from time to time.
5. Understand the extent of decision-making powers and clearly define roles and responsibilities.
6. Agree how to work together, including deciding what form of governance will work best
7. Find people with the right experience and capacity, such as strong leadership skills, and governance or management experience, and who have the time to be involved.
8. Plan how the project can be sustained through its lifetime.
9. Keep the public informed of progress and what is being achieved.
10. Provide assurance that finances are well managed.



What we heard

Our interviews were held with representatives from a range of organisations, with the distinct purpose of seeking the views of stakeholders that would offer different perspectives. We wanted to hear feedback from organisations about the following specific topics:

- the role of the tourism organisation in the sector in relation to data;
- identifying challenges and providing feedback on the current data environment;
- testing the priorities for a future proposed co-governance approach;
- working through the potential remit of the proposed co-governance group; and
- the COVID-19 tourism data response, and any learnings that could be taken forward into a future co-governance model.

There was overall support for a co-governance group with a range of views, opinions, and desires for what system issues a co-governance approach could potentially address. Three common themes came through relating to what the group should provide:

- The development and delivery of sector leadership;
- The creation of a specific forum to discuss issues identified; and
- The ability to provide clarity of direction for data issues in the sector from a strategic perspective.

The following paragraphs broadly summarise the feedback we received through our interview process. Throughout the remainder of this document, we will continue to refer to specific feedback where it is relevant.

Recognised the positive parts of the current tourism data environment

Government agencies had worked hard to further the availability and role of data in the sector, and to ensure stakeholders understood the value of data and insights. Certain tourism data products were regarded as world class and were readily used by New Zealand and international entities for decision-making.

Sought stronger involvement in decision-making processes

While some stakeholders appreciated efforts from the Government to canvas its views and input, it was felt that:

- The industry's lack of 'skin in the game' limited its ability to drive meaningful change in the tourism data environment;
- There was a disconnect from government decision-making processes; and
- It was critical to improve the visibility and accountability of decision-making.

A greater transparency over government level decision-making would provide a stronger understanding of the Government's intended priorities and direction. It would also help to develop a more collaborative mindset for the tourism sector, by ensuring all participants understand their role in the wider tourism data ecosystem.

A key discussion that emerged was the extent industry should have a say in decision-making and was linked to the sector contribution towards funding tourism data management projects. Industry also acknowledged the nature of government requires some decisions to retain a certain 'arm's length' from the sector.

A collaborative approach to leadership was valued

Interviewees discussed the best possible way to leverage the unique skills and knowledge of the whole sector. There was a strong desire to work together for the betterment of the sector, particularly as challenges have emerged from COVID-19. Interviewees were seeking stronger leadership of the data system, allowing coordination on how the tourism sector could work together to contribute to data priorities, and who would be responsible (and accountable) for championing progress.

Building on the good work undertaken to date

Interviewees acknowledged the efforts of MBIE and industry members to date in coming together to identify and respond to industry needs. They recognised the effort that had been put into developing a more collaborative approach through setting the Tourism Data Domain Plan and initiating the Hui to understand the needs of the industry. They wanted to see this approach be built upon in a future model and noted the potential for leveraging work completed to date in agreeing priorities for any new co-governance model.

A strategic focus

While interviewees acknowledged that sub-groups or advisory groups could be formed to support a co-governance approach with technical knowledge, they were clear that the co-governance approach should provide a strategic view - not an operational view. While the group would be expected to focus on some areas that may broach operational matters and decision-making - particularly in accordance to data sets - the group would largely focus on strategic guidance for the sector.

Involving the right people

Several interviewees discussed the importance of having the 'right' people involved. They also considered that participants in any co-governance model would need to demonstrate appropriate seniority to influence their own organisations as well as the wider sector. Involving those with key sector relationships would also help ensure that the co-governance group could effectively share information with, and collect information and feedback from, the sector.

A potential sector contribution to funding

The concept of accountability was driven by discussions around funding, and the possibility of the sector contributing towards any funding approach. Interviewees were clear on the importance of the industry contributing to funding to help drive interest and accountability, despite the financial situation caused by COVID-19.

Interviewees also acknowledged the government was also impacted by the downturn in international tourism numbers to New Zealand. Interviewees discussed the potential of utilising existing levies (such as the International Visitor Levy) to support tourism data governance, or to explore other levy opportunities to deliver an industry contribution.

