

# Tourism Data and Insights Co-Governance

## Terms of Reference

### Consultation Summary of Submissions

The table below presents key suggestions and how they were addressed, as reflected in the new draft of the Terms of Reference. Many small suggestions have been incorporated in the draft and are not included below.

Suggestion/amendment	Change made or explanation
<b>Vision</b>	<b>Vision</b>
<p>The responses suggested some reworking of the vision statement to better reflect current and future priorities and orientations towards wellbeing and sustainability. Respondents emphasised the importance of moving away from the concept of ‘productivity’ and towards a broader notion of ‘value’. This aligns with current economic, government and policy discourse, as reflected in the wellbeing paradigm and initiatives like the OECD’s ‘Better Living’ framework and Treasury’s four capitals framework. Two respondents also recommended that improved understandings of tourism data should be included in the vision.</p>	<p>(Previous version). The vision of this group is to facilitate the provision of consistent, reliable and trusted tourism data and insights that enables timely reporting, decision making, long-term productivity and sustainability for the benefit of all New Zealanders.</p> <p>(New version) <i>The vision of the Tourism Data and Insights Co-Governance Group (the Group) is to facilitate the provision of consistent, reliable and trusted tourism data and insights that enables improved understanding through timely reporting to support better decision making, long-term value gains and sustainability for the benefit of all New Zealanders.</i></p>
<b>Purpose and Objectives</b>	<b>Purpose and Objectives</b>
<p>It was seen as important that the users of tourism-related data are much wider than Government and the tourism industry itself, and recommended that this needs to be clearly set out in the TOR.</p>	<p>Replaced P&amp;O opening paragraph:  <i>The central purpose of the Group is to realise this vision by creating a collaborative forum to identify the information needs of the diverse set of tourism data users (industry, central and local government, communities, iwi, interest groups, academics and commentators), communicate those needs to the wide range of stakeholders, and support the implementation of possible solutions, including the provision of data and insights to users</i></p>

<p>There was a suggested addition of 'understanding tourism data and insights' to the first point under 'core purpose'. Although understanding is detailed further in the actions, this and other respondents found it important to include this in the purpose too. As one respondent said, 'Understanding, not just dissemination will be a key critical success factor if the industry is to improve its performance. Just being given the data without the capacity to interrogate or utilise the insights is not enough to make a difference.'</p>	<p>The point now reads:  <i>Provide leadership and/or advice on the current and future collection, dissemination and understanding of tourism-related data and insights, based on an agreed strategy by and for the tourism sector, government and other stakeholders.</i>  The emphasis on improved understanding was and remains captured in the last point of the objects list: <i>Uplift the sector's capability and understanding of tourism data and insights.</i></p>
<p>It was suggested the TOR include an explicit intention to explore data opportunities beyond traditional tourism data, and further, seek collaboration with domestic and international tourism agencies to establish co-ordinated, shared and benchmarked data sets.</p>	<p>This suggestion is adequately covered in the second point in the Group's 'core purposes':  <i>Recommend and steer the collection of tourism data and correlated insights for the benefit of the tourism sector and policy development.</i></p>
<p>One respondent suggested that the 'Tourism Futures Taskforce Interim Report on Data' would be a helpful reference point and portions of it could be incorporated into the TOR's objectives.</p>	<p>Noted and while not incorporating material from the Taskforce report, the full report will be included in the Group's initial reading pack.</p>
<p><b>Scope</b></p>	<p><b>Scope</b></p>
<p>There was a comment that the scope of the Group is on the provision of data and insights. This respondent viewed reference to 'research' as problematic and potentially misleading due to 'tourism's general exclusion from the research and science system in NZ [which] is not addressed in this work'.</p>	<p>Although this is a very specific interpretation of research, the point was taken and research has been omitted, with emphasis instead on tourism data, insights and projects.</p>
<p>Respondents interpreted the scope to be a mix of governance and executive activity. Several pointed out that providing advice, guidance and direction is distinct from assuring data quality, coordinating and distributing in-kind financial and data inputs. They noted that these are large areas of work in themselves, and expressed some doubt and concern that the Group will have sufficient time and expertise to</p>	<p>This concern is pertains to both the scope and membership structure of the Group. The way to ensure that the Group will have the capacity to carry out governance and executive activities is to appoint members with a range of skills and knowledge. This is reflected in the skills matrix in the membership section of the TOR. The overarching feedback on this section, it should be noted, was the need for diverse</p>

