



**LINCOLN
UNIVERSITY**
CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE

Sustainable Tourism



Research Report No. 2020/101

Paying it forward and back: Regenerative tourism as part of place

A report for the Department of Conservation

Leah McEnhill
Eric S. Jorgensen
Stephen C. Urlich

16 December 2020

Acknowledgements

The Lincoln University Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Tourism warmly acknowledges the Department of Conservation/Te Papa Atawhai who match-funded this research

We are appreciative of the guidance and input from Professor Susanne Becken and would also like to thank her colleagues Tania Short, Cher Knights, and Tim Bamford of the Department of Conservation/Te Papa Atawhai for their support of this work.

We are grateful for the stimulating discussions with Ian ‘Shappy’ Shapcott of Te Ātiawa Manawhenua Ki Te Tau Ihu Trust.

The authors also express their gratitude to the individuals and organisations from Te Taihu/Top of the South who volunteered their time to assist with this research

The authors would also like to acknowledge the contribution of Emeritus Professor David Simmons and Associate Professor Stephen Espiner for their unfailing championing of this work.

© The authors. This work has been prepared for the Department of Conservation, and cannot be reproduced in any form by any other party without the author’s written permission.

Recommended citation:

McEnhill, L., Jorgensen, E.S., Ulrich, S. C. (2020). *Paying it forward and back: regenerative tourism as part of place*. Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Tourism Internal Report 2020/101, Lincoln University.

Contact details:

Dr Steve Ulrich: Steve.Urlich@lincoln.ac.nz

1. Summary

The notion of regenerative tourism has gained significant attention in recent years, as have other regenerative notions such as regenerative agriculture, regenerative design, and regenerative development. It is suggested that these regenerative notions have developed in response to concerns around the effectiveness of the implementation of the sustainability paradigm. However, regenerative tourism as a potential complementary or alternative paradigm currently lacks definition and therefore clarity around what it encompasses. Without clarity, and a shared sense of what regenerative tourism could look like within the context of a place, it could risk becoming over-claimed and difficult to measure and discern. We address these issues in two ways, which comprise the distinct sections of this report.

In **Part 1**, we undertake a literature review to identify key ideas that could justifiably be thought of as elements of regenerative tourism. We begin by examining the relationships between sustainability and regeneration, including whether regeneration is needed to achieve sustainability; whether regeneration is a logical extension of sustainability; and whether regeneration can be articulated as distinct from sustainability. We then ask, if regenerative tourism is distinct, then what does it aim to achieve in practice? We find that regenerative tourism is about promoting enduring positive outcomes, and that to get to a regenerated state, restoration needs to occur – we call this ‘healing, restoring and thriving’. In that sense, we acknowledge that regenerative practices exist on a continuum, within which tourism can make a contribution – ‘paying it forward’ to ‘put something back’ or being more ‘extractive’ and ‘imposed’ on a place. Our attention then turns to potential pathways to regenerative tourism. The first step is the need for a collective shift in perspective to imagine the possibilities that a more regenerative approach could desirably bring. This points us towards Te Ao Māori and the Mauriora Systems Framework (MSF) process developed by Matunga (1993), which positions the mauri of a place, community, and/or taonga at its centre. Activities such as tourism are evaluated by manawhenua for their contribution to the health of the mauri. Provided the MSF is not culturally appropriated, it can intertwine with more managerial approaches like braids in a river to enrich discussions about what communities’ value about their place. This points to the need for collaboration and co-creation, and this is iterative as the process and progress of regeneration is not linear. That understanding leads us to examine bi-cultural ways of measuring progress and what indicators might be useful. We conclude with a brief overview of regenerative tourism in a policy context within Aotearoa New Zealand. Given this context includes the disruption caused by the Covid-19 pandemic, it is timely to explore notions of regenerative tourism.