The 'new normal'

The COVID-19 pandemic emphasised and reinforced existing issues around data challenges, and strengthened the importance of delivering strong, clear data governance and leadership. This 'new normal' has serious ramifications for the sector, not least an ongoing focus on developing domestic tourism. Interviewees hoped a new approach would deal with a range of challenges and would build upon the momentum as the sector recovered from COVID-19.

Interviewees viewed the ongoing response to COVID-19 as a crucial opportunity to improve the collection and use of data while the tourism industry rebuilds. They stated there is a crucial chance to reset New Zealand's tourism and data collective objectives in a way that allows us to identify how the sector is recovering and conveys the sector's importance to New Zealand's economic recovery.

Key elements for consideration for co-governance

Co-governance is a commitment to shared outcomes over time.

The success of a co-governance framework depends on participants having a shared understanding of the group's focus and developing (or enhancing) relationships. This is reinforced by academics who point out that while co-governance is based on self-regulation, its legitimacy is established by the participation and influence of the members of the group.⁵ This commitment to a shared understanding and direction for the group is especially important in the tourism sector with the diversity of groups and needs involved. We view the key foundations are for the group to build:

- a shared understanding of what the co-governance group intends to achieve (an agreed purpose and specific objectives); and
- how they intend to achieve them (decision-making and principles on working together).

Purpose must reflect a shared understanding

Under a co-governance approach, the purpose must reflect a shared understanding of what the group is trying to achieve. Finding common objectives enables the group to focus on reaching shared outcomes. In successful natural resource co-governance arrangements, there was a shared understanding of what central and local government and iwi wanted to achieve in terms of environmental and economic management, and rangatiratanga. In establishing the Waikato River Authority, the single purpose of *restoring and protecting the health and well-being of the Waikato River for future generations* provided strong guidance to the co-governance approach.⁶

In the tourism sector, interviewees felt the purposes stated in the Tourism Data Domain Plan (TDDP) remained relevant. The TDDP focuses on:

- the long-term improvement of official statistics;
- coordinating plans for addressing data issues;
- determining the highest priority information needs; and
- using a cross agency approach to priorities.⁷

We heard similar views when discussing challenges and future opportunities in relation to data issues, which are captured in the following table.

⁵ Wevers, S. G. (2011). *Recognising Rangatiratanga: Sharing power with Māori through Co-Management*. Retrieved online from <https://www.otago.ac.nz/law/research/journals/otago036349.pdf>

⁶ Te Aho, L. (2010). Indigenous Challenges to Enhance Freshwater Governance and Management in Aotearoa New Zealand—The Waikato River Settlement. *Water*, Vol 285, No. 288.

⁷ Tourism Data Domain Plan 2018, Ministry of Business Innovation & Employment, Retrieved online from <https://www.mbie.govt.nz/assets/157deaf9d8/tourism-data-domain-plan-2018.pdf>

Sector views	For consideration in a future purpose statement
Providing leadership on data issues and needs was the key opportunity a potential co-governance model could address.	<i>Clarifies the co-governance group will be the leader on data issues or providing advice to enable leadership.</i>
The sector's needs extended beyond raw data inputs and collection to research, insights, influencing outcomes and data standards.	<i>Is clear on which areas of tourism data it will govern and includes research and insights.</i>
Greater transparency and participation in the decision-making process on data issues was highly valued. Efforts should be made to collaborate and be open with decision-making.	<i>Outlines it creates a forum to allow for open and honest discussion, action and feedback.</i>
Legislative, commercial, privacy and technical capability barriers across the sector would affect sharing of data of the potential co-governance group.	<i>Restrictions require data to be limited to data that is publicly shareable for analysis or publicly available.</i>
The group should hold an advisory role across a range of potential areas. Operational management powers should be limited.	<i>The strategic advice role must be clear and agreed to, and its bounds defined.</i>
Three to five-year strategic plans introduced for data priorities for the tourism sector.	<i>Developing an agreed, common roadmap to measure the progress of work as a sector.</i>

Recommendations

The shared purpose of the co-governance group is clear on its scope and its areas of focus. This will be guided by its decision-making powers and objectives (both of which are discussed in further detail in the following pages). It should incorporate existing tourism strategies to ensure alignment with Government and sector priorities. Based on our discussions with the sector and officials, a future purpose statement includes some or all the following elements:

- Providing leadership and/or advice on data issues of agreed significance to the New Zealand tourism industry;
- Making recommendations to the sector on the associated collection of data, the formation of research and insights, and possible joint development utilising publicly available tourism data; and/or
- Creating a collaborative forum to raise, discuss and advance perennial tourism data issues identified and agreed by the group as being of significance.

