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Executive Summary

The research reported in this study was undertaken in the context of the New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010 (released in 2001) and the anticipated amendments to the Local Government Act 1974 (amended in December 2002). The key objective of this study was to document existing and emerging tourism policies and practices within the local government sector in New Zealand. Within the core themes of tourism enablement and management, the issues of inter-, and intra-, organisational relationships were addressed by this research. The findings from this study provide an assessment of current practices and review future options for more integrated regional planning and management of New Zealand tourism.

Data were obtained from survey respondents through a postal questionnaire, which was then verified via a follow-up telephone interview. Central, regional, and local government agencies were approached from eight of New Zealand’s 16 administrative regions to participate in this study. This survey was conducted over an eleven-week period from early-February to late-April 2002. During this period, a total of 77 organisations (8 Department of Conservation conservancies, 6 regional councils, 44 territorial local authorities, and 19 district/regional tourism organisations) were invited to participate in the study. Valid responses were obtained from 50 of these organisations, providing a response rate of 65 per cent. These included: seven Department of Conservation conservancies, five regional councils, 26 territorial local authorities, and 12 regional or district tourism organisations.

The results of this study indicate that while there is a wide range of public and private sector stakeholders interested in tourism, planning in this sector (in New Zealand) has been largely ad hoc and reactive to situations on a ‘case-by-case’ basis. As visitor numbers have continued to grow, there is increasing realisation of the inter-related economic, social and biophysical implications of tourism and the need for co-ordinated planning strategies within central and local government. Local government has been criticised for its lack of response to the challenge of promoting sustainable tourism development (Tourism Strategy Group, 2001). This concern is attributed to an inadequate appreciation of the role local government can play in providing strategic direction.

To achieve sustainable tourism development, local government has the opportunity to formulate strategies that provide direction and guidance to the industry, set development standards appropriate to the social and biophysical carrying capacities of the host area and make provision for the development and maintenance of adequate infrastructure. However, the findings of this research suggest that there is currently a paucity of clearly articulated, co-ordinated and integrated strategies for sustainable tourism development at the local and regional levels in New Zealand. In fact, few local authorities, and even fewer regional authorities appear to have formulated tourism-specific plans or policies that clearly define what sustainable tourism development means for their locality or region. In addition, the findings indicate that there exists no apparent consensus between the survey respondents regarding the extent, focus and methods that should be applied to planning and managing tourism at the local and regional levels.
Despite this apparent absence of strategic tourism planning, respondents nonetheless regard tourism as a significant sector in local and regional economies. Survey respondents also acknowledged that tourism represented a significant policy issue for local government. Several respondents indicated that written tourism-specific policies or plans were presently held by their organisations. These policies and plans, however, tended to focus on development-related objectives (e.g., destination marketing) rather than integrated destination management.

In addition, the findings of this study indicate an apparent absence of clearly allocated responsibilities and structured communication within and between surveyed organisations. This is particularly apparent within territorial local authorities where, for example, key tourism contacts differ widely, reflecting inconsistent conceptualisations of the core aspects of tourism planning. Collection and use of data by organisations pertains mainly to demand, for example visitor numbers, rather than supply-side issues, such as infrastructure needs and environmental quality associated with tourism. Furthermore, funding and staffing priorities are focussed on development-based issues, such as destination marketing and promotion, while broader strategic and environmental management concerns appear to be largely ignored.

The key constraints faced by organisations surveyed in this study appear to be universal concerns, namely, a lack of adequate funding, staffing and tourism-related data. These concerns are followed by legislative constraints and institutional boundaries, which serve to limit the ability of these organisations (especially regional councils) to be more pro-active in tourism planning and management. These factors are perceived as limiting potential for more effective regional tourism planning and management.

The amendments to the Local Government Act 1974 clearly signal the need for all councils to prepare long-term strategic plans. These strategic plans will identify outcomes and priorities wanted by communities and the most appropriate agencies to implement these outcomes. Tourism objectives, as well as the means by which to implement and achieve them, will therefore be encompassed within these plans. As such, the key implication of these amendments to the Local Government Act 1974 is that the amended Act will provide a stronger mandate for territorial local authorities and regional councils to undertake strategic tourism planning to achieve integrated destination management objectives.

Regional, district and city councils can all be seen as having potentially vital roles to play in tourism planning and management. The focus of regional councils is primarily on regional strategic issues, including cross-boundary issues, whereas the focus of district and city councils centres on the management of impacts and the provision of infrastructure at the local level. It is therefore imperative that local and regional government agencies carry out their respective roles, with regard to tourism planning and management, in a co-operative and collaborative manner.

The opportunity for councils to collaborate on the delivery of functions and services offers potential for administrative efficiencies, economies of scale, and effective use of specialised skills in the area of tourism. To this end, it is also important to develop and maintain trusting relationships between local and regional stakeholder
organisations. It is in this respect that regional tourism organisations and economic development boards can be particularly useful. Ultimately, such a co-operative and collaborative approach to tourism can create the potential for devising appropriate solutions to local and regional issues of tourism planning and management.
Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 The Challenge of Sustainable Tourism Development

Sustainable tourism development depends on local government co-ordinating and integrating their management of tourism impacts whilst enabling a level and type of tourism development that is appropriate for local communities. As one of New Zealand’s largest industries, tourism has the potential to contribute to, or detract from, the sustainable development of host communities and environments in which it operates. Due to the nature of New Zealand’s tourism product there is a growing awareness within both the public and private sectors of the need to ensure tourism is developed in a sustainable manner. Within the public sector, central, regional and local government all have roles in tourism planning and management.

Central government’s involvement is focused on overseas promotion and information services within a broad national policy framework. A number of central government agencies also have indirect roles in tourism planning and management. These include departments with responsibility for natural and cultural heritage conservation, health and safety, transport, police, indigenous peoples, and economic development. Regional government’s involvement in tourism is largely undefined, although they do play an indirect role through their responsibilities and functions associated with environmental planning.

Territorial local authorities (TLAs) have two broad functions in relation to the tourism industry. Firstly, to promote tourism development with the aim of harnessing economic benefits for constituents, while secondly, to mitigate the adverse impacts increased development also brings. As these two functions create a potential conflict of interest for local government, and because numerous tourism-related stakeholders seek diverse outcomes from government policies, TLAs must balance these differing interests and conflicts through its decision-making processes, while seeking the ‘best’ overall direction of tourism development locally, as well as regionally and nationally.

1.2 The Research Problem

While there is a wide range of private and public sector stakeholders interested in tourism, tourism planning in New Zealand has generally been ad hoc and reactive to situations of concern only as, or after, they occur. As visitor numbers have continued to grow, there is increasing realisation of the inter-related economic, social and biophysical implications of tourism and the need for co-ordinated planning strategies within central, regional and local government. At a recent conference on tourism research in New Zealand, local government was criticised for its lack of response to

---

1 The World Tourism Organisation (WTO) defines sustainable tourism development as that which meets the needs of present tourists and host regions while at the same time protects and enhances opportunities for the future. Sustainable tourism development leads to the management of all resources in such a way so that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems (WTO, 1993).
the challenge of promoting sustainable tourism development (New Zealand Tourism Strategy (NZTS), 2001). This concern is attributed to inadequate understanding by local government of the tourism industry and its needs, and of the role local government can play in providing strategic direction.

1.3 Objectives of the Research

This study was undertaken in 2002 in the context of the recently released *New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010* (2001), and the anticipated amendments to the *Local Government Act 1974* 2. Organisations targeted by this study included those government agencies considered to have leading roles and responsibilities (direct and indirect) with respect to sustainable tourism development, namely, the Department of Conservation, regional councils, territorial local authorities, and regional tourism organisations. The key objective of this study was as follows:

- To document emerging tourism policies and practices within the local and regional government sector in New Zealand.

However, there was also a need to establish the overall standing of tourism within the broader context. This indicated three additional research objectives were required to achieve this goal. These additional objectives included:

- Describe governmental involvement in tourism management and development in the New Zealand context.
- Define, and provide guidelines for, sustainable tourism development by local government.
- Provide profiles for each of the regions represented in this research.

Within the core themes of tourism ‘enablement’ and *management*, the issues of inter-, and intra-, organisational relationships are addressed by this research. The findings from this study provide an assessment of current practices and review future options for more integrated regional planning and management of New Zealand tourism.

1.4 Amendments to the Local Government Act 1974

The anticipated amendments to the *Local Government Act 1974* have a number of implications for the role of local government in tourism planning. The intention of the Bill is:

“…to enable local decision making, by, and on behalf of, individuals in their communities, to democratically promote and action their social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being in the present and for the future.”

This signals a significant public manifestation of the Government’s commitment to a sustainable development framework for New Zealand. Key proposals within the Bill are as follows:

---

2 The Act was amended by the New Zealand Parliament in December 2002.
• The granting to local government of a ‘power of general competence’, defined as “…the freedom to undertake any action or make any decision which is not specifically excluded by law or central authority”.

• The Bill grants regional, district and city councils the same powers of general competence allowing for a greater range of intervention at the regional and local levels. Potentially this provides more opportunity for regional councils to actively pursue sustainable development objectives. This increased local discretion and flexibility will be balanced with a legislative requirement for a required protocol, or process of communication and consultation to guide how councils work together during the course of a three-year term.

• The Bill clearly signals the need to prepare strategic plans (Long-term Council Community Plans) to identify outcomes and priorities wanted by communities, beyond the required Annual and District Plans, including those related to tourism.

1.5 Report Structure

The report is organised as follows. Chapter 2 provides an outline of the tourism-related roles and responsibilities of the organisations identified in this study (i.e., territorial local authorities, regional councils, regional tourism organisations, and the Department of Conservation). In addition, guidelines are offered for sustainable tourism development from a local government perspective. Chapter 3 presents a brief description of the research methods used, and response obtained, in this study. Chapter 4 presents the main findings of this study, and is organised according to four main themes: (1) the importance of tourism, (2) tourism policies and plans, (3) working relationships and lines of communication, and (4) monitoring and forecasting. It is followed by Chapter 5, which discusses the main findings of this study.
Chapter 2
Roles and Responsibilities in Sustainable Tourism Development

2.1 Introduction

In New Zealand, all levels of government (central, regional and local) have a variety of roles in promoting and ensuring sustainable tourism development. Accordingly, this chapter provides a brief description of the responsibilities and functions of the governmental agencies identified directly by this report (i.e., Department of Conservation, Regional Councils, Regional Tourism Organisations, and Territorial Local Authorities), as well as offers guidelines for sustainable tourism development from a local government perspective.

2.2 The Role of Central Government

Before the mid-1980s, central government in New Zealand was directly involved in the tourism sector through the operation of tourist information services, hotels and the national airline (Air New Zealand). However, most of this involvement came to an end during the mid-1980s when central government sold Air New Zealand, the Government Tourism Board and the Tourism Hotel Chain and initiated public sector restructuring. Key components of this restructuring included:

- Department of Conservation: established in 1987 from an amalgam of several existing government departments to manage the natural and cultural heritage of New Zealand, known as the public conservation estate, for broad recreational use by New Zealanders and visitors.
- The Resource Management Act 1991: the principal responsibility for administering this was devolved to local government.
- A series of changes to the structure and functions of local and regional government.
- Central government divesting itself of the tourism provider role, by selling off tourism assets.
- New Zealand Tourism Board: set up in 1990 after government and industry recommendations (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 1997).

As tourism is a diverse sector that impacts upon many government activities, there are a number of central government departments and agencies with tourism-related responsibilities. These range from industry development and environmental management roles to the protection of health and safety. However, due to the overwhelming use of the conservation estate as a key, and iconic, tourist attraction in New Zealand, the authors of this report decided that the Department of Conservation should alone be included in this study as a key central government agency with responsibilities (both direct and indirect) for the management of tourism-related resources.
2.2.1 Department of Conservation

When in New Zealand, many visitors will engage in some outdoor activity, and one third of tourists will visit public conservation land during their stay (NZTS, 2001). This gives the Department of Conservation (DoC) a major role in tourism management (see Table 1). The Department of Conservation’s primary mandate is to promote the protection of natural, cultural and historic resources. However, the Department is also empowered, through legislation, to allow for tourism:

...to the extent that the use of any natural or historic resource for recreation or tourism is not inconsistent with its conservation, to foster the use of natural and historic resources for recreation, and to allow their use for tourism (Part II, Section 6(e) of the Conservation Act 1987).

The Department of Conservation has produced several management strategies in reaction to their growing tourism role, including a Visitors Services Strategy. This Strategy explains why the areas managed by the Department have been protected and highlights their importance as places for visitors to enjoy. It aims to protect the intrinsic natural and historic values of conservation lands, foster visits by the public and educate visitors while managing for their safety (http://www.doc.govt.nz, May 2002).