In **Part 2**, to explore different notion of regenerative tourism, we conducted informal discussions in Waikawa and Picton/Waitohi with key selected individuals. The purpose of this work was not to undertake a formal research study at this time, rather to assess whether there was potential for a case study in the area. Any case study would naturally be a co-designed partnership between the Department of Conservation/Te Papa Atawhai and Manawhenua, with research support from the Lincoln University Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Tourism. We found that people naturally gravitated towards regenerative tourism, though unsurprisingly, when delving deeper it becomes apparent that there are diverging views as to what it might mean in theory and practice. We identified that conversations in the study area and wider Tōtaranui/Queen Charlotte Sound should be understood and framed in the context of evidence highlighting the current state of environmental indicators in the Marlborough Sounds. The state of the environment has

been shown to be degraded by historical and current human activities, and although there are bright spots, there is general concern that the mauri of the Marlborough Sounds needs to be regenerated and the current environmental trajectory reversed. Strongly associated with this are concerns about the continuing decline of cultural values and the frustrations of tangata whenua iwi with regard to their ability to meet their post-settlement aspirations for revitalisation of 'place and people'. During various conversations it became apparent that tourism is both a contributor to environmental and social stressors, but it could also be a 'force for good' if management was aimed to restore and regenerate the different dimensions of wellbeing. This will be an ongoing challenge for the region, as there are new, much larger interisland ferries being commissioned which will increase visitor numbers. The resumption of cruise ship visits post-pandemic and the attraction of the Queen Charlotte Track and Link Pathway will add to the pressure on people and place. From these discussions, we identify that a collaboratively co-developed; long-term, inter-generational strategy is desirable to frame future development of the sector. Implementation would need to be founded upon securing a healthy and thriving natural world and build capacity as a place and community to respond to a rapidly changing world. Tourism would both 'pay it forward and back' by contributing to the wider regeneration of the area, and through ongoing restorative actions. To explore this within a place, we support the co-development of a case study in Waikawa and Picton/Waitohi by the Department of Conservation and manawhenua. We conclude by presenting two working propositions for regenerative tourism to inform those discussions.

Contents

1. Summary	3
2. Introduction to Part 1	6
3. Methodology.....	6
4. Towards a new regenerative paradigm	6
5. Sustainability and regeneration	7
5.1 Regeneration to achieve sustainability.....	7
5.2 Regeneration as an extension of sustainability	7
5.3 Regeneration as distinct from sustainability	8
6. Aims of regenerative tourism	8
6.1 Regeneration as promoting enduring positive outcomes	9
6.2 Regeneration as healing, restoring, and thriving.....	9
6.3 A regenerative continuum	9
7. Pathways to regenerative tourism.....	10
7.1 Fundamental change in perspective	10
7.2 Mauriora Systems Framework.....	11
7.3 Place-based approaches	11
7.4 Need for collaboration and co-creation.....	11
7.5 Iterative approaches	12
7.6 Diverse economies framework	12
8. Measuring progress	13
8.1 Measuring flourishing	13
8.2 Māori measures and indicators	13
8.3 Regenerative economy indicators	14
9. Regenerative tourism in the Aotearoa New Zealand policy context.....	15
10. Findings from Part 1.....	15
11. Introduction to Part 2	16
12. Situational context for discussions	16
13. Observations and insights from discussions.....	17
14. Working propositions of regenerative tourism	18
References	19
Appendix	22

2. Introduction to Part 1

The current COVID-19 pandemic has had a significant impact on tourism in Aotearoa New Zealand, effectively preventing international tourists from visiting the country. While posing significant challenges for the country, and in particular those involved in the tourism sector, the COVID-19 crisis has also provided a unique opportunity to stop and consider how tourism might be rethought and redefined post-COVID-19 (Auckland Tourism, Events, & Economic Development, 2020; Brouder et al., 2020; Glusac, 2020). This need to reconsider tourism stems from the view that in some instances current forms of tourism are unsustainable due to their environmental, social, and cultural impacts (Cave & Dredge, 2020; Pollock, 2019). Regenerative tourism is one such concept which has been put forward as a possible alternative to current forms of tourism (Ateljevic, 2020; Cave & Dredge, 2020; Pollock, 2019). The following literature review will explore the notion of regenerative tourism and in particular the way it is thought to be defined, achieved, and measured. Specific attention will be paid to how the notion of regenerative tourism might fit in Aotearoa New Zealand contexts and how it might be informed by and incorporate Māori values and knowledge.

3. Methodology

The Lincoln University LibrarySearch and Google Scholar were used to undertake this research. Search terms included: “regenerative tourism” which returned 13 results on LibrarySearch and 46 on Google Scholar; “regenerative paradigm” AND “tourism” which returned 6 results on LibrarySearch and 81 results on Google Scholar; and “regenerative paradigm” AND “Māori”, which gained 1 result on the Library Search and no results on google scholar. Having found this literature, abstracts were then read to determine whether the articles were of relevance to the study. Using a snowball sampling approach, relevant literature was also collected from the reference lists from literature found in database searches. Snowball sampling was also used to collect relevant literature from experts in the field of tourism.