Objectives are commonly held

Objectives represent the actions a group will need to take to achieve its shared purpose. The ability of a co-governance group to achieve its objectives is closely tied to its agreed decision-making powers and the authority it has with its stakeholders. A consistent narrative in the natural resources sector is that successful co-governance arrangements understood the common objectives among the different parties involved (the Crown, local councils and iwi). For example, the Waikato River Authority objectives incorporated broad

government objectives, public policy objectives as well as reflecting iwi aspirations and their role in influencing policy.⁸

There was agreement from interviewees and officials that the full value of a co-governance group would only be realised if it considered a broader range of matters than data alone. Examples given included the development of insights, the potential advancement and agreement of research priorities, and actions that could enable further collaborative initiatives and programs within the sector. Existing and broader tourism sector objectives should be balanced with sector aspirations, which are outlined below:

Sector aspirations	For consideration in future objective statements
Data and insights will be timely and drive decision-making about policy and business decision-making.	<p><i>Aligning the objectives of the co-governance group with existing strategies and goals outlined in the Aotearoa Tourism strategy and Tourism Data Domain Plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>New Zealand-Aotearoa delivers exceptional visitor experiences</i> ● <i>Improvement of tourism sector productivity</i> ● <i>Tourism protects, restores and champions New Zealand-Aotearoa's natural environment, culture and historic heritage</i> ● <i>New Zealanders' lives are improved by tourism</i> ● <i>Tourism supports thriving and sustainable regions – ensures regional dispersal of visitors and enable visitor flows.</i> <p><i>Build consensus and decide which sector aspirations should be incorporated into focused group objectives.</i></p> <p><i>Make trade-offs and prioritise as not all aspirations can be achieved at once.</i></p>
A tourism data map covering demand, supply, international and domestic areas will be agreed upon.	
Establishing a core data set or set of expectations on what is provided by the Government and the sector.	
A collaborative approach, the sharing of data and adopting an open position to data where possible.	
A sense of shared accountability and responsibility on deciding how tourism data needs are met.	
The sector develops a mature approach to data and is guided by standards and frameworks driven by a co-governance group.	
New information sources are considered and integrated to improve collection processes where effective and cost-efficient, reducing duplication.	
There is a single landing page where the sector can find the information and access they need from a 'one stop shop' of data, research, insight and tools.	
The sector can benefit from the usability of data, insight, research and initiatives and programs.	

This ambitious list would need to be prioritised to ensure the sector's efforts were focused on the most important areas. The suggested three to five-year strategy could help the group agree on key priorities with an initial focus on building collaboration and building the support and buy-in of key industry stakeholders.

Recommendations

The Terms of Reference document for the co-governance group should outline a prioritised set of objectives. We have identified the following common objectives which are consistent with both existing sector strategies and aspirations to be tested with the group for inclusion.

⁸ Co-governance and co-management arrangements for the upper Waipa river, 2010, The Treasury New Zealand, retrieved from <https://treasury.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2010-11/ris-ots-cgcmuwr-nov10.pdf>

- Establishing a collaborative approach with the sector through co-governance;
- Aligning the objectives of the co-governance group with existing strategies or aspirations (Aotearoa Tourism strategy, Tourism Data Domain Plan);
- Developing and/or agreeing to a consistent and coherent approach to data management and standards;
- Promoting improved access to existing publicly available tourism data sources;
- Uplifting the sector's capability, understanding and value of tourism data, insights and research;
- Co-funding new data opportunities and projects in the tourism sector; and
- Developing a Plan or Roadmap for delivery.

Decision-making powers are non-binding

Powers of the co-governance group

The majority of New Zealand co-governance group decision making powers are outlined by the legal instruments which form them. In the natural resource context, co-governance is formed by statute with its powers outlined and given to the co-governance group.

As this group will be formed through consensus it will not have the power to require organisations to commit to any agreed approach or strategy. Instead it will rely on the group agreeing to non-binding recommendations and influencing key sector stakeholders through its advisory function. The ability for members to hold mana and influence within their respective parts of government and the sector is a key consideration when appointing members to the group.

This focus on providing strategic advice and recommendations aligns with the preferences of the sector and officials. This would be fed back to government, industry and the sector by members of the group. This reflects the idea that the value of a co-governance group is in the connection of its members to their respective parts of the tourism and Government sectors, utilising these members to disseminate and test ideas, concepts and feedback.