However, DoC constantly struggles to provide the level of service required by current visitor numbers. Many of the areas they manage suffer environmental pressure from visitors and require ‘hardening’ or additional public safety measures the Department cannot afford. One method the Department has adopted to recoup some costs is through administering concessions for local operators to conduct their tourism activities on public conservation land. Controlling tourism operations on public conservation lands also allows DoC to monitor concessionaires and check their activities are not having adverse environmental impacts (http://www.doc.govt.nz, May 2002).
Table 1
Roles and Functions of Government Involvement in Tourism (New Zealand)
(adapted from Hall, 2000 pp. 145-151)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary National Agencies</th>
<th>Roles*</th>
<th>Enabling legislation</th>
<th>Responsible minister</th>
<th>Principal tourism-related functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Policy Operations Regulation</td>
<td>Conservation Act 1987</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Management of land in the conservation estate to achieve conservation objectives; gives effect to the principles of Treaty of Waitangi; advocates conservation; education; provision of visitor services and visitor centres; maintain historic and cultural heritage; and liaises with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional and Local Agencies</th>
<th>Roles*</th>
<th>Primary acts</th>
<th>Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Territorial local authorities</td>
<td>Operations Policy Infrastructure Regulation Information Marketing</td>
<td>Local Government Act 1974 Resource Management Act 1991</td>
<td>Integrated management of the effects of the use, development and protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district. Also involved in economic development, local government owned attractions, e.g. art galleries and museums, and the management of visitor information services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional tourism organisations</td>
<td>Marketing Information Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing and promotion of areas within New Zealand, international marketing usually undertaken in conjunction with the NZTB; provide information to operators and to visitors. Funding base is usually from local authorities although some RTOs also have a membership base as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Roles
- Infrastructure = Infrastructure development and provision
- Information = Information provision and research
- Marketing = Marketing and promotion
- Operations = Direct land/asset management and/or service provision
- Policy = Policy development and analysis, including sector development
- Regulation = Managing compliance with legislation
2.3 The Role of Regional Government

In the New Zealand context, regional councils generally have little direct involvement in tourism planning per se (PCE, 1997). However, under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), regional councils do have an indirect influence on sustainable tourism development through regional policy statements and plans on air, water and soil quality, and coastal activities. According to legislation, regional councils’ indirect tourism-related functions include:

- Formulation and implementation of regional environmental plans and policy statements under the RMA where these provisions regulate tourism development, such as discharges to water.
- Administration of the resource consent process, particularly monitoring the consent compliance of tourism-related developments.
- State of the environment monitoring to ensure environmental standards are being met across the region, such as ensuring drinking and recreational water quality.
- Flood management (e.g., when accommodation providers are at risk from flooding).
- The provision of public transport systems.

Under the Local Government Act 1974, the role(s) regional councils can undertake in tourism planning and management are limited to those activities ‘permitted’ by territorial local authorities within its jurisdiction. As a consequence of this legislative constraint, regional councils play only a limited and indirect role in sustainable tourism management that mainly involves managing the adverse biophysical impacts of tourism and other activities from an integrated regional perspective. This involvement occurs within the legislative framework of the RMA. Thus, much of the responsibility for tourism planning and management at the regional and local levels lies with territorial local authorities.

2.4 The Role of Local Government

At the sub-national level of government, territorial local authorities (TLAs) have the broadest and most significant influence on tourism planning and management. Local authorities have dual functions relating to tourism that can broadly be categorised as the enablement of tourism and the management of tourism’s negative impacts.

The enablement of tourism by local government can be defined as more than just the promotion and marketing of a region. By enabling tourism, territorial authorities aim to advance economic development opportunities. Local government enablement initiatives include:

- Support for tourism marketing organisations and trusts.
- Promotional and information activities.
- Festivals, events and entertainment.
- Research and training.
Enabling visitor growth and tourism development have not been traditional functions of local government, who have seen their role as limited to providing the required utilities and amenities, and administering necessary planning and development control processes. Recently, however, local government is more actively supporting tourism as part of initiatives to spark regional economic and development opportunities (Duncan, 1995), due largely to the sector’s above-average growth potential. Tourism is also seen as an area of investment that allows councils to fulfil their dual responsibilities of economic development and the provision of facilities and services for local communities, as well as for visitors and the tourism industry itself.

However, while tourism undoubtedly contributes to regional economic development, many authors acknowledge that unless managed properly, the costs of tourism can exceed its benefits (e.g., Hall et al., 1997). As public sector bodies, territorial authorities have certain functions and responsibilities requiring them to avoid, remedy or mitigate the negative social, biophysical and economic impacts that increased visitor numbers and tourism activities can cause. To manage tourism’s adverse social and environmental impacts, territorial local authorities:

- Regulate tourism development (e.g., setting environmental, health and safety standards).
- Plan utilities, such as transport networks, waste management, and sewerage.
- Monitor tourism development and trends, such as host satisfaction surveys and environmental monitoring.

These dual functions of tourism enablement and management can create a conflict of interest for local authorities over what level and type of development to allow. While local authorities use tourism to realise economic opportunities to areas under their jurisdiction, for tourism development to be sustainable councils must also seek to mitigate adverse effects from tourism growth. This can be achieved by controlling tourism activities and development that are inappropriate to the surrounding biophysical and social environs.

While the above conflict of interest is real for tourism management by territorial authorities, in many ways it is no different from concerns that arise over other management roles. In response to these concerns, many local authorities have devolved their promotional tasks to regional tourism organisations (RTOs), which has lessened this conflict of interest, or at least put it at ‘arms length’. This division of economic development and regulatory functions within the local authority itself can act to mitigate this conflict of interest. While this separation of functions raises other concerns in terms of strategic tourism planning and creating extra ‘red tape’ for developers, it also enables checks and balances within council itself.

### 2.4 The Role of Regional Tourism Organisations

Regional tourism organisations (RTOs) were originally established in the 1980s, in close connection with, and accountable to, TLAs. The duties that regional tourism organisations perform allow for a separation of regulatory and promotional roles. Originally, RTOs were structured with diverse boards of management, including
representatives from local government, the tourism industry, businesses and community groups (Kearsley, 1997). Over time they have tended to become more independent, less directly involved with local councils, and have gradually restructured to become smaller, more professional boards of management. In the process of their evolution, RTOs have thus become more independent of local authorities.

Under the guidance of the Tourism Industry Association New Zealand (TIANZ) and Tourism New Zealand (TNZ), the roles and functions of RTOs were clarified in 1997. Twenty-six bodies were designated as Regional Tourism Organisations, with an associated tier of District Tourism Organisations. The key mandate of RTOs has been to promote tourism at a regional level, with their primary responsibility being destination marketing. A range of functions is performed in relation to this, for example: liaising with travel agents and local tourism operators to provide information on regional tourism products, such as accommodation and activities. RTO tasks also include providing product manuals, attending industry fairs, facilitating media promotions, offering economic or community development initiatives and business advice, and funding or managing events.

2.5 Guidelines for Sustainable Tourism Development

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, sustainable tourism development is that which meets the needs of present tourists and host regions while at the same time protects and enhances opportunities for the future. Importantly, planning for sustainable tourism development can necessitate a major shift in thinking and involves communities making political choices based on complex social, economic and environmental trade-offs. With this in mind, the current literature on tourism planning provides a number of general guidelines for the promotion of sustainable tourism development by local government (Hall, 1997; Hall, 2000). These guidelines are useful as they may act as a framework for assessing the role that all levels of government can play in promoting sustainable tourism development.

1. Local government tourism planning should be strategic.

The tourism sector is complex and relationships between demand and product, public and private sector, host and visitor are often poorly understood, thus creating barriers to strategic tourism planning (Hall, 1997:23-25). Local government’s management of tourism is often fragmented, poorly co-ordinated and misdirected, a precondition for the ‘tyranny of the small, incremental decisions’. While tourism ventures may appear harmless if approved case-by-case, over time adverse social and environmental effects can arise from cumulative, unplanned tourism development. Ad hoc, reactive tourism planning by local government does not bring about sustainable tourism development.

Strategic tourism planning requires local government to balance their three distinct but inter-related objectives of the promotion of tourism, the management of tourism’s effects and the provision of adequate infrastructure. Forward planning enables tourism management to be tactical and provide for anticipated requirements and pressure points (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE), 1997). Perhaps most importantly, planning for sustainable tourism development involves changes in
thinking by local government to appreciate the longer-term perspective as well as what may be realistically achieved in the short and medium electoral term (PCE, 1997:117)

2. Local government’s tourism planning should be co-ordinated with management efforts of other sectors and with community stakeholders.

Tourism involves diverse stakeholder groups, including national, regional and local government, the tourism industry or private sector, statutory organisations, non-government organisations (NGOs), and the host community, each with their own goals, values and expectations. Therefore planning for sustainable tourism development requires co-ordinating policy formulation and implementation, in consultation with these diverse groups in the local/regional community. Accordingly, a principle for sustainable tourism development outlined by the World Tourism Organisation (WTO) states:

"Tourism planning, development and operation should be part of conservation or sustainable development strategies for a region, a province (state) or the nation. Tourism planning, development and operation should be cross-sectorial and integrated, involving different government agencies, private corporations, citizen groups and individuals, thus providing the widest possible benefits (1993:40)."

Integrating policies and operations for tourism planning helps ensure management objectives and functions do not conflict or overlap and allows for more efficient use of resources. Collaborative tourism planning enables clearly defined management functions to be provided (Elliot, 1997; Gunn, 1994; WTO, 1993; Inskeep, 1992) and can provide a system of checks and balances that mitigate against conflicts of interest. Effective planning for sustainable tourism therefore requires effective communication between agencies and stakeholder groups (PCE, 1997). To ensure tourism is part of overall sustainable development strategies for a region or district, tourism interests must be represented (WTO, 1993:40).

3. Local government’s planning should ensure tourism development respects the scale and character of the host location.

During tourism development, agencies, corporations, groups and individuals should respect the culture, economy and the natural environment of the host community. To be sustainable, tourism planning must recognise the unique character, intrinsic values and benefits of a viable natural environment to human society, as well as its importance for the quality of the tourism product. Sustainable tourism development also involves protecting and enhancing a natural attraction for future generations, which means its long-term viability must not be prejudiced by short-term considerations (PCE, 1997; WTO, 1993).

New Zealanders, including tangata whenua, have expectations of their natural environment and traditional patterns of access and use that should be acknowledged. In New Zealand, public sector management is guided by Treaty of Waitangi principles, and requirements exist under law that acknowledge the interests and expectations of tangata whenua (PCE, 1997:118). Tourism planning should therefore encourage a positive relationship between the attraction, the visitor and the host community. The application of concepts such as carrying capacities and limits of
acceptable change are useful mechanisms by which to understand and manage the
effects of development activity on host communities and environments (PCE,
1997:119) while at the same time enabling tourism development and private
investment.

4. Local government’s tourism planning should facilitate stakeholder
participation and be accountable to stakeholders.

Local government acts as the linkage between industry and citizens, national
government and citizens, and tourists and host communities (Elliot, 1997). The role
of local government is pivotal in this respect because it has the opportunity to be
closer to citizens and local industry in order to gain better understanding of their
goals, needs and concerns.

Participation and input into local government planning processes can constructively
address these goals, needs and concerns, and ensure stakeholders, particularly local
communities and iwi, do not feel excluded from tourism planning (PCE, 1997; WTO,
1993). Open, democratic decision-making, despite slowing policy formulation,
enables multiple stakeholders to have active involvement in the tourism product.
Transparent planning processes also ensure government remains accountable to its
constituents. In addition, local government should provide reliable information and
communication about tourism and its effect prior to and during development,
especially for local people so they can influence the direction of development in the
individual and collective interest (WTO, 1993:40).

5. Local government’s tourism planning should be efficient and effective and
ensure costs incurred through tourism development are internalised Regional
Tourism Organisations

One of the most important powers held by local government is the ability to levy
taxes, rates or financial contributions based usually on property values (Elliot, 1997).
Regional and local authorities are obliged make the most efficient and effective use of
these public funds when planning for sustainable tourism.

Ideally, the distribution of tourism’s economic benefits should reflect the
environmental and socio-cultural costs of producing tourism-related goods and
services. The World Tourism Organisation states tourism planning should be
undertaken with equity in mind to fairly distribute costs and benefits among tourism
promoters, host peoples and areas (WTO, 1993:40) This may involve the use of user-
or polluter-pays principles, industry levies or a ‘tourist tax’. However, economic
controls for tourism must be flexible enough to accommodate a dynamic, highly
fragmented tourism industry and not unduly slow or restrict economic development
(Elliot, 1997; Gunn, 1994).

6. Local government’s tourism planning should include monitoring and be
adaptive and educational.

Ongoing monitoring and evaluation is necessary to measure local government’s
progress in achieving sustainable tourism development. Monitoring and research
shows where local government’s management systems are inadequate and need
adjusting (PCE, 1997; Hall, et al., 1997; WTO, 1993). Research can also project tourism trends and identify likely future pressures, enabling local government to plan strategically for longer-term sustainable tourism development (PCE, 1997). Integrated environmental, social and economic cost-benefit analyses should be undertaken before any major local project, with careful consideration to returns for the host community and to the ways it might link with existing uses, ways of life and the natural environment.

Good information can affect community opinion about tourism development, which in turn, may influence local government’s management systems or investment choices. An increase in reliable data enables stakeholders to have a better understanding of tourism’s effects, including actual, cumulative and potential effects and provides options for the appropriate mix of regional tourism products (PCE, 1997:119).

While it will not be possible to fill all data gaps, available monitoring and research results can feed back into local government planning to enable adaptive tourism management. This can also enable stakeholders to take advantages of opportunities or respond to changes. Data gathered can also be used to create educational and awareness programs for local residents and industry or training programs for tourism-sector staff that can sensitise people to the issues of sustainable tourism development (WTO, 1993:40).

7. **Local government's tourism planning should ensure a quality visitor experience.**

To be sustainable, tourism development must provide visitors with a quality experience (WTO, 1993). This ensures ongoing visitor demand for a location that enables the host industry to remain economically viable. A quality tourism product has benefits for the host community through improved amenities and services available for use by local residents. Tourism management by the public sector can set development standards and guidelines for industry to ensure a quality product.

2.6 **Conclusion**

In New Zealand, all levels of government (central, regional and local) have a variety of roles in ensuring sustainable tourism development. This chapter has served to outline the roles and functions of the organisations targeted in this study (i.e., DoC, regional councils, RTOs, and TLAs), as well as establish criteria (admittedly, as attainable ideals) for identifying sustainable tourism development. The following chapter of this report will provide a description of the research methods, and research instrument, used in this study.
Chapter 3
Research Methods

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the research methods used to obtain the data for this report. Included in this chapter is a description of the sample framework, the method of data collection, and a brief outline of the research instrument. In addition to this, the job titles of respondents, response rate and survey time frame are also presented.