4. Towards a new regenerative paradigm

The concept of regenerative tourism has gained significant attention in recent years, as have other regenerative notions such as regenerative agriculture, regenerative design, and regenerative development. It is suggested that these regenerative notions have developed in response to concerns around the effectiveness of the sustainable paradigm (Glusac, 2020; Wahl, 2018). In particular, the current sustainability paradigm has been criticised for its anthropocentric focus and mechanistic view of the world, its tendency to address dimensions of sustainability in fragmented way, and its focus on avoiding harm rather than on improving current circumstances (Ateljevic, 2020; Axinte, Mehmood, Marsden, & Roep, 2019; Gibbons, 2020; Robinson & Cole, 2015). It is also suggested that the current sustainability paradigm is problematic because it is often poorly defined (Roseland & Spiliotopoulou, 2018) and misused, reducing the potency and undermining the meaning of sustainability (Axinte et al., 2019; Ceridwen, 2007; Gibbons, 2020; J. Walter Thompson Intelligence, 2018). Furthermore, some suggest that there is a need to move beyond the notion of sustainability

as, in a complex, uncertain, and constantly changing world, it is not possible to achieve 'sustainability', that being the ability to maintain particular activities or processes in the long-term (Benson & Craig, 2014). As these criticisms have purportedly motivated the move away from sustainability and toward the regenerative paradigm (Ceridwen, 2007; Gibbons, 2020), it bears considering how the notions of regeneration and sustainability relate to and differ from one another.

5. Sustainability and regeneration

When defining the meaning and aim of regenerative tourism, some authors have compared it to other forms of tourism such as sustainable tourism, responsible tourism, or resilient tourism (Çakar & Uzut, 2020; Dwyer, 2017). These comparisons can help to distinguish regenerative tourism from other existing forms of tourism that have also been developed to address challenges posed by tourism (Çakar & Uzut, 2020). There are various views on how sustainable tourism and regenerative tourism relate to one another, which are explored in the following section, along with the idea that regenerative tourism may be able to address some of the issues that sustainable tourism has not addressed.

5.1 Regeneration to achieve sustainability

One particular view is that regeneration is an important step in achieving sustainability in the context of tourism (Cave & Dredge, 2020; Glusac, 2020; Lovins, 2016; Sheller, 2020). Cave and Dredge (2020) suggested that in order for the sustainability of both social and environmental systems to be realised there is a need for these systems to become regenerative. Similarly, it has been argued that without regeneration it is not possible to have a sustainable Earth (Glusac, 2020). What these views seem to suggest is that, in order for sustainability to be achieved, it is important that living systems are able to regenerate in the context of tourism. Becken (2019) expresses a different but related view by suggesting that, rather than being a necessary part of sustainability, the notion of regeneration may be able to help provide a clearer pathway for how to achieve sustainable tourism.

5.2 Regeneration as an extension of sustainability

One alternative view is that the concept of regenerative tourism is an extension or natural maturation of the notion of sustainable tourism (Çakar & Uzut, 2020; Pollock, 2019). According to this view, the notion of regeneration builds on the current notion of sustainability, recognising that in its current state sustainability is not sufficient for addressing the current challenges facing tourism (J. Walter Thompson Intelligence, 2018). It is suggested that, as opposed to fitting within the current form of sustainability, the current form of sustainability can be nested within the transcendent notion of regeneration (Gibbons, 2020). Rather than suggesting that other existing forms of sustainability should become redundant, it is purported that the various ways of understanding sustainability ought to be combined and built upon (Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015; Gibbons, 2020; Pollock, 2019). This is because each phase can be considered an important step in humanity's continuous process of development to better understand the world (Pollock, 2019; Robinson & Cole, 2015). It is also in recognition of the value that the more mechanistic views of sustainability have for things such as technology and engineering, while ecological perspectives to sustainability are useful in relation to living systems (Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015).

5.3 Regeneration as distinct from sustainability

Another alternative is that the notion of regeneration is quite separate or distinct from the notion of sustainability, meaning that regeneration does not contribute to the realisation of sustainability and sustainability does not contribute to the realisation of regeneration (Çakar & Uzut, 2020; De Pecol, 2016). This view of the relationship between sustainability and regeneration seems to be the least prominent, perhaps due to the belief that new or emergent concepts tend to be informed by or built upon previous ideas.