Barriers to data sharing and information sharing

Interviewees raised concerns about the potential remit of the group, and whether the co-governance group would be empowered to direct each other on what data they should be collecting, or in sharing this data. Interviewees were quick to identify they felt this would be beyond the remit of the group, and pointed to barriers to sharing information including:

- Commercial confidentiality agreements
- Public disclosure
- Privacy standards
- Legislative requirements
- Technical capability
- Financial costs

While there was a strong desire from industry to work more collaboratively, issues surrounding the sharing of information are complex, and are unlikely to be resolved in the short-term. While the group should take a longer-term focus and consider how the sector can act more collaboratively (i.e. sharing information), it should not overlook immediate methods of collaboration that are less difficult to implement at pace.

Recommendations

The initial decision-making powers of the group should focus on providing advice and recommendations to industry and government. This would enable the group to maintain a strategic focus and avoid the concerns raised over operational data sharing, which may be considered in the future, and over a longer time frame. This also provides the group time to develop shared buy-in from industry and build goodwill for future work.

Principles focus on working together

Effective co-governance requires a dedication to forming strong relationships over time. Best practice acknowledges that members will need to invest in the development of relationships.⁹ These relationships can be slow to build, because parties often have different perspectives, aspirations and priorities. To enable the success of any potential co-governance group, members must be willing to work together; committed to listening and learning from each other; and must try to understand each other's perspectives.

A co-governance group should also adopt principles which continue to create a sense of shared responsibility. Along with the resulting collaborative approach to issues, this will provide a clear signal to the sector of the willingness of MBIE and Government to work alongside key industry stakeholders for the betterment of the New Zealand tourism data environment.

Interviewees shared similar views and agreed the sector should work together in an open and collaborative environment like the Hui. This environment allowed parties to work together to find opportunities and solutions to long standing data challenges. There was further agreement that the new group continues MBIE's efforts to act in good-faith, gather the views of the sector, and drive collaboration.

Recommendations

The co-governance group agrees on principles that focus on building relationships and collaboration over the long term. Some of these could include:

- a willingness to work together, listen and learn from each other and to understand each other's perspectives;
- adopting a solution focused and open data approach;
- participating, contributing and committing to working for the collective interest of the sector;
- being open and transparent around challenges and constraints; and/or
- being willing to be flexible, find compromises and reach decisions diplomatically, even if members of the group disagree.

⁹ Office of the Auditor General (2016). *Principles for effectively co-governing natural resources*. Retrieved online from <https://www.oag.govt.nz/2016/co-governance/docs/co-governance-amended.pdf>

Operational considerations for co-governance

The following topics represent a range of operational areas to be considered when forming any co-governance group.

Size of the co-governance group

There is no 'ideal' number for governance groups, regardless of whether they incorporate co-governance elements. The size of the group must enable good governance principles to be maintained and ensure responsive decision-making.

In New Zealand, most co-governance groups have 8 - 12 members to balance the representation of different stakeholders with the speed of decision making. There is no exact guidance on how the size of natural resource co-governance groups were determined and the decisions were likely made on the trade-offs between smaller and larger groups (i.e. between faster decision making and gathering a greater representation of view and expertise).

Stakeholder views also sought this balance in a co-governance group. The future group should truly represent them in terms of skill set, experience and ability to participate in the governance process while being agile enough to find quick wins from the outset. Representation is critical to the sector, as it ensures that the collective views of the sector are part of the group's decision-making processes and the recommendations and outcomes are reported

We also heard that it was important that any co-governance group had the remit to drive real leadership for the tourism industry and could identify both short and long-term priorities for discussion and potential implementation.

Recommendations

A medium size co-governance body of 12 members, in line with the common size of governance bodies in New Zealand. This allows for the benefits of both the smaller and larger sized configurations discussed above, while minimising the drawbacks identified. A 12 member governance group would ensure that members demonstrate the diversity of the tourism industry and should be supported by a strong Terms of Reference document that outlines the roles of individual members.

Membership representation and rotation

Representation

Research by Hughey, Jacobson and Smith noted successful co-governance groups weren't necessarily responsible for management implementation but operated at a relationship and strategic direction setting level, with other organisations (including the respective sector) responsible for implementation.¹⁰ In the context of this relationship setting function, it is therefore very important that the group foster true and enduring representation for the sector, as this will provide the greatest likelihood of achieving sector 'buy in'.