3.2 Sample Framework

As mentioned earlier, this study was undertaken in the context of the recently released *New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010* (2001), and the anticipated amendments to the *Local Government Act 1974*. The objective of this report is to document emerging tourism policies and practices within the local government sector in New Zealand.

3.2.1 Selecting a regional sample

It was initially anticipated that a census of all relevant government agencies (i.e., all DoC conservancies, regional councils, territorial local authorities and regional tourism organisations) would be included in this study. However, due to (mainly) temporal constraints associated with undertaking such a task, it was determined that a cross-sectional approach be employed to gather data which could be considered indicative, if not representative, of the intended government agencies. Consequently, the data contained in this study are derived from information collected from government organisations (i.e., DoC conservancies, regional councils, territorial local authorities, and regional tourism organisations) within eight of New Zealand’s 16 regions. These regions include:

- Auckland.
- Bay of Plenty.
- Gisborne/East Coast.
- Manawatu/Wanganui.
- Nelson/Tasman.
- Canterbury.
- West Coast.
- Otago.

The above eight regions were selected according to their geographic, economic, and tourism-related characteristics. Four regions were chosen from the North Island, and four from the South Island. The above eight regions represent a combination of key characteristics including economic attributes, visitor/resident ratios and dominance of

3 It is instructive to note that Nelson and Tasman constitute two separate regions. However, for the purposes of this study they were regarded as one region in order that collected data could be more readily aligned to existing data sources and trends.
the conservation estate. There was a representative mixture in terms of the tourism-related characteristics of the regions, with tourist gateways, key destinations, emerging destinations, and varying international and domestic visitation rates (see Appendix 1 for a description of each selected region).

### 3.3 Data Collection

The questionnaire used in this study was developed according to sustainability-related issues addressed in the tourism literature, and from specific concerns raised during the pre-test phase of the questionnaire design process. The format and questions asked of respondents maintained the underlying structure of previous studies relating to local government involvement in tourism (e.g., Parkinson, 1997; Kearsley et al., 1999).

Four core themes were addressed in the questionnaire used in this study (see Appendix 2), and includes:

- The economic significance of tourism.
- Tourism plans and policies.
- Working relationships and lines of communication.
- Monitoring and forecasting.

#### 3.3.1 Job titles of respondents

All Department of Conservation conservancies (DoC), regional councils (RCs), territorial local authorities (TLAs), and regional tourism organisations (RTOs) within each of these eight selected regions were invited to participate in this study. A suitable respondent from each organisation was selected on a referral basis (i.e., via contact with Chief Executives from each organisation and requesting referral to the ‘most appropriate’ person to answer questionnaire).

Once selected, a questionnaire was forwarded by mail to the appropriate respondent for completion. However, it often proved difficult to find authoritative respondents, with the survey being referred between staff members. Although not entirely satisfactory, this method of referral proved to be the most practical approach given the apparent absence of an appointed tourism ‘position’ within many organisations. In many ways the difficulties of administering the survey reflects the lack of consistent conceptualisation of the core aspects of tourism planning across the organisations involved. Once a key respondent was identified, the survey was administered by telephone, allowing further qualitative comments to be incorporated into the interview. As the job titles of the participating respondents suggest, the position, responsibilities and knowledge base of respondents differed substantially between individual organisations. The job titles of the respondents are as follows:

- Chief Executive.
- Administrative Assistant.
- Planner (Events and Tourism).
- Planning Officer (Policy).
• Policy Analyst.
• Policy Planner.
• Recreation Planner.
• Senior Planner.
• Senior Technical Support Officer.
• Senior Research Advisor.
• Technical Services Officer (Recreation).
• Conservator.
• Business and Community Advisor.
• Community Development and Tourism Marketing Manager.
• Corporate Services Manager.
• Community Services Manager.
• Customer Services Executive.
• Director of Community Services.
• Director of Policy and Planning.
• Economic Development Officer.
• Partnerships and Advocacy Leader for Economic Development (Tourism).
• General Manager (City Development and Marketing).
• Group Manager (Communications).
• Manager (Events and City Promotion).
• Manager (Marketing and Economic Development).
• Manager of Tourism Board.
• Marketing Manager.

3.3.2 Survey time frame and response rate
This survey was conducted over an 11-week period from early-February to late-April 2002. During this period, a total of 77 organisations (8 DoC conservancies, 6 regional councils, 44 territorial local authorities, and 19 district/regional tourism organisations) were invited to participate in the study. Responses were obtained from 50 of these organisations, providing a response rate of 65 per cent. These included: seven DoC conservancies, five RCs, 26 TLAs, and 12 RTOs (See Table 2 below).
### Table 2
Sample Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Total Available</th>
<th>DoC</th>
<th>RCs</th>
<th>TLAs</th>
<th>RTOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne/East Coast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu/Wanganui</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson/Tasman*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>(77)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Included in this total are two unitary authorities.

### 3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a description of the research methods employed to undertake this study. Data were obtained from survey respondents through a postal questionnaire, which was then verified via a follow-up telephone interview. Central, regional, and local government agencies were approached from eight of New Zealand’s 16 regions to participate in this study. Valid responses were obtained from 65 per cent of these organisations. The following chapter will examine the findings obtained from these respondents.
Chapter 4
Survey Findings

4.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the information provided by representatives of the Department of Conservation (DoC), regional councils (RCs), territorial local authorities (TLAs), and regional tourism organisations (RTOs) from within eight of New Zealand’s 16 regions. Data were derived from a postal questionnaire and subsequent follow-up interview. The chapter is organised according to the previously outlined core themes detailed in the research instrument (questionnaire) of (1) the significance of tourism, (2) tourism plans and policies, (3) working relationships and lines of communication, and (4) monitoring and forecasting. The survey findings are presented on an overall, and then organisational, basis and are considered to be indicative of institutional perspectives on issues related to tourism planning in the local and regional community context. As stated earlier, valid responses were obtained from 50 organisations, and included seven Department of Conservation conservancies, five regional councils, 26 territorial local authorities, and 12 regional tourism organisations.

It was initially hoped that this study would be able to provide an inter-regional, as well as an inter-organisational, perspective of current tourism-related practices adopted by various levels of government authorities in New Zealand. However, the initial findings of this study have indicated to the authors that no such regional variations are apparent (with the required degree of validity) within the associated data set obtained through the survey process. This has been compounded by unavoidable (and, for the purposes of validity of data, unacceptable) variations in the sample profile of each of the respective regions addressed in this study. For example, the Auckland region provided valid responses from seven organisations (1 DoC, 1 RC, 5 TLAs, zero RTOs), while the Otago region provided valid responses from six organisations (1 DoC, zero RCs, 3 TLAs, 2 RTOs). Such a variable response ‘profile’ means, in practical terms, that the overall response from the Otago region will exhibit a greater bias towards higher tourism-related involvement and development responses (on the basis of a greater number of RTO response and lack of RC response) than the Auckland region.

Similar inter-regional variations are present throughout the entire regional sample, and as such means that it is prudent to focus on inter-organisational results alone, rather than risk presenting data that would lack the required validity for robust analysis to be undertaken and conclusions to be derived. With this in mind, the data presented in this chapter will focus initially on overall findings, and then examine inter-organisational variations (and similarities) in response obtained for each of the previously mentioned ‘core’ themes contained within the research instrument.

4.2 The Significance of Tourism

The first section in the questionnaire addressed questions relating to the perceived significance and influence of tourism, as well as key constraints on organisation’s involvement in tourism, as perceived by each respondent.
4.2.1 Overall Response

The first question in the questionnaire asked respondents to list the five most important economic sectors in their area. The question was open-ended and respondents provided their own categories. Some interpretation was required to map the raw responses onto a consistent set of category descriptions, which included such sectors as agriculture, forestry, industry, commerce, and tourism. Overall, respondents indicated that tourism was the second-most important economic sector in their respective localities (behind Agriculture). From this finding, therefore, it is fair to say that there is widespread acceptance of the importance of tourism for local and regional economies within New Zealand.

The second and third questions focussed on the effect of tourism on the organisation’s strategies, policies and operational responsibilities (e.g., provision of core services etc.). Responses to these questions indicate how much tourism actually influences the organisation’s policies and activities, as perceived by the representative interviewed. Table 3 shows response to the first question and presents results for each type of organisation and for overall assessment.

Table 3
The Significance of Tourism’s Influence on Shaping the Development of Organisation’s Strategies and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence of Tourism</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely significant</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very significant</td>
<td>9 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately significant</td>
<td>12 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly significant</td>
<td>12 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid responses</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, 40 per cent (n = 20) of all respondents indicated that tourism was an extremely significant or very significant influence upon their organisations strategies and policies, while 35 per cent (n = 17) of all respondents indicated that tourism was only slightly, or not at all, significant. The remaining 25 per cent (n = 12) indicated that tourism’s influence was moderately significant. Similarly, 37 per cent (n = 18) of all respondents indicated that tourism was an extremely significant or very significant influence upon their organisation’s operational responsibilities, while 36 per cent (n = 18) of all respondents indicated that tourism’s influence was only slightly, or not at all, significant. The remaining 27 per cent (n = 13) indicated that tourism’s influence was moderately significant (see Table 4).
Table 4
The Significance of Tourism’s Influence on Organisation’s Operational Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence of Tourism</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely significant</td>
<td>9 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very significant</td>
<td>9 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately significant</td>
<td>13 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly significant</td>
<td>15 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>49 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following this, respondents were asked to indicate the key constraints on their respective organisation’s ability to adequately address the issues and impacts associated with tourism in their localities. Overall, the key constraints identified included a lack of adequate (tourism) data, inadequate funding and staffing levels, and current funding and staffing being prioritised to ‘other areas’.

4.2.2 Organisational Response

The results show that 42 per cent (n = 3) of DoC respondents indicated that tourism’s influence upon their organisation’s strategies and policies was extremely significant or very significant. However, 72 per cent (n = 5) of DoC respondents indicated that tourism’s influence upon their organisation’s operational responsibilities was extremely significant or very significant. This figure reflects the important role that DoC play in maintaining New Zealand’s conservation estate, and the recognition that the conservation estate is a significant tourist attraction in its own right.

The responses from RTO representatives also indicate that tourism’s influence upon RTO strategies and policies, and operational responsibilities, is significant. Ninety-two per cent (n = 11) of RTO respondents indicated that tourism’s influence upon their organisation’s strategies and policies was extremely significant or very significant. Similarly, the majority of RTO respondents (67%, n = 8) indicated that tourism’s influence upon their organisation’s operational responsibilities was extremely significant or very significant. These responses reflect the central role tourism plays in these organisations, although it should be noted that we would have expected a greater proportion of RTO respondents to indicate tourism’s influence as being extremely or very significant, due to the explicit relationship of these organisations with tourism.

In contrast to the responses from DoC and RTO representatives, all (100%, n = 4) regional council respondents indicated that the influence of tourism upon council
strategies and policies, and upon operational responsibilities, was considered to be slightly, or not at all, significant. This response is indicative of the muted and constrained role that regional councils presently play in tourism (although regional councils do have a role to play in areas such as public transport, as well as air and water quality, all of which are indirectly associated with the ‘public-good’ nature of the tourism industry).

Following the trend set by regional councils, 42 per cent (n = 11) of TLA representatives indicated that tourism’s influence upon their organisation’s strategies and policies was slightly, or not at all, significant, while a further 35 per cent (n = 9) indicated that tourism’s influence was moderately significant. Similarly, 50 per cent (n = 13) of TLA respondents indicated that tourism’s influence upon their organisation’s operational responsibilities was slightly, or not at all, significant, while a further 31 per cent (n = 8) indicated that tourism’s influence was moderately significant.

Respondents were then asked to indicate the key constraints on their respective organisation’s ability to adequately address the issues and impacts associated with tourism in their localities. Representatives from TLAs and DoC most-commonly reported a lack of adequate tourism-related data, inadequate funding and staffing levels, and funding and staffing being prioritised to ‘other areas’ as being key constraints. Department of Conservation respondents also named legislative constraints and institutional boundaries as being of significance to their organisation’s involvement in tourism. Regional tourism organisation respondents named a lack of adequate data, inadequate funding and staffing levels, as well as legislative constraints and institutional boundaries as key constraints. Finally, RC representatives indicated that legislative constraints and institutional boundaries (e.g., Local Government Act 1974) were the greatest impediment to their organisation’s involvement in, and response to, tourism-related issues and impacts.

4.3 Tourism Policies and Plans

The second section in the questionnaire addressed questions relating to the status, and focus of, tourism plans or policies presently held by each respective organisation.

4.3.1 Overall Response

The first question in this section asked respondents to indicate whether or not their respective organisations had any written policy or strategic plan that related specifically to tourism (see Table 5). Overall, the results indicate that 68 per cent (n = 33) of organisations participating in this survey either currently had, or were in the process of developing, written policies or strategic plans that related specifically to tourism in their locality. Of these policies and plans, 67 per cent (n = 20) had been, or were in the process of being, co-ordinated with, or complimentary to, broader tourism strategies or alliances held with other local or regional organisations. Such a finding reflects the commonly held practise of many neighbouring local and regional authorities – many of which share complimentary destination characteristics – of combining often-scarce resources (e.g., funding levels and staffing expertise) in order to more adequately promote their respective localities as tourist destinations.
Table 5
The Status of Specific Tourism Policies and Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Policy/Plan</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism policy/plan currently in place</td>
<td>27 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism policy/plan currently being developed</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No current tourism policy/plan, but future intent indicated</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No tourism policy/plan, nor future intent, indicated</td>
<td>8 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid responses</td>
<td>48 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were then asked to indicate whether or not their organisation’s written tourism policies or strategic plans had been formulated in such a way so as to both facilitate tourism development, and to manage or mitigate tourism’s negative impacts, in their respective localities (see Table 6). Overall, 54 per cent (n = 25) of respondents indicated that such tourism policies and plans had been formulated to facilitate tourism development. Similarly, 48 per cent (n = 22) of all organisations surveyed indicated that such tourism policies and plans contained specific strategies to minimise the negative social, economic and environmental impacts associated with tourism in their respective localities. In addition, respondents were also asked to assess the relative importance of tourism development and management-related objectives to their respective organisations. Overall, 40 per cent (n = 19) of respondents indicated that the development of tourism was of the greatest importance to their organisation, while 33 per cent (n = 16) indicated that the management of tourism’s impacts was of greatest importance. A further 25 per cent (n = 12) rated both development and management objectives as being of equal significance to their organisation.
Table 6
Policies and Plans that Facilitate Tourism Development and Manage Tourism’s Negative Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Plan Characteristics</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/plans that facilitate tourism development</td>
<td>25 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/plans that manage tourism’s negative impacts</td>
<td>22 (48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Organisational Response

The responses obtained from RTO (100%, n = 12), DoC (71%, n = 5), and TLA (62%, n = 16) representatives all indicate that a large proportion of these organisations either currently have, or are in the process of developing, written policies or strategic plans that relate specifically to tourism in their localities. Such a finding suggests that these organisations are, at the very least, beginning to consider (or treat) tourism as an area worthy of specific attention within their policy or planning documents.