<p>undertake everything under the TOR's current scope. Both the governance and executive roles are seen as necessary, but it was suggested the language be clearer on what each role will deliver.</p>	<p>representation in terms of skills and backgrounds. It should also be noted that the Group will be supported by technical advisors on matters of data quality and methodologies. When it comes to assuring tourism data quality, the Group's mandate will be to ensure that appropriate processes are applied at a high level, rather than actually reviewing the data and making assessments of its quality. They will leverage appropriate people in their respective organisations and networks.</p>
<p><b>Decision-making capacity of the Group</b></p>	<p><b>Decision-making capacity of the Group</b></p>
<p>Under MBIE's minimum requirements for the provision of tourism data, it was suggested that a measure of accommodation use, by region and type, as currently provided by the Accommodation Data Programme, be added as a minimum requirement.</p>	<p>Accommodation data is recognised to be highly important for the sector, but it is not one of MBIE's minimum requirements. A footnote has been added to clarify that the two measures listed are <a href="#">Tier 1 statistics</a>.</p>
<p><b>Membership, structure and appointments</b></p>	<p><b>Membership, structure and appointments</b></p>
<p>Feedback on this section was mainly around the need for diverse representation, both in terms of organisations and skills. Rather than skills-based versus institutional representation, the feedback suggests a hybrid approach to ensure the Group reflects the diverse needs and interests of the tourism sector. This included considering matters of scale so that the Group does not solely consist of CEOs from large tourism industry businesses and organisations, but also smaller ones who may have different data needs.</p>	<p>This feedback has been noted and will be reflected in the appointment process. The statement 'Members could be appointed on the basis of a skill-set, or to ensure representation or some mix' has been changed to:</p> <p><i>Members will be appointed on the basis of their skill-sets, subject matter expertise in tourism and organisational representation.</i></p> <p>The TOR does not suggest that specific organisations will be guaranteed membership, though it is likely that representatives from key government agencies like MBIE, DOC and Tourism NZ will be appointed. (Tourism Policy view on this?)</p> <p>While having members from organisations at different scales would be ideal, a concern is that smaller organisations may not have the skills and capacity to contribute to the Group. That said, the application process will be open</p>

	<p>to all and all applicants evaluated based on the same criteria. One possibility is that there could be a member who represents small organisations, rather than a direct representative from a specific organisation. The same option could be considered for a member to represent a community voice.</p>
<p>One respondent suggested that nine core members were too many and that the Group would operate more effectively with a maximum of eight members, including the two co-chairs. Along with efficiency and effectiveness, this respondent saw the potential for the appointment committee to find a smaller number of suitable candidates than nine. If this were the case, they would be obliged by the TOR to appoint nine members, despite not all of these being well-suited for the job.</p>	<p>This point was taken, but balanced by the need for diverse representation of organisations and skills, which would be limited by having a small number of members on the Group. The statement regarding the number of members now reads: <i>The Group will consist of a maximum of nine core members and two independent co-chairs.</i></p>
<p>Several respondents advocated that a senior tourism academic be a member of the Group, not only for their research expertise but providing a link to New Zealand's tourism education sector.</p>	<p>'Tourism academics' has been added to the representative membership list in this section. Academic skills are sufficiently covered in the skills-based membership list.</p>
<p>A concern was expressed that setting up a formal Technical Advisory Team to support the Group could be time-consuming and complex.</p>	<p>Rather than a formal Technical Advisory Team, the TOR now reads: <i>Technical advisors with expertise in tourism statistics, research and communications will be consulted by the Group as required.</i></p>
<p>There was a strong aversion to the idea that members should be expected or mandated to co-fund the Group and commit resources. This concern appears to relate directly to the sentence: 'This also raises the question of to what extent Group members' organisations are expected to support their membership by contributing resources (financial, data, or in-kind contributions).'</p>	<p>This sentence has been deleted from this section of the TOR, and is covered in the final 'Resourcing' section.</p>
<p>An observation was made that the Industry Transformation Plan (ITP) in development at MBIE is still at a very early stage and will not</p>	<p>The ITPs development and the establishment of the Group have now been decoupled. The paragraph now reads:</p>