The membership of any co-governance group should reflect its sector and enable the purpose of the group.

¹⁰ Ibid.

In our discussions with stakeholders, maintaining the link between Government and the tourism industry was strongly reiterated. Having Statistics New Zealand and MBIE as members of the governance group was universally agreed, to ensure a connection to Government priorities and decision-making.

Interviewees indicated that opportunities to collect data on emerging topics of interest - such as Māori tourism and sustainability - should not be overlooked. Given there are existing Māori economic development as well as conservation strategies, membership composition should enable these perspectives and needs to be represented.

Rotation

To ensure there is fairness and equity of appointments, periodic membership rotation of representatives (including a mixture of large and small business operators) could be implemented. This would reduce any perceptions of bias or acting in self-interest while also reducing conflicts of interests.

The ability to regularly change board membership was highly valued in the experience of the Rotorua Te Arawa Lakes Group co-governance arrangement. Changes were made to reflect a greater partnership between regional council and iwi and showed a 'willingness to sit down and discuss people's perspectives'.¹¹ However, this concept should be balanced against the time it would take to get a new member 'up to speed' to actively participate in the group.

This would address the general concern that the co-governance group is representative of the sector. Through our interviews, we heard that the co-governance group could lose trust and credibility if not a true reflection of the sector. Industry could end up viewing the group as another 'war room' or another sector 'being directed from Wellington'.

Recommendations

The proposed co-governance group should be representative of the sector and include members from the central government, peak bodies and industry. Consideration should be given to a potential rotating membership of the group (and specific individual representatives, if desired) to ensure there is a diversity of thinking.

A potential co-governance membership configuration which reflects this is outlined below:

Central Government	Peak Bodies	Industry
MBIE Statistics New Zealand Department of Conservation Rotating agency position	Tourism Industry Aotearoa Regional Tourism Organisations NZ Māori representative/advisor Rotating peak body position	Large Business Operator Small Business Operator Data expert Rotating industry position

Governance groups are generally established based on representative leadership, skills-based leadership, or a combination of these approaches.

It was important that co-governance participants are co-operative and operate in good faith and in a collaborative manner.¹² Successful co-governance groups such as the Waikato River Authority and Te

¹¹ Office of the Auditor General (2016). *Principles for effectively co-governing natural resources*. Retrieved online from <https://www.oag.govt.nz/2016/co-governance/docs/co-governance-amended.pdf>

¹² Harris, R. C. (2015). *The changing face of co-governance in New Zealand – how are Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tūhoe promoting the interests of their people through power-sharing arrangements in resource management?* Thesis. Retrieved online from <https://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/handle/10092/10792>

Urewera Board have incorporated these lessons by choosing members based on their mana, knowledge, standing in the community, skills and governance experience to participate in discussions.

As this co-governance group will hold a strategic advisory role, industry stakeholders agreed with this view that the group contains a diverse range of expertise and skills as well as members with broad networks and influence within the sector. Members should have:

- skills that enable the group to respond to a wide scope of data challenges in the tourism industry.
- influence to provide a key linkage with the sector and fulfil the communications functions to share and gather information while developing trust and support for the group.

Recommendations

A mixed model for co-governance should be adopted. Members should be appointed or elected based on their:

- ability to participate in active governance discussions;
- breadth of experience and skills in terms of tourism data, governance, legal; and
- diversity of thought, including the incorporation of cultural knowledge and tikanga.

Members must have the required mana as the co-governance holds an advisory function. Members must be able to represent the sector views to the co-governance group and communicate any recommendations and influence follow up action back to the sector.

The role of an independent Chair

The use of an independent chair could drive the effective functioning of the group. In New Zealand, most co-governance groups appoint a Chair and co-chairs to build trust between the Crown and iwi to reflect their partnership under the Treaty of Waitangi. The appointment of the Chair, usually held by mana whenua with government representatives (central, local or district) holding deputy chair positions.

As this co-governance group focuses on the hearing the different perspectives of the sector on data issues and how to address them, an independent Chair is more appropriate. Given the diversity and strength of views the independence of the Chair will facilitate discussions and guide disagreements to a shared understanding without the implication of bias or degrading relationships.