However, going against this trend, only 25 per cent (n = 1) of RCs surveyed either currently had, or were in the process of developing, tourism-specific policies or plans. This finding is reflective of the muted role played by RCs with respect to tourism at this time. This is due largely to the legislative constraints upon RCs to act towards tourism-related issues without the express, and unanimous, support of all constituent TLAs within the RCs jurisdiction. This is further compounded by the prevailing opinion of many respondents from all organisations represented in this study that RC involvement (and, for that matter, TLA involvement) in tourism is largely unnecessary, and should instead remain the domain of RTOs.

When asked to indicate whether or not tourism-specific policies or plans were co-ordinated with, or complimentary to, broader tourism strategies at the intra-, and inter-regional levels, 92 per cent (n = 11) of RTO respondents and 77 per cent (n = 10) of TLA respondents answered in the affirmative. Interestingly, no (zero) DoC or RC respondents answered in the affirmative. This finding suggests that a certain degree of insularity is evident in the manner by which these two latter organisations formulate tourism-related policies or planning documents. This is a potentially significant limitation of any intra-, or inter-, regional tourism-specific planning regime, as both of these organisations form a necessary part (both directly and indirectly) of the provision of a sustainable tourism product within host communities.

When asked if their respective organisation’s tourism-specific policies or plans were formulated in such a way so as to facilitate tourism development, 75 per cent (n = 9) of RTOs and 58 per cent (n = 14) of TLAs answered in the affirmative. In contrast with these two organisations, only 29 per cent (n = 2) of DoC respondents and 25 per cent (n = 1) of RC respondents answered in the affirmative. Conversely, 100 per cent
of DoC respondents, 58 per cent (n = 7) of RTOs, 50 per cent (n = 2) of RCs and only 25 per cent (n = 6) of TLAs indicated that their respective tourism-specific policies or plans contained strategies to manage the negative impacts (e.g., social, economic and environmental) associated with tourism.

Respondents were also asked to indicate the relative importance given to tourism-development, and tourism-management, objectives by their respective organisations. Fifty-eight per cent (n = 7) of RTO respondents, and 46 per cent (n = 12) of TLA respondents indicated that the development of tourism was of greatest importance to their respective organisations. Conversely, 100 per cent (n = 7) of DoC respondents and 75 per cent (n = 3) of RC respondents indicated that the management of tourism’s impacts was of greatest importance to their respective organisations. A further 33 per cent (n = 4) of RTO respondents and 31 per cent (n = 8) of TLA respondents indicated that tourism development and the management of tourism’s impacts were of equal importance to their organisations.

The above findings suggest that RTOs, and to a lesser extent TLAs, display a bias toward, or preference for, tourism development over tourism-impact management. Alternately, DoC and RC responses indicate a bias toward, or preference for, tourism-impact management over tourism development. Such a finding is to be expected, as DoC and RCs have a recognised mandate to ensure that the natural biophysical environment within their respective jurisdictions is used in a sustainable manner, and thus preserved for future generations.

Similarly, the bias of RTOs toward development is also to be expected, given its explicit mandate for the marketing, promotion and development of tourism within destination areas. Likewise, the close institutional relationship held between many RTOs and TLAs serves to suggest that the apparent preference of TLAs toward developmental objectives, while not as pronounced as that of RTOs, is not an unexpected finding. However, given that TLAs have an array of responsibilities relating to such issues as the provision core infrastructure and public amenities, the lack of attention given to tourism-related impact management objectives means that there is a danger that TLAs may underestimate the potential negative impacts associated with touristic activity in their localities. As TLAs are centrally placed to deal with the impacts, both positive and negative, of tourism at the local and intra-regional levels, it is recommended that a more balanced approach to the manner in which tourism is regarded, and consequently allowed for, within the relevant organisational policy and planning documents.

4.4 Working Relationships and Lines of Communication

The third section in the questionnaire addressed questions relating to working relationships and lines of communication associated with tourism at the intra-, and inter-, organisational levels.

4.4.1 Overall Response

The first question in this section asked respondents to indicate how the lines of communication regarding tourism were structured within their respective organisations (see Table 7). Overall, at the intra-organisational level, 56 per cent (n =
25) of respondents indicated that the lines of communication regarding tourism were structured formally within their respective organisations, while 36 per cent (n = 16) of all respondents stated that this communication was structured informally. When asked to indicate how regularly tourism-related communication was maintained within their organisation, 48 per cent (n = 20) of all respondents indicated the existence of communication on a continuous basis, while a further 19 per cent (n = 8) indicated the existence of communication on a monthly basis. These findings most likely reflect the nature of communication found in a typical office setting, in which a formal roster of scheduled meetings and reporting forums is used to supplement the more informal (and often continuous) conversational exchange of information within organisations.

Table 7
Intra-organisational Lines of Communication for Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of Tourism-related Communication</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>DoC</th>
<th>RCs</th>
<th>TLAs</th>
<th>RTOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 (56%)</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>9 (37%)</td>
<td>8 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (36%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>13 (54%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No communication at all</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>45 (100%)</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, at the inter-organisational level, the majority of respondents surveyed (79%, n = 38) indicated that their respective organisations had established platforms via which regular dialogue with the ‘tourism industry’ could occur with respect to tourism-related issues. In addition to these platforms for tourism-related dialogue, ongoing working relationships were most commonly held with (other) regional tourism organisations, tourism industry representatives, (other) territorial local authorities, and local Maori iwi groups. In addition to these working relationships, other prominent responses included: regional development boards, Tourism New Zealand, and (other) Department of Conservation conservancies. Respondents were then asked to rate the effectiveness of these existing working relationships. Overall, respondents indicated that the most effective tourism-related ongoing working relationships were held with (other) regional tourism organisations, tourism industry representatives, and (other) territorial local authorities.

The final question in this series asked respondents to indicate which organisations should play ‘leading roles’ with respect to tourism in their localities. From this, an overall ranking (from one to five) of ‘significant’ organisations was derived. This ranking is as follows:

- Regional tourism organisations.
- Tourism industry representatives.
• Territorial local authorities.
• Tourism New Zealand.
• Department of Conservation.

4.4.2 Organisational Response

The responses obtained from DoC (100%, n = 7) and RTO (73%, n = 8) representatives indicate that a large proportion of these organisations maintain formally structured lines of intra-organisational communication with respect to tourism related issues. In contrast to this, only 37 per cent (n = 9) of TLAs and 25 per cent (n = 1) of RCs indicated that formally structured lines of communication (with respect to tourism) were maintained within their respective organisations. Instead, over 54 per cent (n = 13) of TLA respondents indicated that the lines of tourism-related communication were informally maintained. In the case of RCs, a further 25 per cent (n = 1) of respondents indicated that the lines of tourism-related communication were informally maintained, 25 per cent (n = 1) indicated that no such tourism-related communication occurred within their organisation, while 25 per cent (n = 1) was not able to provide a definitive response.

The above findings appear to be reflective of the more concise and clearly defined ‘domain’ of responsibility held by DoC and RTOs, when compared to TLAs and RCs. In addition, it is the experience of the authors (in undertaking this study) that DoC and RTOs are more likely to possess an identifiable, and often linear, hierarchical structure with respect to the allocation of specific tourism-, or visitor-, related areas of responsibility than that of TLAs and RCs. This is due largely to their explicit connection with the ‘visitor industry’, whereas the two latter organisations’ tourism-related roles and responsibilities can be considered to be more indirect and diffuse. Thus, the lines of tourism-related communication are more likely to be formally structured when the allocation of responsibility for tourism is explicit, and when the domain of tourism-, or visitor-, related responsibility held by the organisation is concise and clearly defined.

Respondents were then asked to indicate whether or not their respective organisations had established any platforms via which regular communication with the tourism industry could occur. In response, 92 per cent (n = 11) of RTOs, 85 per cent (n = 22) of TLAs, and 71 per cent (n = 5) of DoC representatives answered in the affirmative. In contrast, 75 per cent (n = 3) of RC respondents answered in the negative. This finding is to be expected because, as mentioned earlier, RCs play only an indirect and minor role in tourism-related matters within their jurisdiction. This limited role is determined largely by the legislative constraints associated with the Local Government Act 1974, and thus establishing such platforms for dialogue with the tourism industry could be considered to be stepping outside the bounds of organisational responsibilities. In addition, many RCs consider such investment (in terms of time and money) to establish relationships between the public and private sectors as inherently ‘risky’ given that any such active involvement in tourism-related matters occurs only with the consent of all constituent TLAs within its jurisdiction.

Respondents were also asked to indicate the organisations, if any, with which ongoing working relationships (with respect to tourism-related issues) were maintained. A list of organisations was provided in the questionnaire (see Appendix 2). While
respondents identified ongoing working relationships with all of the listed organisations, it was possible to elicit (from their responses) the most commonly held relationships. In general, TLAs most commonly maintained such relationships with RTOs and tourism industry representatives. Regional tourism organisations most commonly maintained working relationships with the New Zealand Tourism Board, tourism industry representatives, TLAs, DoC, and local Maori iwi groups. Ongoing working relationships were most commonly held by RCs with TLAs and RTOs, while DoC most commonly maintained such relationships with local Maori iwi groups, as well as with TLAs, RCs, and non-government organisations. Following this, respondents were asked to ‘rate’ the effectiveness of these working relationships. Not surprisingly, these most commonly named working relationships, as detailed above, were also considered by the respondents to be the most effective.

The final question in this section asked respondents to indicate, in order of preference, the organisations that should play leading roles with respect to tourism in their localities. Respondents from TLAs indicated that RTOs and tourism industry representatives should play leading roles in tourism. Such a finding is not unexpected, as TLAs often contract out responsibility for tourism to their associated RTOs. The naming of tourism industry representatives also acknowledges the role of private sector in regional economic growth.

Regional tourism organisation representatives indicated that RTOs, TLAs and tourism industry representatives should play leading roles in tourism. To a large extent, this finding reflects that current situation with respect to leading agency involvement in tourism. Likewise, respondents from RCs indicated that TLAs, RTOs, and tourism industry representatives should play leading roles in tourism, and acknowledged the need for a statutory authority to lead the planning and management of tourism in collaboration with RTOs and the tourism industry. Finally, respondents from DoC indicated that tourism industry representatives, and RTOs should play leading roles in tourism, followed by RCs, central government, and TLAs.

Overall, these findings suggest that there is a general consensus, between respondents from all of the organisations surveyed, that leading tourism-related roles should be played primarily by RTOs and tourism industry representatives. Interestingly, of all the responses provided, TLA representatives were the only group of respondents not to name TLAs as a significant leading agency in tourism-related issues. This would suggest that TLA representatives do not consider their respective organisations to be a significant, nor important, player in tourism-related matters. Such a finding is indicative of the ‘hands-off’ approach of many TLAs towards tourism. This approach has, to a large extent, been fuelled by the prevailing perception of many TLA representatives that the appropriate way to deal with tourism is to defer all tourism-related responsibilities to the relevant RTO. Because many RTOs come under the jurisdiction and organisational umbrella of their respective TLAs, many TLA respondents suggested, through implication, that all tourism-related issues should thus be the primary responsibility of RTOs.
4.5 Monitoring and Forecasting

The fourth section in the questionnaire addressed questions relating to the monitoring and forecasting of current and expected tourism-related demand within their localities.

4.5.1 Overall Response

The first question in this section asked respondents to indicate whether or not their respective organisations had previously accessed tourism-related data in order to increase its ability to effectively undertake requisite functions and responsibilities. Overall, 71 per cent (n = 34) of all respondents indicated that their respective organisations had previously accessed tourism-related data for this purpose. Of these tourism-related data, the most commonly accessed by these organisations overall included international visitor numbers, domestic visitor numbers, visitor expenditure(s), tourism’s contribution to the local economy, and visitor satisfaction. Overall, the least commonly accessed data included tourism’s impact on the environment, tourism’s impact on ‘core’ infrastructure, and resident satisfaction (see Table 8). These findings serve to highlight the prevailing focus of many organisations on tourism development (especially the economic benefits associated with tourism) at the apparent expense of impact management issues associated with such development.

Table 8
Accessing Specific Tourism-Related Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Tourism-related Data</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International visitor numbers</td>
<td>36 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic visitor numbers</td>
<td>33 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor expenditures</td>
<td>24 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor satisfaction</td>
<td>20 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident’ satisfaction</td>
<td>14 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism’s economic contribution</td>
<td>24 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on core infrastructure</td>
<td>13 (28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were then asked to indicate the extent to which these data were applied, or factored, when evaluating the expected demands and future provision of various amenities and services commonly used by both residents and visitors. Overall, tourism-related data were most commonly applied to marketing/promotion and information services, tourism policy development, and recreational facilities/complexes. Conversely, tourism-related data were least commonly applied to
the provision of public toilets, roading, car parking, rubbish collection and waste management.