likely be in place during the nine month establishment phase of the Group. It was suggested that the Group appointments should be for a minimum of twelve months.	<i>A Tourism Industry Transformation Plan (ITP) is in development at MBIE, which will likely impact the work of the Group in the future. However, the ITP is currently at an early stage. The Group will be expected to align its work and strategic direction with the plan once it is in place.</i>
<b>Agency responsibilities</b>	<b>Agency responsibilities</b>
The meaning of the following statement was questioned: 'Ensure agencies have a common position on how to support each engagement.' The respondent queried how a common position would be achieved given diverse agencies and stakeholders often have different interests.	The word 'position' was replaced with <i>approach</i> , which avoids the suggestion that all members and agencies must have the same stance on matters.
<b>Reporting and timeframes</b>	<b>Reporting and timeframes</b>
Given the changing nature of tourism and future uncertainty, it was suggested that a long-term strategy report be developed every three years, not five.	Five years has been changed to <i>three years</i> , and long-term has been changed to <i>mid-term</i> . Once the tourism sector is a steadier state, a five year report could be considered.
One respondent sought clarification regarding the long-term strategy report. They asked whether this was a new Tourism Data Domain Plan, a tourism data roadmap, or a review of the state of tourism data under the Group. If it's the latter, this respondent thought it needs to be put into place much quicker and reviewed annually.	<p>The mid-term strategy report will cover the following, as specified in the TOR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mid-term strategy of the Group and prioritised objectives</li> <li>● Reviewing the effectiveness of the Group in achieving its purpose and objectives, particularly in driving collaboration, and meeting tourism data and insights needs</li> <li>● Other measures determined by the Group</li> </ul> <p>It is not any of the other reports suggested by the respondent.</p>
<b>Engagement with the tourism sector</b>	<b>Engagement with the tourism sector</b>

<p>The consensus was that there should be a simple, easy to access and use platform for receiving and communicating information.</p>	<p>MBIE is considering adding a Co-Governance section to the recently launched Tourism Evidence and Insights Centre (TEIC). This would create a centralised feedback loop and also connect to a key source for tourism data and insights.</p>
<p><b>Additional feedback</b></p>	<p><b>Additional feedback</b></p>
<p>There was a call for greater attention and nuance to Māori principles and practices, including data sovereignty.</p>	<p>This point has been taken and will be addressed in the background reading pack supplied to the Group. The following point has been added to the 'skills-based membership' section of the TOR:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Understanding of principles and practices regarding Māori data sovereignty</i></p> <p>Moreover, the independent chair who brings Te Ao Māori expertise will ensure that the Group adequately incorporates Māori principles and practices, including data sovereignty.</p>
<p>There was a recommendation that the group to adhere to the principle of simplicity and to bear in mind that many smaller operators may lack the time/resources to draw the appropriate conclusions from tourism data.</p>	<p>This point has been taken and will be addressed in the background reading pack supplied to the Group.</p>
<p>The question of 'what kind of tourism we want' came through in several responses in different sections. It was suggested or implied that the Co-Governance Group should engage or even lead on this future strategy/policy level, not be limited to tourism data.</p>	<p>This is a broad and important consideration that is being addressed by several other forums, such as the Industry Transformation Plan, the Tourism CEs group, etc. The future of New Zealand tourism will certainly be important context for the Group, but its focus will be the data and insights system that will provide an evidence base for sound decision making.</p>