Any independent Chair would need to ensure the group remains strategically focused. When talking about governance concepts with stakeholders, we found at times discussions shifting towards specific operational concerns. Given the subject matter of data and the desired view that decision-making should be maintained at the strategic level, a skilled Chair - independent or otherwise - will ensure that discussion remains strategic, rather than straying into 'detailed' territory.

Recommendations

The Chair's role would be clearly outlined in a Terms of Reference document for the co-governance group to ensure that:

- The Chair supports the group to uphold the agreed purpose, objectives and principles;
- The Chair ensures active participation and that meetings are focused towards strategic outcomes; and

- The Chair ensures cooperation and participation of all members of the group, and as many respective sector views as plausible.

To supplement the proposed mixed representation model of membership, any possible chairperson should demonstrate:

- Chairperson/governance or leadership experience;
- Strong communications and relationship management skills; and
- Ideally, experience with the tourism data and the wider industry.

An independent Chair could be appointed to lead the group to ensure it is appropriately guided throughout its formation and ongoing delivery. The potential Chair should be discussed and chosen in consultation with industry and should possess the necessary experience, relationship management and communications skills.

The Terms of Reference document for the group should clearly define the Chair's role, and the groups expectations for its Chair.

Communications

Regular and consistent communications on the activities of the co-governance group will create a greater sense of transparency and accountability. In the natural resource sector, keeping the sector and the public informed provided the following benefits:

- the sustained support and engagement for projects;
- assisted in setting realistic expectations around the pace of progress; and
- created open dialogue with the sector on the progress of initiatives.

The sector outlined its desire to strengthen the transparency of existing activities, where possible. Tourism data issues are widely agreed by the sector as being complex and long standing, but there is a desire for swift movement to start addressing some of these.

It is crucial that dialogue with the sector is open, transparent and honest, and points clearly to how challenges are being considered and addressed by the group.

Recommendations

A key responsibility of co-governance members should be to distribute information from the group to the wider industry. The group could also use the Tourism Users Group, an existing communication forum, to highlight recommendations and formal positions reached to the rest of the industry and provide updates on a centralised webpage. Given the historic challenges in the Tourism Users Group, it is important to note that a two-way dialogue between members and the co-governance group will provide the most value.

Where the group would 'fit in'

Co-governance groups generally work in a close but arm's length arrangement with local, district or central Government authorities. This arrangement is possible by having the group contain representatives from these agencies. In the New Zealand co-governance groups have achieved this by requiring a certain number of members separately appointed by Iwi, the Crown and local authorities.

As a result, co-governance groups generally advise, report and make recommendations to the organisations involved in the co-governance group or have a shared interest. For example, Waikato River Authority reviews

and approves funding applications as a group without the requirement to seek approval from a Ministry, Minister or other authority.¹³

This model was supported by the sector, who favoured remaining independent of the Minister and other existing tourism governance bodies. The consensus was that this could be overcome if the correct representation of the industry, and having decision makers who were empowered to commit to recommendations were at the table.

We note, co-governance groups in the natural resource sector are generally supported by empowering legislation and/or the Treaty of Waitangi. In this absence, linking this group initially to the support of MBIE's formal structure may help to support its formal advisory function.



Recommendations

A strong Terms of Reference document or charter outlining the principles and expectations of members should outline this. In addition, the Terms of Reference should include the expectation the group will be providing advice and recommendations to the sector and expects this advice to be considered by MBIE and the sector.


Accountability and Reporting

In co-governance accountability broadly relates to the tracking of decision making, actions and outcomes. It would also require the measurement of the success of the group, and how it was responding to the needs of industry and stakeholders.

In New Zealand natural resource co-governance groups there were no clear rules on monitoring and reporting. We found certain groups were required to provide the following reports/outputs through its forming legislation to provide accountability. These groups had stronger decision making powers than what is being considered in the tourism data context.

Report type		Audience	Scope
	Annual reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relevant Minister or governing body (Local authority, board or trustees) Other stakeholders (industry, community) Public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress of the group against agreed performance targets. Recent funding of projects. Project outcomes. Changes to and the performance of the group.
	Long term reports or management plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relevant Minister or governing body (Local authority, board or trustees) Other stakeholders (industry, community) Public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing and reviewing the effectiveness of the group in terms of function, strategy and initiatives funded.

¹³ The Waikato River Authority does seek to have an appropriate Waikato Regional Council staff member to participate to access technical knowledge of the Council as well as avoiding duplication with other council projects.