Following this, respondents were also asked to indicate the areas, and extent, to which funding and staffing were allocated within their respective organisations. Overall, respondents indicated that the highest level of funding ($) and staffing (FTE) were allocated to market/promotion and information services. The average funding and staffing levels for this category were $324,322 (n = 35) and 3.28 FTE (n = 31) respectively. The lowest levels of funding and staffing overall were allocated to environmental impact management. The average levels of funding and staffing for this category were $20,750 (n = 2) and 0.35 FTE (n = 5) respectively.

4.5.2 Organisational Response

In general, the responses obtained from all participants in this study indicate that a relatively high proportion of all organisations have previously accessed tourism-related data in order to increase their ability to effectively administer requisite tasks and responsibilities. Specifically, 100 per cent (n = 12) of RTOs, 71 per cent (n = 5) of DoC conservancies, 61 per cent (n = 16) of TLAs, and 50 per cent (n = 2) of RCs surveyed answered in the affirmative. However, while there appears to be a degree of consistency between organisations with respect to accessing tourism-related data, clear trends are evident as to the specific type(s) of data accessed.

The most-commonly accessed data reported by RTOs included visitor numbers (international and domestic), visitor expenditures, and the contribution made by tourism to the local economy. Similarly, TLA respondents most-commonly reported accessing data relating to visitor numbers (international and domestic), and tourism’s contribution to the local economy. Regional council respondents most-commonly reported accessing data relating to visitor numbers (international and domestic), satisfaction levels of visitors and residents, as well as tourism’s contribution to the local economy, and tourism’s impact on core infrastructure. Finally, DoC respondents most-commonly reported accessing data relating to visitor satisfaction, visitor numbers (international and domestic), tourism’s impact on core infrastructure and upon the environment. Interestingly, DoC was the only organisation surveyed to indicate that data relating to visitor expenditures, as well as tourism’s contribution to the local economy, was a low priority.

In a similar vein, the least-commonly accessed tourism-related data by RTOs, TLAs and RCs included data relating to tourism’s impact on the environment and upon core infrastructure. This finding, in many ways, reflects the difficulty of differentiating between tourism-related, and resident-related, impacts on the environment and upon core infrastructure. The responses obtained from DoC representatives, however, suggest that tourism impact-related data are of greatest significance to DoC conservancies. This finding is consistent with DoC’s position as administrator of New Zealand’s conservation estate, and thus reflects DoC’s explicitly stated management-related roles and responsibilities.

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the areas, and extent to which, tourism-related funding and staffing were allocated within their respective organisations. In general, representatives from TLAs, RTOs, and RCs all reported that the greatest proportion of staffing and funding was allocated to marketing, promotion and
information services, and (in the case of TLAs and RTOs) organising ‘events’. Department of Conservation respondents also reported the allocation of these resources to marketing, promotion and information services. However, the large majority of DoC’s tourism-related funding and staffing was allocated to environmental impact management, thus reflecting the environmental management objectives of this organisation.

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter has presented data obtained from a survey of TLA, RTO, RC, and DoC representatives from eight of New Zealand’s 16 constituent regions. Data have been presented on an overall, and then organisational, basis so as to highlight variations (and similarities) in the manner by which each of these organisations plan for, and act towards, tourism in their respective localities. The findings of this chapter are summarised below. These findings will then be discussed in the following chapter.

In summary, the findings presented in this chapter indicate that tourism is widely acknowledged as being an important sector in local and regional economies, and as such represents a significant policy issue for local and regional governments. However, there appears to be a lack of consensus between, and within, organisations regarding the scope, focus, and direction of appropriate planning roles and responsibilities within and, in some cases, between most organisations. This is, in all likelihood, a consequence of the diverse and often diffuse nature of tourism within host communities, and thus reflects the difficulties associated with differentiating between visitor and host impacts. While most organisations represented in this study reported possessing clearly defined tourism-specific policies or strategic plans (in various forms), many of which compliment broader tourism strategies, these appear to focus predominantly on tourism-related development and promotion objectives. In many cases, tourism-related impact management issues appear not to be a consideration of these organisations, with the only obvious exception to this being responses obtained from DoC representatives.

Following this apparent bias towards development and promotion, the majority of organisations in this study most-commonly accessed data relating to visitor numbers, visitor expenditures, and tourism’s contribution to the local economy. The least-commonly accessed data related to tourism’s impact on the environment, and upon core infrastructure. However, once again DoC proved to be the exception to this trend, with representatives of this organisation reporting that data relating to tourism’s impact on the environment, and upon core infrastructure, were most-commonly accessed.

Finally, the key constraints faced by the organisations in this study centred on inadequate data, funding, and staffing levels. Other significant constraints to be named included legislative constraints and institutional boundaries. These latter constraints were of particular relevance to RCs, as the Local Government Act 1974 currently restricts its active involvement in tourism⁴. To some extent, RCs (and TLAs) are also constrained by the prevailing perception that tourism-related issues are

---

⁴ This was the situation prior to the amendment of the Local Government Act in December 2002.
already being addressed adequately, and appropriately, by RTOs without the need for input from other organisations. Clearly, the above findings indicate the existence of a number of ‘key’ areas that merit further discussion. Accordingly, these findings will be discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter 5
Discussion and Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

This study was undertaken in the context of the *New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010* (2001), and the anticipated amendments to the *Local Government Act 1974*. Organisations targeted in this study included those government agencies considered to have leading roles and responsibilities with respect to sustainable tourism development. These organisations included the Department of Conservation, regional councils, regional tourism organisations, and territorial local authorities.

While there is a wide range of public and private sector stakeholders interested in tourism, tourism planning in New Zealand has generally been ad hoc and reactive to situations only as, and when, they arise. As visitor numbers have continued to grow, there is increasing realisation of the inter-related economic, social and biophysical implications of tourism and the need for co-ordinated planning strategies within central and local government. Local government has been criticised for its lack of response to the challenge of promoting sustainable tourism development (NZTS, 2001). This concern is attributed to an inadequate appreciation of the role local government can play in providing strategic direction. With this in mind, the key objective of this report was: to document emerging tourism policies and practices within the local government sector in New Zealand. This chapter thus provides a discussion of the survey findings presented in Chapter 4. This discussion will first address overall findings, and then focus on the respective roles of specific organisations.

5.2 Summary of Study Findings

To achieve sustainable tourism development, local government has the opportunity to formulate strategies that provide direction and guidance to tourism (in conjunction with other economic activities), set development standards appropriate to the social and biophysical carrying capacity of the host area, and make provision for the maintenance and development of adequate infrastructure. However, the findings of this research suggest that there is currently a dearth of clearly articulated, co-ordinated, and integrated strategies for sustainable tourism development at the local and regional levels in New Zealand. In fact, few local and/or regional authorities appear to have formulated tourism-specific plans or policies that define clearly what sustainable tourism development means for their locality or region. In addition, there was no apparent consensus between the organisations surveyed regarding the extent, focus and methods that should be applied to planning and managing tourism at the local and regional levels.

Despite this absence of strategic planning, tourism is widely recognised and accepted as being an important sector in local and regional economies. Likewise, tourism was widely acknowledged by organisation representatives within this study as being a significant policy issue for local government. Several organisations represented in this study claim to hold a written tourism-specific policy or plan. However, these policies
and plans appear to focus on development-related objectives (e.g., tourism growth) rather than integrated destination management.

In addition, there appears to be a lack of clearly allocated responsibilities and structured communication within and between key bodies. This is particularly apparent within TLAs where, for example, key tourism contacts differ widely, reflecting inconsistent conceptualisations of the core aspects of tourism planning. Collection and use of data by organisations pertains mainly to demand, for example visitor numbers, rather than supply-side issues, such as infrastructure needs and environmental quality associated with tourism. Furthermore, funding and staffing priorities are focussed on development-based issues, such as destination marketing and promotion, while broader strategic and environmental management concerns appear to be largely ignored.

The key constraints faced by organisations appear to be universal concerns, namely, a lack of adequate funding, staffing and tourism-related data. These concerns are followed by legislative constraints and institutional boundaries, which serve to limit the ability of these organisations (especially RCs) to be more pro-active in tourism planning and management. These factors are perceived as limiting potential for more effective regional tourism planning and management.

5.3 Role of Territorial Local Authorities

In general, TLAs appear to have adopted a somewhat narrow focus with respect to their roles and responsibilities in planning and managing tourism. Rather than maintain a high level of direct involvement, TLAs have deferred most of the responsibilities for tourism to the RTOs (and DTOs) and regional development boards within their respective localities. Consequently, TLAs appear not to regard tourism management as being a core area of responsibility, although some do acknowledge that tourism, like many other industries, does have implications for their core functions (e.g., the provision of recreational facilities). There were, however, a number of TLA respondents that acknowledged the potential significance of tourism as a TLA function. These respondents indicated that, as such, tourism should come under the umbrella of the wider policy and planning mandate of TLAs. In addition, TLA perceptions of tourism appear to be limited predominantly to its significance as an economic development tool. In this regard, most TLAs do not appear to have a full appreciation of the potential role local government can play in sustainable tourism development.

Generally, TLAs perceive themselves to be acting in accordance with their legislative and electoral mandate as far as tourism is concerned. However, for TLAs across New Zealand there is a range of factors influencing organisational capacity for dealing effectively with tourism at the local level. Some of these issues have emerged in the survey findings, while others are more contextual and relate to factors such as current institutional arrangements and ideologies, regional socio-economic history, and the stage of the tourism life cycle experienced by the destination area. These underlying factors have a strong influence on the degree and direction of active involvement TLAs adopt in enabling and managing tourism in their areas.
5.4 Role of Regional Tourism Organisations

Presently, the focus of RTOs is on destination marketing and promotion, rather than destination management. They also perform a range of other functions including data collection and liaison between statutory bodies and industry, essential for tourism planning. Although destination management issues were of concern to RTOs respondents, RTOs lack the capacity and mandate to address these issues effectively. Thus, the emphasis of RTO involvement in tourism is on demand, rather than supply-sided, management.

Crucially, the *New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010* (NZTS) envisages a greater role for RTOs, encompassing co-ordination of tourism planning and development among local operators, local government interests, and communities. With a predicted consolidation of current RTO numbers, the NZTS envisages strengthened links between central government, local government and operators, and that tourism planning will be better co-ordinated and managed regionally. The strategy thus clearly puts the onus on ‘New RTOs’ to act as key strategic planning agencies. It is also clear that to undertake wider ranging functions proposed by NZTS, RTOs would need to undergo radical changes to their statutory and organisational mandates, funding, and staffing in order to adequately address planning for sustainable tourism.

The governance and structure of RTOs varies widely. This may have implications for funding, functions undertaken and accountability to stakeholders. Within the grouping of RTOs sampled in this survey, there are examples of organisations operating under a range of structures. Some are operating within the structure of their local territorial authority, or under contract to a TLA(s), others were legally established Incorporated Societies, some were administered by a Trust or Board, and in one example within this study the RTO operated as a Local Authority Trading Enterprise. With this in mind, one of the requirements for a more consistent and co-ordinated approach to destination marketing, let alone destination management, would require that key bodies operate from within comparable institutional and legal structures.

Significantly, inter-, and intra-, regional ‘alliances’ between RTOs do exist presently, such as the newly established Coastal Otago Alliance. The potential cost efficiencies resulting from pooling of resources is evidently one key benefit of this form of collaboration, and there are additional benefits in terms of strengthening the market profile of smaller RTO areas. As macro-regional marketing alliances continue to emerge, these tend to be based on touring routes, or ‘communities of interest’ rather than territorial authority boundaries. However, they may be more closely aligned with regional council boundaries.

The primary responsibility of RTOs is, and for the foreseeable future will continue to be, destination marketing and associated tasks. It is hard to envisage how amalgamating RTOs into more effective regional alliances to form New RTOs (as recommended in the NZTS) will shift their mandate and skills base from destination marketing to destination management. Unless there is a significant allocation of financial and human resources from central government towards institutional capacity building, RTOs would not be in a position to adopt responsibility for destination management at the local and regional levels. To facilitate this would require a major shift in operational mandates and restructuring of areas of responsibility between
TLAs, regional councils, and RTOs. Considering the critical public accountability issues associated with such changes, new legislative mandates would need to be created to allow New RTOs to take on responsibility for influencing management and monitoring of core public assets and services and resources, currently under the auspices of TLAs and regional councils.

As RTOs collate data on tourism in their regions they are in a relatively strong position to co-ordinate the promotion and marketing of regional tourism. In lieu of more proactive, integrated regional tourism planning strategies emerging from the statutory sector, a limited number of RTOs are coming to the fore with industry-driven development visions for their areas. To varying degrees RTOs are becoming involved in aspects of regional tourism planning. However, these do not constitute comprehensive regional tourism planning strategies. While RTOs are clearly identifiable within the NZTS as the key bodies with regional tourism as their core business, this does not necessarily make them the most appropriate base for addressing the wider requirements of regional destination management.

The findings of this research suggest that the expansion of RTOs roles anticipated in the NZTS lies beyond their current legislative mandate and capacity. Likewise, the institutional focus on growth pays insufficient heed to social and environmental impacts of tourism at the local and regional levels. As such, the key responsibility for co-ordinating the management of social and environmental impacts of tourism at the local and regional levels must remain jointly with the statutory authorities (i.e., city, district, and regional councils).

5.5 Role of Regional Councils

Regional councils currently have little to do with tourism planning and management per se. This is due largely because they are constrained by local government legislation, which currently restricts them from active involvement in tourism without the express, and unanimous, permission of all TLAs within their respective jurisdictions. To some extent, they are also constrained by TLA perceptions that tourism related issues are already being adequately addressed without the input of regional councils. The need to have approval from all TLAs within the region is seen as prohibitively risky (financially), and is the primary reason why relatively low levels of funding and staffing are allocated to this area.

Nonetheless, the mandate of RCs (under the RMA) encompasses the effective management of land, air and water resources, which in turn are core issues for sustainable tourism development. To this extent, RC respondents conceded that they do have an indirect role in promoting the objectives of sustainable management of ‘key’ natural resources, upon which tourism depends.

5.6 Role of Department of Conservation

The Department of Conservation is a central government agency, whose primary mandate is to manage the national conservation estate in accordance with the Conservation Act. The findings of this study indicate that issues relating to the
management of tourism’s impacts, rather than the development of tourism, are of prime importance to DoC respondents. In addition, there appears to be an inward-, rather than outward-, looking approach to addressing tourism-related issues, with an apparent focus on site-specific management. At the conservancy level, DoC’s predominant local links are with concessionaires, NGOs, recreational and conservation interest groups, local iwi and hapu. Interestingly, DoC representatives indicated that no such relationships are maintained with local RCs, TLAs, or RTOs.

5.7 Concluding Remarks

The December 2002 amendment to the Local Government Act 1974 clearly signals the need for all councils to prepare long-term strategic plans. This is a significant step forward. These strategic plans will identify outcomes and priorities wanted by communities, and the most appropriate agencies to implement these outcomes. Tourism objectives, as well as the means by which to implement and achieve them, will therefore be encompassed within these plans. The key implication therefore, of the December 2002 amendment is that the Act will now provide a stronger mandate for territorial local authorities and regional councils to undertake strategic tourism planning and destination management.

Regional, district and city councils all can be seen as having potentially vital roles to play in tourism planning and management. The focus of regional councils is primarily on regional strategic issues, including cross-boundary issues, whereas the focus of district and city councils is more on the management of effects and provision of infrastructure at the local level. It is therefore imperative that local and regional government agencies carry out their respective roles, with regard to tourism planning and management, in a co-operative and collaborative manner.

The opportunity for councils to collaborate on the delivery of functions and services offers potential for administrative efficiencies, economies of scale, and effective use of specialised skills in the area of tourism. To this end, it is also important to develop and maintain trusting relationships between local and regional stakeholder organisations. It is in this respect that RTOs and economic development boards can be particularly useful. Ultimately, such a co-operative and collaborative approach to tourism can create the potential for devising appropriate solutions to local and regional issues of tourism planning and management.
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Appendix 1
Profile of Selected Regions

Overview

The eight constituent regions in this study were selected according to their geographic, economic, and tourism-related characteristics. The four North Island regions are Auckland, Bay of Plenty, East Coast/Gisborne, Manawatu/Wanganui. The South Island regions are Nelson/Tasman, Canterbury, West Coast, and Otago. These eight regions offer a representative mixture in terms of the tourism-related characteristics of the regions, with tourist ‘gateways’, key ‘destinations’, emerging ‘destinations’, and varying international and domestic visitation rates. They have varying economic attributes, visitor/resident ratios and variations in relation to the dominance of the conservation estate.

Visitor Density

Visitor density for each region was calculated to stratify the regions in terms of visitation patterns (see Figure 1). Visitor density, as a relative measure of the physical ‘presence’ of visitors within specific regions, was calculated using data obtained from the International Visitor Survey (IVS) (http://www.tourisminfo.co.nz), the New Zealand Domestic Travel Survey 1999 (Forsyte, 2000), and Statistics New Zealand 2001 Census data (http://www.statsnz.co.nz). The data obtained from each of these sources refer to ‘bednights’ (‘international visitor nights’ and ‘domestic [visitor] nights’) and ‘usually resident’ population by region. The annual number of international visitor nights and domestic visitor nights were added together to provide an overall annual figure (total visitor nights). This figure was then divided by the total ‘usually resident’ population’s bednights for one year (i.e., population multiplied by 365 to give an annual bednight figure for residents). The resultant figures were then expressed as a ratio of 100 for ease of interpretation. For example, Auckland has a visitor density of 4.1:100. This means that tourists contribute 4.1 per cent of total bednights and associated service demands in Auckland. The results presented in Figure 1 show that Auckland has the lowest visitor intensity while the West Coast has the highest visitor intensity at 16:100.

---

5 It is instructive to note that the resultant ratio represents an averaged yearly figure that does not take account of seasonal flux and associated shifts in demand. There is also an estimated average of 15 nights of outbound domestic tourism. While more accurate tourism density indices may be calculated, for the purposes of this study this technique was deemed sufficient.
Figure 1
Visitor Density for Selected Regions

Visitor Density (Visitors per 100 bednights, annual basis)

- Gisborne: 6.1:100
- Manawatu/Wanganui: 4.8:100
- Auckland: 4:100
- Canterbury: 5.9:100
- Nelson/Tasman: 10.5:100
- Bay of Plenty: 8.4:100
- Otago: 12:100
- West Coast: 16.3:100
Economic Dimensions of Tourism for Selected Regions

The data presented in Figure 2 shows the economic contribution of tourism to the eight survey regions (Angus, 2001). It can be seen from these data that Auckland as the key gateway centre of New Zealand receives the highest total economic contribution from tourism, although tourism is less significant within the wider economy. Total earnings from tourism in Canterbury are relatively high, as they are in the Otago region. In the total regional economy, the contribution from tourism is comparatively high in the Bay of Plenty and Manawatu/Wanganui regions. Generally, the regions selected for this study entered relatively evenly across a range of visitor densities. However, three of the South Island regions had the highest visitor densities, namely West Coast, Otago, and Nelson/Tasman.

The data presented in Figure 3 illustrate the economic contribution of tourism by market, indicating the domestic/international market mix of tourism within the regions (Angus, 2001). Reflecting the international gateway status of Auckland, 70 per cent of tourist expenditure in this region comes from the international market (Angus, 2001). This contrasts with the other North Island regions, where a greater proportion of tourism’s economic contribution comes from the domestic market. In the South Island, the West Coast receives approximately 71 per cent of its tourist expenditure from the international market. Otago receives more international expenditure than domestic (62.3%), as does Canterbury (59.7%). This contrasts with the Nelson/Tasman region, which receives 54 per cent of its tourist expenditure from the domestic market.
Figure 2
Economic Contribution of Tourism to Selected Regions (1999)
(Source: Angus, 2001)
Figure 3
Economic Contribution of Tourism to Selected Regions by Market (1999)
(Source: Angus, 2001)
Auckland Region

**Key Tourism Statistics**
Total international visitor arrivals to Auckland per annum were 1,212,111 for the year ended June 2001. There were 10,124,380 international visitor nights in the same period, making the average length of stay for international visitors 8.3 days. The Auckland region had 6,886,000 domestic visitor nights in 1999 (NZDTS, 2000). Total visitor nights are approximately 17,010,380 per annum. Auckland has a resident population of 1,068,645, making it the region with the lowest visitor to resident ratio on the visitor density continuum (4.1:100; see Figure 1.).

**Regional Characteristics and Attractions**
With its international airport the Auckland region acts as the key gateway for overseas visitors to New Zealand. The city is a destination in its own right and also supports a high level of transit tourism. Event tourism is a key market, with conferences and hosting of events, such as the America’s Cup yachting race. Within the North Island, Auckland also functions as a gateway to the Northland region and the popular Rotorua area.

Auckland is the biggest urban city in New Zealand and has the largest concentration of Polynesian people in the world. As a growing modern city, Auckland has undergone something of a renaissance with a changing skyline, now including the tallest tower in the Southern Hemisphere and waterfront development associated with the America’s Cup event. With its eclectic mix of culture, theatre, art and fashion Auckland’s cultural attractions cater to a wide range of tastes and styles. The region also offers an extensive range of accommodation from five star luxury hotels to intimate bed and breakfasts, upmarket lodge experiences, serviced apartments, backpackers and motels.

Auckland lies across an 11km wide volcanic isthmus separating two harbours - the Waitemata and Manukau - and has the largest boat ownership per capita in the world. There are 22 regional parks within easy reach of downtown Auckland, two marine reserves, 100km of coastline, more than 500km of walking and hiking tracks, and 48 volcanic cones (http://www.aucklandnz.com/). Auckland's spectacular Hauraki Gulf is a unique feature and gives visitors the opportunity to experience some of the, more than 50 islands located there including native bird sanctuaries, Pohutukawa covered and lava strewn inactive volcanoes, sandy islands, and vineyard covered islands and retreats.

The Waitakere Ranges (Auckland’s largest regional park) provides a native forest setting for mountain biking and walking on the edge of the urban area. The West Coast surf beaches of Whatipu, Karekare, Piha, Bethels and Muriwai offer grand sweeping beachscapes and a gannet colony at Muriwai. Snorkelling is available at Goat Island Marine Reserve north of Auckland. The city provides a base for a wide range of activities and access to a vast range of land-based and marine recreational areas.

Bay of Plenty Region

**Key Tourism Statistics**
Total international visitor arrivals to Bay of Plenty region were 604,058 for the year ending June 2001. There were 1,624,930 international visitor nights in the same period, making the average length of stay for international visitors 2.7 days. The Bay of Plenty region had
5,705,000 domestic visitor nights in 1999 (NZDTS, 2000). Total visitor nights are approximately 7,329,930 per annum. The Bay of Plenty region has a resident population of 224,367, giving it a moderate visitor to resident ratio on the visitor density continuum (8.4:100; see Figure 1.).

**Regional Characteristics and Attractions**

The principal city in the Bay of Plenty region, Rotorua stands as one of the original tourist destinations within New Zealand. The geothermal resort city has attracted visitors for over 200 years and is the heartland of Maori culture. There are 35 marae in the Rotorua District, and staying as a guest on a marae is a unique cultural experience for many international as well as domestic visitors. Maori cultural performances and traditional hangi feasts allow visitors to gain an understanding of the local stories through song and dance and experience food cooked through the traditional underground earthen ovens.

Rotorua provides a diverse range of activities for visitors, with day trips out to Mokoia Island on Lake Rotorua, the Museum of Art and History, the historical Blue Baths, with its 1930s tearoom. There are farm shows, opportunities to view native wildlife, there is also a scenic gondola. Rotorua region is also one of the country’s prime trout fishing areas. Many of the volcanic crater lakes stock trophy-seized rainbow trout, and local professional guides can be hired to fly-fish the lakes or rivers.

The geothermal hot springs of the area provide the natural resource base for a range of therapeutic spa and massage therapy services. Visitors can explore various geothermal sites including: the Wai-O-Tapu Thermal Wonderland, the Waimangu Volcanic Valley (formed during the 1886 Mt Tarawera eruption), and the Pohutu Geyser at Whakarewarewa Thermal valley which can shoot water 30metres high. At the Hell’s Gate thermal reserve steam rises from lakes and for a sighting of a currently active volcano, there are scenic flights to White Island.

Mt Tarawera plays an important role in the region, is sacred and under the guardianship of Ngati Rangitihi Maori. It is possible to hike, helicopter or four-wheel drive to the top of the dormant volcano and explore the crater.

Other natural attractions in the area include: the Whakarewarewa Forest where visitors can walk, ride a horse or mountainbike. The Rotorua region has eleven main lakes and many rivers that allow for a range of excursions: cruises, kayaking, and white water rafting. The Rangitaiki River provides rapids and the Kaituna River has the country’s highest commercially rafted waterfall.

**The East Coast Region**

**Key Tourism Statistics**

Total international visitor arrivals to the East Coast region were 28,973 for the year ending June 2001. There were 103,682 international visitor nights in the same period, making the average length of stay for international visitors 3.6 days. The East Coast region had 881,000 domestic visitor nights in 1999 (NZDTS, 2000). Total visitor nights are approximately 984,682 per annum. The East Coast region has a resident population of 45,786, giving it a low visitor to resident ratio on the visitor density continuum (6.1:100; see Figure 1).
**Regional Characteristics and Attractions**

Within the East Coast region is Te Urewera National Park (212,672 hectares), the third largest national park and the largest untouched native forest in New Zealand. This is one of the most stunning areas for hiking and trekking in the region. The park lies between the Bay of Plenty and Hawke’s Bay. The nearest towns are Whakatane and Taneatua to the north, Murupara and Ruatahuna to the west, and Wairoa to the east.

The East Coast is the known as the first mainland location in the world to see the sunrise each day. At 1,752 metres, Mount Hikurangi is the first point on mainland New Zealand to catch the sun. It’s a very spiritual mountain for the local Maori people and permission can be sought to climb the peak.

Gisborne is one of the sunniest cities in New Zealand, its white sand surf beaches are a big attraction for surfers from all over the world. The city provides gourmet dining and wine tasting. Specialities of the region include the Southern Hemisphere's first commercially grown black truffles, fine cheeses and Chardonnay wine.

Other centres in the region include Wairoa, gateway to Te Urewera National Park, Mahia, a coastal getaway and Opotiki, gateway to natural areas such as Waioeka Scenic Reserve with its bush scenery and river rafting, canoeing and swimming, or the Motu River for rafting trips.

Sites of historic interest include Captain Cook’s landing site at Kaiti Beach. Heritage Trails in the district highlight places of historical significance. Tairawhiti Museum and Arts Centre houses a fine collection of European and Maori artefacts and an extensive photographic collection. Maori culture is evident throughout the region. Appointments can be made to visit the picturesque Te Poho O Rawiri Marae.

Activities undertaken in the area include: swimming with Blue and Mako sharks in a specially designed snorkelling cage. There is also trout fishing in outlying rivers. Horse trekking is available over farmland trails and along beaches. Trout fishing, hunting, swimming, kayaking can also be enjoyed around Lake Waikaremoana.

**Manawatu/Wanganui Region**

**Key Tourism Statistics**

Total international visitor arrivals to the Manawatu/Wanganui region were 137,299 for the year ending June 2001. There were 730,571 international visitor nights in the same period, making the average length of stay for international visitors 5.3 days. The Manawatu/Wanganui region had a total of 3,124,000 domestic visitor nights in 2000 (NZDTS, 1999). Total visitor nights are approximately 3,854,571 per annum. The Manawatu/Wanganui region has a resident population of 228,771, giving it a low visitor to resident ratio on the visitor density continuum (4.8:100; see Figure 1).