	<p>Routine accountability documents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other stakeholders (industry, community) • Public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting minutes, agendas, background information on the group and membership.
---	--	--	---

As noted earlier, there was broad support for establishing a similar reporting and accountability framework. This included a strategic plan over a three to five-year period supported by regular progress reporting. These reports would provide a continued benchmark of the delivery of initiatives and strategy. The sector was not clear on the timing of these periodic reports but believed these should not be too frequent or divert the resources and focus of the group away from its purpose.

We found there was no clear consensus on measuring the wider success of the group to the sector, but suggested metrics included:

- whether there was increased access, use and/or awareness of tourism data by the sector; and/or
- increased satisfaction with the available data products.

While a *'Mood of the Nation'* type survey which was qualitative in nature was suggested, it was agreed there were possible issues with how 'satisfaction' would be measured accurately due to the distinct needs of users.

Recommendations

Once established the group prepares and approves the following annual, long term and routine accountability documents.

Annual or short-term reports to the sector and MBIE which at minimum

- identify and outline the funding of new projects;
- provide a benchmark of existing projects; and
- provide a snapshot of progress against the group's overall strategy.

A long-term strategy report compiled every five years focusing on

- establishing the long-term strategy of the group and prioritised objectives;
- reviewing the effectiveness of the group in achieving its purpose and objectives;
- identifying where changes are needed to the Terms of Reference, memberships and/or overall strategy of the group;
- the success of the group in working together and driving collaboration, as well as meeting tourism data needs; and
- wider measures of success of the group to the sector.

Routine documents such as meeting minutes, agendas and background information should be made available publicly.

Resourcing of initiatives

Resourcing in co-governance arrangements can be a contentious issue. In the natural resources sector, co-governance groups found success when they planned early, secured funding by pooling resources, and took a joint approach to responsibility and the implementation of a group strategy.

Of note is the approach of the Waikato River Authority which incorporates these lessons through a co-funding approach. Applicants to the WRA's contestable fund for project funding must outline an element of co-funding in their proposals. This approach maximises the value of the Authority's funds from its Treaty settlement and creates joint responsibility between the applicant and the WRA.

Stakeholders supported co-funding projects between the Government and the sector and recognised this approach would create a sense of shared responsibility in their delivery. Despite the impacts of COVID-19 on the sector's ability (industry and government) to fund and resource projects, there was still support for this co-funding approach if initiatives aligned with sector aspirations and could help with its recovery.

Feedback stated that areas of interest included

- identifying where key datasets could be improved or created to address information gaps;
- commissioning research and insight projects to improve tourism business practices; and
- the feasibility of larger data projects such as digital platform solutions.

As with all other potential topics of consideration, these themes exist on a spectrum, with some being relatively low cost to implement and others requiring significant funding input.

Recommendations

The co-governance group should establish

- a co-funding arrangement to commission projects and initiatives;
- plans how the operations and commissioned projects are funded within the group's constrained financial environment; and
- sets funding criteria including the scale of funding being requested from participants, an element of co-funding from participants and evidence the application aligns with the purpose and objectives of the co-governance group.

Additional support for the group

In New Zealand, local authorities often supported co-governance groups by providing secretariat and administrative support when required. This ensured the functions and focus of the group could be maintained. Interviewees suggested a secretariat was put in place to support the group. This person (or persons) would be responsible for all administrative processes relating to the group. The function could be carried out by an existing MBIE staff member, or a new staff member appointed for this purpose.

Separately, there was support for the co-governance group to be assisted by technical experts on projects where necessary. This would inform discussion as well as the advice and recommendations provided by the group.

Recommendations

Additional support such as a secretariat for the group should be agreed to by the co-governance group and provided when necessary. This includes identifying whether:

- secretariat support could either be provided by MBIE or by other co-governance group members
- additional expert support required could be considered once the core membership of the group has been established.

Appendix A: Overview of the industry

In our initial research phase of research on the New Zealand tourism data environment, we identified:

- The New Zealand tourism sector is a key driver of our economy. It is estimated to be directly responsible for 5.8% of total Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and a further 4.0% of GDP is derived through activities of industries that support tourism.¹⁴
- However, the current tourism data landscape is not meeting all the expectations of stakeholders. This is a barrier to the sector being more aligned and makes planning and management of the sector challenging. Key high-level findings concerning the current data landscape include:
 - The sector is data rich, but data collection occurs in silos. This makes it difficult to build up a comprehensive understanding of the sector and to understand the flow on impacts of the sector;
 - The volume, granularity and variety of tourism data is increasing, as is demand for how this data is used; However, there is no consensus within the sector as to how, or what, data should be managed and analysed to benefit the sector;
 - Attempts at collaboration between different agencies and organisations have been difficult due to legitimate challenges relating to data ownership, access, commercial sensitivities and consumer privacy. Overcoming these challenges will require sustained collaboration between the agencies and organisations involved.
- There appears to be a genuine desire for greater data collaboration within the sector. The tourism sector has identified a robust data co-governance arrangement is crucial to help it understand the future impacts tourism and plan accordingly.
- A universal and established best practice approach to data co-governance in New Zealand does not currently exist. A future tourism data co governance model will need to be tailored to the needs and characteristics of the tourism sector.

While this summary was formed prior to the COVID-19 pandemic it remains relevant, with a potentially increased emphasis on the value of collaboration by removing silos within the sector, reducing duplication, and gaining agreement on priorities and approaches.

¹⁴ Statistics New Zealand, Tourism Satellite Account, December 2019, accessible from <https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/tourism-satellite-account-2019>

Appendix B: Interviewees

Interviews were conducted with stakeholders as recommended by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. These stakeholders were recommended as they could offer views on the tourism data environment and potential governance arrangements. Additional comments were provided by John Doorbar (MBIE) to provide a Te Ao Māori perspective. Interviews were with representatives of a broad sector, so it is possible that others in the sector could offer a different perspective on a future co-governance arrangement.

Attendee	Organisation	Date
Scott Tasker	Auckland Airport	24 June
Jenny Simpson	Air New Zealand	13 July
Andy Higgs	Centrality	24 June
Tim Bamford Susanne Becken	Department of Conservation	21 July
Julie White	Hospitality Association New Zealand	01 July
Charlie Ives	Regional Tourism New Zealand	26 June
Paul Pascoe Kevin Sweeney	Statistics New Zealand	29 June
Bruce Bassett Chris Roberts	Tourism Industry Aotearoa	24 June 23 June
Bryce Kelliher Emil Petrov	Tourism New Zealand	31 July
Brian Westwood	Youth Hostel Association of New Zealand	30 June

Appendix C: Interview Topics

Topic	Question scopes
Understanding the current state	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Understanding the interviewee's role in the tourism data system, ● Identifying the challenges and opportunities in the current governance arrangements
Moving to a future co-governance arrangement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identifying the suitability of co-governance in the tourism data system from a system and individual perspective ● Identifying priorities for improving publicly available tourism data
Decision-making scope in a future co-governance arrangement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identifying barriers to a future co-governance model from a system and individual perspective ● Defining the possible scope of decision-making powers, the co-governance group should hold ● Scoping how the co-governance group could fit with existing governance groups and entities ● Scoping the accountability characteristics and indicators
COVID-19 and data governance lessons learned	<p>Identifying whether the COVID-19 tourism data response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Changed opinions on the importance of data co-governance ● Would have benefitted from an existing co-governance framework ● Identified learnings that could be carried into a co-governance framework

Appendix D: Disclaimer and restrictions

This report has been prepared solely for the purposes stated herein and should not be relied upon for any other purpose. We accept no liability to any party should it be used for any purpose other than that for which it was prepared.

This report is strictly confidential and (save to the extent required by applicable law and/or regulation) must not be released to any third party without our express written consent which is at our sole discretion.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, PwC accepts no duty of care to any third party in connection with the provision of this Report and/or any related information or explanation (together, the "Information"). Accordingly, regardless of the form of action, whether in contract, tort (including without limitation, negligence) or otherwise, and to the extent permitted by applicable law, PwC accepts no liability of any kind to any third party and disclaims all responsibility for the consequences of any third party acting or refraining to act in reliance on the Information.

We have not independently verified the accuracy of information provided to us and have not conducted any form of audit in respect of the organisation for which work is completed. Accordingly, we express no opinion on the reliability, accuracy, or completeness of the information provided to us and upon which we have relied.

The statements and opinions expressed herein have been made in good faith, and on the basis that all information relied upon is true and accurate in all material respects, and not misleading by reason of omission or otherwise.

The statements and opinions expressed in this report are based on information available as at the date of the report.

We reserve the right, but will be under no obligation, to review or amend our Report, if any additional information, which was in existence on the date of this report, was not brought to our attention, or subsequently comes to light. This report is issued pursuant to the terms and conditions set out in our contract dated 14 February 2020