**Regional Characteristics and Attractions**

The Wanganui region is on the lower west coast of the North Island, south of Taranaki and the Taupo/Ruapehu regions. The area is known for its Maori culture, heritage, Whanganui National Park and river-based activities. The Whanganui River is the longest navigable river in the country, with 239 rapids and stunning bush scenery. It can be explored by jet boat,
kayak, canoe, raft, or paddle steamer, and is popular for fly-fishing. There is a trail to the mysterious ‘Bridge to Nowhere’, built across the Mangapurua Gorge to give access to an isolated settlement that was finally abandoned in 1942.

To the east of Wanganui lie the university city of Palmerston North, the towns of Feilding, Ashhurst and many rural villages. Main centres in the River Region include Taihape, the largest of the towns along the road to Mount Ruapehu, renowned as the ‘gumboot capital’ of New Zealand. Levin, which has a significant clothing industry, is the principal town servicing the horticultural and agricultural community of the Horowhenua District and is located at the junction of State Highways 1 and 57.

The Horowhenua District lies approximately one hour north of Wellington on State Highway 1. It is bounded by the Tararua Ranges in the east and the Tasman Sea to the west. The area is known as the ‘market garden’ of the lower North Island. Natural attractions in the area include the unique dune lakes of Horowhenua and Papaitonga, rich in Maori history and native fauna.

Foxton Township has great historical significance as the original river port of the Manawatu region and the centre of the flax industry. This history can be seen in painted murals around the town, the horse drawn tram and the trolley bus museum. The Foxton River Cruise also recreates part of the town's history and provides access to the Manawatu River estuary and wetlands, of international ornithological significance, to view the royal spoonbills. As well as excellent brown trout fly-fishing in the Rangitikei River, there’s the chance to see rare and migrating birds at the Manawatu River estuary. It is also possible to jet boat through the Manawatu Gorge.

In the Rangitikei River valley and surrounding hill country, Bed and Breakfasts and farmstays are a speciality. The Rangitikei River supports an excellent trout fishery and has opportunities for bungy jumping, white water and scenic rafting. Golf courses are sprinkled throughout the area.

Manawatu has lavender and herb gardens, where visitors can meet local growers, who harvest and produce a unique range of natural health, herb and honey products which visitors can experience with beauty treatment or relaxation massage. There is a range of gardens open to visitors in the area, from those with collections of rhododendrons and azaleas, to rose gardens and formal English gardens.

Ruahine Forest Park is one of a number of small mountain ranges that form the spine of the North Island. The range offers forest and alpine walks. The park is accessed from Taihape or Mangaweka.

**The Nelson/Tasman Region**

**Key Tourism Statistics**

Total international visitor arrivals to the Nelson/Tasman region were 227,062 for the year ending June 2001. There are 973,411 international visitor nights in the same period, making the average length of stay for international visitors 4.3 days. The Nelson/Tasman region had a total of 2,200,000 domestic visitor nights in 2000 (NZDTS, 1999). Total visitor nights are approximately 3,173,411 per annum. The Nelson/Tasman region has a resident population of
78,255, giving it a moderate to high visitor to resident ratio on the visitor density continuum (10.5:100; see Figure 1.).

Regional Characteristics and Attractions
The Nelson/Tasman Region is the fastest growing region in the country (StatsNZ, 2000). Located at the heart of New Zealand, the region is known for its good climate, experiencing the highest sunshine hours in the country. The region serves as a popular domestic and international holiday destination. The landscape of the Nelson/Tasman region encompasses mountain wilderness, skifields, alpine lakes, karst limestone topography, fishing rivers, mountain and coastal forest areas, rocky coastlines, wetland areas as well as the renowned golden beaches. Nelson has a lively arts and craft scene, a growing selection of beer and wine makers and diverse agricultural produce. There are two key National Parks in the Nelson/Tasman region, Abel Tasman and Kahurangi, as well as Mt Richmond Forest Park.

The region can be divided into five distinct geographical areas:

Western Tasman Bay
Abel Tasman National Park falls within the Western Tasman Bay area, and is the smallest national park in the country at approximately 23,000 hectares. The park is a major drawcard to the area, with its 49km coastal track providing a popular tramping experience. Kaiteriteri and Marahau are the main southern access points for Abel Tasman National Park and provide a base for water activities such as the increasingly popular kayaking. The settlement of Motueka serves as a transit town for accessing this popular coastal park as well as a service centre for visitors to the park which contributes an estimated $25 million annually to the region’s economy.

Over recent years, as a result of increasing visitor pressure, there have been investigations into the possibility of incorporating the foreshore under DoC control. The current situation in Abel Tasman National Park follows recommendations that the foreshore be managed under the Reserves Act 1997 with areas adjoining the national park managed by DoC and foreshore adjoining council or private land managed by Tasman District Council. An advisory group is to be retained to meet regularly with DoC and council managers to discuss relevant management issues, and recommendations include the introduction of new legislation to establish a one nautical mile management zone from the foreshore to manage activity on the sea as well as the land.

Kahurangi National Park is the other key national park in the region, and the southern Motueka Valley provides an important access point into this and the Mt Owen limestone karst landscape can also be reached via the Wangapeka track. Graham Valley, leading to Flora Saddle provides a regionally important access point to Mt Arthur peak (1795m) and the Mt Arthur tablelands of Kahurangi National Park.

St Arnaud/Murchison
The Buller River and its tributaries, as well as the lakes and river of Nelson Lakes National Park collectively constitute one of the countries most significant trout fishing areas. The park itself is a major tramping area and provides recreational boating on Lake Rotoiti, as well as Lake Rotorua where there is an internationally known fishing lodge.

The Nelson Lakes National Park, located one and a half hour’s drive south of Nelson receives 100,000 visitors annually, predominantly domestic tourists. This area of glacial lakes offers
Department of Conservation camping facilities, and provides skiing opportunities with the small club skifield of Mt Robert, and the commercial Rainbow skifield. The Rainbow valley also provides access to the highcountry Molesworth Station, open seasonally and used mainly by domestic visitors for 4x4 and mountainbiking.

Murchison, at the confluence of four main rivers is a centre for white water kayaking, as well as being key transit point for visitor flows between Nelson/Tasman area and West Coast as well as Christchurch/Canterbury and the Nelson/Tasman region.

Nelson/Richmond
Nelson/Richmond is a major destination for domestic tourists, particular visitors from within the South Island. Located on the outskirts of Nelson, Tahunanui Beach Holiday Park is one of the biggest motor camps in the southern hemisphere. The area is known for its strong art and craft community. Visitors can view and purchase work from skilled local potters, painters, weavers and wood workers. Nelson also stages the annual Wearable Art Awards showcasing local artistic talent.

The southern edge of the town borders on Mt Richmond Forest Park that offers opportunities for short walks and tramping. The coastal settlement of Mapua provides a recreational base for water-based activities within the estuary and foreshore, and has specialised restaurants, cafes and wineries. Vineyard and horticultural tours are available.

Golden Bay
Golden Bay is the main access gateway to Kahurangi National Park, the second largest in the country at 400,000 hectares. The coastal area south of Farewell Spit, with 10,000 hectares of tidal area (identified by IUCN as an internationally important wetland), offers itself for 4x4 experiences. Walks along the 28kms of Farewell Spit start from the Visitor Centre.

The alternative lifestyle and pace of life in Golden Bay is a large part of the appeal of this area. Pupu Springs, near Takaka is the largest fresh water spring in NZ and there is quality rock climbing at Payne’s Ford.

The Cobb Valley provides access to the northern alpine section of Kahurangi National Park where there are outstanding coastal scenic areas. The Heaphy track with its diverse nature experience is one of the most popular Great Walks in the country, and connects Golden Bay with Karamea, in the northern Buller District of the West Coast.

The Canterbury Region

Key Tourism Statistics
Total international visitor arrivals to Canterbury per annum are 755,636 for the year ending June 2001. There were 4,334,740 international visitor nights in the same period, making the average length of stay for international visitors 5.7 days. The Canterbury region had a total of 5,970,000 domestic visitor nights in 1999 (NZDTS, 2000). Total visitor nights are approximately 10,304,740 per annum. The Canterbury region has a resident population of 468,039, giving it a low to moderate visitor to resident ratio on the visitor density continuum (5.9:100; see Figure 1).
Overnight visitor numbers constitute approximately 10.7 per cent of total overnight trips taken within New Zealand, second to Auckland. The vast majority of visitors come to the region on holiday (over 600,000). Those visiting for business purposes or to see friends and relatives constitute between 45,000 and 65,000 each (RTO/Stats NZ). The most popular form of accommodation for both domestic as well as international visitors is private homes/staying with friends and relatives, this is followed by hostel accommodation (backpackers or student) and hotels rank third.

**Regional Characteristics and Attractions**

Canterbury region covers approximately one third of the South Island, constituting the largest geographic region. Christchurch is New Zealand’s second major gateway and acts as a hub for the region, as well as the starting point for many tours of the South Island. A well-established infrastructure supports the accommodation, transport and entertainment of visitors to the region.

The amenities and activities available in the city are complemented by the scenic beauty and natural resources of the region. Canterbury offers diverse topography, with mountains, rivers, lakes, beaches and coastline, the plains and foothills as well as the volcanic landscape of the Port Hills and Banks Peninsula. These natural environments provide the basis for a wide range of recreational opportunities for domestic as well as international visitors. There are two National Parks in the Canterbury region, Mt Cook and Arthur’s Pass, as well as three Forest Parks. Other attractions within the region include opportunities for marine mammal watching in Kaikoura. There are several skifields operating in the winter season. There is also the thermal resort of Hanmer Springs, and the wineries of inland Canterbury.

There are nine District Councils with headquarters operating from within the Canterbury Region. A small part of the northern Waitaki District falls under the Canterbury region, but is mainly administered from within the Otago Region.

Ashburton is one hour south of Christchurch, situated on the State highway 73 transit route. The District offers salmon and trout fishing on the Rakaia River, ski-ing at Mount Hutt, walking in the Mount Somers and Rakaia Gorge area.

Banks Peninsula, is an hour and a half from Christchurch, and its historic French influenced settlement, of Akaroa predominantly caters for domestic visitors and increasing numbers of international tourists.

Huronui District centres on the alpine resort of Hanmer Springs, popular with domestic as well as international visitors. As well as the thermal pools, there is jetboating, horseriding, ski-ing and the wineries of the Waipara Valley.

Kaikoura is located 2 hours north of Christchurch and is a key stop-over destination in the region, with an increasing range of activities based around the marine mammals. Whalewatching is available by boat, swimming with seals and dolphins, bird watching and hiking the peninsula walkways are all popular activities based in this scenic coastal town.

MacKenzie District attracts visitors to its scenic lakes and for views of Aoraki/Mt Cook.
Selwyn District extends east towards the Southern Alps and is known for its wineries, golf courses, rivers and lakes such as the scenic high country experience of Lake Coleridge, which offers water skiing and fishing opportunities to visitors.

Timaru receives mainly domestic visitors and has the largest collection of preserved Victorian and Edwardian architecture in New Zealand. The area offers trips around Caroline Bay, or rafting on the Rangitata, Museums and Winery at Geraldine. Waimate is a centre for South Island farming and off the main transit route of State Highway 73 and provides a quiet rural base for walking and biking in the area.

Waimakariri District is easily accessible from Christchurch, providing visitors with opportunities for half day trips.

The West Coast Region

Key Tourism Statistics
Total international visitor arrivals to the West Coast region were 350,233 for the year ending June 2001. There were 928,458 international visitor nights in the same period, making the average length of stay for international visitors 2.7 days. The West Coast region had a total of 869,000 domestic visitor nights in 1999 (NZDTS, 2000). Total visitor nights are approximately 1,797,458 per annum. The West Coast region has a resident population of 32,514, giving it an extremely high visitor to resident ratio on the visitor density continuum (16.3:100; see Figure 1).

Regional Characteristics and Attractions
The West Coast region extends 550kms and is geographically isolated from other south island regions by the mountain range that runs along the alpine fault line. The area is renowned for its dramatic coastline, the closeness of the mountains to the sea and its high rainfall and associated temperate rainforests, as well as its unique cultural history, including pioneer gold rush era heritage. In recognition of its unique landscape and ecological characteristics, there are five National Parks within the region, with parts of south Westland being included in the South-West New Zealand World Heritage Area.

The scenic State Highway 6 follows the coastline most of the way from Westport through to Hokitika before heading inland, rejoicing the coast south of the glaciers. The road then heads east over the Southern Alps range, through the Haast Pass to the Otago region, where many visitors do a circuit of the south island travel on through to the popular destinations of Queenstown, Wanaka and Fiordland.

Visitors can access the West Coast region, from the northern end, from Nelson through to Westport and the Buller district, or from Christchurch through either Arthur’s Pass to Greymouth, or via the more northerly Lewis Pass. Arthur’s Pass settlement, is the most popular gateway to the Westland region from Christchurch and offers an alpine experience for visitors and day hikes, the transalpine train also stops here before going on through to Greymouth.

Within the Buller district, and close to Westport (the main town in the northern end of Westland), is the 4kms Cape Foulwind walkway. Tauranga Bay at the southern end of Capt the walkway has a seal-breeding colony with seals present year round. Other walks in the district
include the historic Denniston Incline, Charming Creek that runs through an old mining area. Karamea, 100kms north of Westport is close to the start of the Heaphy and Wangapeka Tracks, there are several spectacular limestone arch formations found in the area, and the Karamea and other rivers in the area offer good swimming, fishing and canoeing.

Between Westport and Greymouth is the increasingly popular Pancake Rocks at Punakaiki. The Paparoa National Park offers a number of interesting walks and incorporates a mountain range, limestone cliffs and caves and a black petrel colony.

Further south, Greymouth’s key visitor attraction is Shantytown, situated amid beautiful native bush, Shantytown is a replica pioneering gold-mining town, where visitors can pan for gold and take a short ride on a steam train. Hokitika is a major centre for greenstone and is home of the increasingly popular annual Wild Foods Festival.

The Fox and Franz Josef glaciers are the key visitor attractions on the West Coast. Nowhere in the world’s temperate zones are glaciers so accessible. Most of the accommodation and activities such as scenic flights and guided glacier walks are based out of Fox or Franz villages. The West Coast has three times the national average for businesses in the accommodation, café and restaurant industries, reflecting the importance of tourism to the region. Many of these operations are centred around the glacier region.

One of New Zealand's great scenic icons, Lake Matheson, lies just 6km from Fox Glacier, and is especially popular in early morning when visitors can see the highest mountains in the Southern Alps, including Mt. Cook, reflected in the ‘mirror lake’.

The White Heron Breeding Colony at Whataroa and the area surrounding coastal Okarito provide a sanctuary and feeding grounds for New Zealand's only breeding colony of Kotuku, or white heron.

Further south is the Westland/Tai Poutini National Park. Lake Moeraki and Lake Paringa offer fishing and boating opportunities. Haast township is the most southerly settlement before SHW 6 heads off east over to the Haast Pass. Jackson’s Bay, a former sealing station is a small fishing settlement 35kms down the coast south of Haast.

The Otago Region

Key Tourism Statistics
Total international visitor arrivals to the Otago region were 645,197 for the year ending June 2001. There were 3,589,079 international visitor nights in the same period, making the average length of stay for international visitors 5.6 days. The Otago region had 4,348,000 domestic visitor nights in 1999 (NZDTS, 2000). Total visitor nights are approximately 7,937,079 per annum. The Otago region has a resident population of 185,082, giving it a moderately high visitor to resident ratio on the visitor density continuum (12:100; see Figure 1).

Regional Characteristics and Attractions

Coastal Otago
The Otago coast stretches from the Waitaki River to the Clutha River, on the South Island’s eastern coast. About halfway between is the city of Dunedin, the South Island’s second
largest city. As New Zealand’s oldest city, Dunedin is one of the best-preserved Victorian and Edwardian cities in the Southern Hemisphere. The Dunedin Public Art Gallery holds valuable collections. The Otago Museum has exhibitions on Otago’s gold mining heritage and the Settlers Museum tells the story of Dunedin’s Scottish settlers. There is also the Sports Hall of Fame and Dunedin Botanic Gardens to visit. Larnach Castle is New Zealand’s only true castle, located on a hill overlooking the magnificent Otago Harbour.

The unique wildlife experiences are another reason to visit the city, with albatross and penguin viewing a major drawcard. The Royal Albatross Centre, at Taiaroa Head, Otago Peninsula is the site of the only mainland breeding colony of royal albatross in the world. There is also a yellow-eyed penguin reserve on the Otago peninsula where these rarest of birds can be observed. The historic township of Oamaru has a blue penguin colony, and 30kms south between Oamaru and Dunedin are the intriguing Moeraki boulders, an unusual and scenic geological phenomenon.

Central Otago
Central Otago was once the site of a major gold rush in the 1860s. Throughout the landscape of river basins and deep river gorges the region retains relics of this era. The climate gives the hottest summers and coldest winters in New Zealand. The Central Otago towns of Alexandra, Clyde, Cromwell, Roxburgh and Ranfurly serve as a base for exploring the surrounding historic countryside. The hydroelectric dams on the Clutha River allow for a range of water-based activities for visitors to Lake Dunstan and Lake Roxburgh. From power boating, jet boating, skiing, through to sailing, windsurfing, kayaking and fishing.

Other activities in the Central Otago region include mountainbiking in the remote tussock landscape, jet boating on the rivers and gold panning. Some of the smaller townships such as Naseby and St Bathans offer a real sense of history, while Ranfurly is the access point for the increasingly popular Otago Central Rail Trail which provides a unique recreational facility rich in history, and is used by walkers, mountain bikers and horse riders. The area produces a range of stone fruit, apricots and cherries are a speciality of the area. The Clyde Wine Region of Central Otago, is now the fastest growing wine region in New Zealand and known for its award winning Pinot Noir, and many wineries offer tastings throughout the summer months.

Otago Lakes District
Queenstown is New Zealand’s premiere four season alpine and lake resort. Located on the shores of Lake Wakatipu and overlooked by the dominant Remarkables Range, Queenstown’s scenic setting is the base for year-round activities. These high adventure activities include bungy jumping and jet boating on the Shotover, Kawarau and Dart Rivers, white water rafting on the Shotover or Kawarau Rivers, and parapenting or hot air ballooning.

Queenstown serves as an alpine playground for skiers and snowboarders during the winter season, and the town hosts the annual Winter Festival. The internationally acclaimed ski fields of the Remarkables and Coronet Peak offer great runs for skiers and snowboarders of all levels. Cardrona Alpine Resort offers open terrain, with Heli-skiing and heli-boarding available. Coronet Peak is New Zealand’s only night skiing area.

On Lake Wakatipu, the vintage TSS Earnslaw steamer has been restored to its original condition and takes visitors on daily trips. There are several scenic golf courses in the area. The nearby historical Arrowtown has quaint, tree-lined streets, miners’ cottages and shops preserved as they were during the 19th century gold rush era.
Wanaka is the region’s second resort town after Queenstown and is located on the shores of Lake Wanaka, surrounded by the Southern Alps, close to Mount Aspiring National Park. The township itself offers visitors a combination of outdoor adventure and indoor luxury, with a range of comfortable accommodation, shopping opportunities and eateries.

Wanaka hosts a number of annual festivals and events, including the three-day air show, Warbirds Over Wanaka. The International World Heli-Challenge, attracts the world’s best snowboarders and skiers tackle to the nearby alpine slopes during the winter season.

In common with Queenstown, the lake, mountains and ski fields around Wanaka provide for a wide range of adventures, a guide can be hired for fly-fishing on the lakes, rivers and streams in the area, brown and rainbow trout fishing is available. There is sailing, water-skiing, kayaking and wind surfing on Lake Wanaka. The rivers offer white water sledging or canyoning. Horse trekking or walking in the mountains is a highlight of the area, from short walks around Mt Iron or the Diamond Lakes, through to valley hikes in Mt Aspiring National Park, or mountaineering with a professional mountain guide. During the winter season heli-skiing or heli-boarding are available. The ski fields of Cardrona and Treble Cone offer a mixed terrain for skiers and snowboards of all abilities.
Appendix 2
Research Instrument (Questionnaire)
SURVEY:

PLANNING FOR TOURISM

IN

NEW ZEALAND
This questionnaire is divided into five sections, each targeting different issues and roles of local government organisations (territorial local authorities, regional councils, regional and district tourism organisations) and the Department of Conservation in relation to the planning and management of tourism.

For the purposes of this survey, a tourist is defined as a non-resident visitor to your area (domestic or international).

Please mark your responses in the appropriate boxes, and feel free to make additional comments, as these can be discussed during the course of our telephone interview.

**Section 1: Assessing the Importance of Tourism**

1. In your assessment, what are the five most important economic sectors in your area? Please rank from 1 to 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Economic Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In your assessment, how significant is tourism's influence in shaping the development of your organisation's strategies and policies?

   1 = Extremely significant
   2 = Very significant
   3 = Moderately significant
   4 = Slightly significant
   5 = Not significant at all
   6 = Don't know
In your assessment, how significant is tourism's influence on the operational responsibilities (including provision of services) undertaken by your organisation?

1 = Extremely significant
2 = Very significant
3 = Moderately significant
4 = Slightly significant
5 = Not significant at all
6 = Don't know

In your assessment, what are the key constraints to your organisation's ability to adequately address the issues and impacts associated with tourism in your area?

Please rate each constraint from 1 to 5 in the appropriate box.

1 = Extremely relevant
2 = Very relevant
3 = Moderately relevant
4 = Slightly relevant
5 = Not relevant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate or reliable data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of necessary expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate staffing levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate funding levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High staff 'turn-over'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative constraints/ institutional boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of clear lines of responsibility within your organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of co-ordination/ communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current funding and staffing prioritised to other areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2: Tourism Plans and Policies

5 Does your organisation have a written policy or strategic plan that relates specifically to tourism in, or visitors to, your area?

1 = Yes (please name document)
2 = Currently being developed
3 = Not yet, but future intent
4 = No
5 = Don’t know
If your answer is “no” or “don’t know” or “not yet”, go to Question 8.

6 Which of the following organisations or interested parties have had input (direct or indirect) into the preparation and development of your tourism policy or plan? Please select the level of input, from 1 to 5, for each organisation or group.

1 = Extremely involved
2 = Very involved
3 = Moderately involved
4 = Slightly involved
5 = Not involved at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TLAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Tourism Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District or Regional Tourism Organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism industry representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Iwi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Is your organisation's tourism policy or plan co-ordinated with, or complimentary to, any broader tourism strategies in your area? (e.g., district or regional tourism 'alliances' etc.)

1 = Yes (please provide examples) 
2 = No 
3 = Don't know

8 Is tourism treated as a separate section or special area in your organisation's key planning documents? (e.g., District Plan, Annual Plan, Conservation Management Strategy, Visitor Management Plan).

1 = Yes (Please name documents) 
2 = No 
3 = Don't know

9 Have these plans been formulated in such a way so as to facilitate tourism development?

1 = Yes 
2 = No 
3 = Don't know

10 Do these plans have specific strategies to minimise negative impacts from tourism?

1 = Yes 
2 = No 
3 = Don't know
11. In your assessment, is the development of tourism, or the management of tourism impacts, of greatest importance to your organisation?

1 = Development
2 = Management
3 = Both equally significant
4 = Don't know

12. On a scale of 1 (not important) to 10 (extremely important), how important to your organisation is the development of tourism that provides or creates jobs locally?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not important Extremely important

13. On a scale of 1 (not important) to 10 (extremely important), how important to your organisation is the development of tourism that is **environmentally sustainable**?

(e.g., the use of Green Globe 21 or other environmentally-based certification processes, or implementing Environmental Management Systems etc.).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not important Extremely important
Section 3: Working Relationships and Lines of Communication

14 Has your organisation established any platform via which continuous dialogue with the tourism industry can occur regarding tourism planning and management?

1 = Yes (please name)  
2 = No  
3 = Don't know

15 Have the responsibilities for the various aspects and issues associated with tourism been allocated specifically within your organisation? (e.g., planning/policy development, marketing and promotion, monitoring visitor numbers, monitoring demands on utility services, amenities and core infrastructure etc.)

1 = Specifically allocated  
2 = Some specifically allocated, some implicitly allocated  
3 = Implicitly allocated  
4 = Not allocated at all  
5 = Don't know

*If specifically allocated, please indicate the area of responsibility, and name the responsible department and relevant officer(s).*


16 If the responsibilities for tourism are shared or split within your organisation, how are the lines of communication structured?

1 = Formally (please explain how)  
2 = Informally (please explain how)  
3 = No communication (please explain why)  
4 = Don't know
If the responsibilities for tourism are shared or split within your organisation, approximately how regularly is communication maintained?

1 = Continously  
2 = Weekly  
3 = Fortnightly  
4 = Monthly  
5 = Quarterly  
6 = Annually  
7 = Other (please state)  

A. With respect to tourism development and management in your area, does your organisation have ongoing working relationships with any of the following organisations or groups?

If yes, please rank the effectiveness of relationship in Column A, using the scale below.

1 = Extremely effective  
2 = Very effective  
3 = Moderately effective  
4 = Slightly effective  
5 = Not effective at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Councils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Tourism Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Tourism Organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Iwi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism industry representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please name)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Which five organisations should play leading roles with respect to tourism in your area?

Please rank from 1 to 5 in Column B.
Section 4: Monitoring and Forecasting

19 Has your organisation previously accessed tourism-related data (available from national databases and surveys) in order to increase its ability to effectively administer its requisite tasks and responsibilities? (e.g., International Visitor Survey, New Zealand Domestic Travel Study etc.)

1 = Yes (please name sources)  
2 = No  
3 = Don't know

20 A. Does your organisation measure, or obtain, data for the following indicators of tourism in your area?

1 = Yes  
2 = No

B. If your answer is "yes", please indicate your sources of data and how frequently these are obtained.

1 = Monthly  
2 = Quarterly  
3 = Six-monthly  
4 = Annually  
5 = Other (please state)  
6 = Don't know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>What source?</th>
<th>How frequently?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International visitor numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic visitor numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents' satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism's contribution to the local economy (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on core infrastructure*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes water, waste water and solid wastes systems.
Does your organisation specifically take into consideration tourism-related data when evaluating the expected demands and future provision of the following categories?

*Answer Y/N/DK for the following categories.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Y/ N/ DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism policy development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/promotion/information services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational facilities/complexes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish collection/waste management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public toilets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to tourism in your area, what level of **funding** and **staffing** (direct or indirect) does your organisation provide for the following categories in the last financial year?

*Please mark appropriate boxes. If answer is "don't know", write "DK".*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Funds ($)</th>
<th>Staff (FTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organising events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/promotion/information provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to private sector (e.g., rate relief, expert advice etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing/implementing planning policy or strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impact management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please name)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What proportion of your tourism-related funding comes from the following organisations in the last financial year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Proportion of total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TLAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Tourism Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District or Regional Tourism Organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism industry representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Iwi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5: Personal Details

Which organisation do you represent?  
DoC employees: please also indicate your Conservancy or location of Office Headquarters.

Please indicate your position/job title?

How many years have you worked in your current position?
27

How many years have you worked for your current employer?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
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