Regardless of how sustainability and regeneration are seen to relate to one another, it seems that there is widespread agreement that there needs to be a significant change from the way tourism is often currently practised (Cave & Dredge, 2020; Pollock, 2019). Whether starting afresh with a distinct new notion or incorporating it into an existing notion, there is a need to engage in conversations with those involved in and affected by tourism to determine what regenerative tourism means to people and place, what it entails, and how it might be measured (Wahl, 2018). If this is not achieved it appears that regenerative tourism may become another elusive alternative form of tourism (Brouder et al., 2020) criticised for being misused and poorly defined (Ceridwen, 2007; J. Walter Thompson Intelligence, 2018). As Wahl (2018) highlighted, this is particularly important as now that the notion of regeneration is gaining popularity amongst a variety of different sectors and industries, it is likely that some of the meaning behind the notion will be lost, at least for a time. Already there seem to be a number of examples in the literature where the terms sustainability and regeneration are used interchangeably or are defined in the same way (Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015; J. Walter Thompson Intelligence, 2018). The following sections will explore what is meant by the notion of regenerative tourism, how it might be achieved, and how it might be measured.

Interestingly, the notion of regeneration, be it in relation to regenerative sustainability (e.g., Robinson & Cole 2015) or regenerative tourism, may be more inspiring than the notion of sustainability (Andersson, 2019; Gibbons, 2020), which has been criticised for its uninspiring messages of scarcity, sacrifice, and harm reduction (Robinson & Cole, 2015). It has also been suggested that the notion of regeneration is more robust than the notion of sustainability as it encourages us to look at the world differently by reminding us that 'life is a regenerative community' (Wahl, 2018, para. 20). This is in contrast to the notion of sustainability, which is often interpreted as reminding us that we need to sustain the current state of the Earth (De Pecol, 2016), a state which it has been suggested as unsustainable (Robinson & Cole, 2015). The notion of sustaining has also been criticised by Pauly (1995) who argues that, in the case of fisheries scientists, new generations of scientists may evaluate changing states or baselines based on the state they find them in when they start their careers, thus, as states change and fisheries stocks are reduced each new generation of scientists adopts a new baseline. Pauly (1995) refers to this phenomenon, where there is gradual acceptance and accommodation of the depletion of fish stocks, as the Shifting Baseline Syndrome.

6. Aims of regenerative tourism

As with the relationship between sustainability and regeneration, there are also varying views or understandings about what the aim of regeneration is, and what regenerative tourism might aim to regenerate. The following section will examine the main perspectives on what regeneration is trying to achieve and regenerate.

6.1 Regeneration as promoting enduring positive outcomes

One prominent view is that regeneration is focussed on achieving enduring positive outcomes (Ceridwen, 2007; Robinson & Cole, 2015; Shapcott, 2020; Ulrich & Simmons, 2020). It is suggested that while sustainability is merely focussed on avoiding harm, regeneration is focussed on avoiding harm while also doing good (Axinte et al., 2019; Ceridwen, 2007; Robinson & Cole, 2015). As was highlighted above, one of the challenges with current sustainable approaches is that they often aim to sustain the current state of things, rather than improving the current state or achieving a desired state (Williams, 2020). This is seen to be problematic as it fails to address the harm that has already been caused through unsustainable activities (Robinson & Cole, 2015). Thus, according to this line of thought, it is suggested that the aim of regeneration is to avoid harm and to also help rehabilitate living systems, resulting in enduring positive outcomes, and addressing previous harms. With specific regard to tourism, Glusac (2020) suggested that regenerative travel is travel that leaves the place visited in better condition than it was prior to being visited. It seems that the challenge with this approach, alongside achieving consensus of what comprises 'improved', is ensuring that attention is paid to whole living systems, rather than just improving fragmented parts of living systems, as has been a criticism of recent sustainable approaches (Gibbons, 2020).

6.2 Regeneration as healing, restoring, and thriving

Conversely, it has been suggested that regeneration is more than just doing good and is instead about restoring or healing living systems in order to make them whole again (De Pecol, 2016; Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015; Holliday, 2020). This notion stems from the understanding that when human or natural systems are healthy they have the ability to organise, repair, and regenerate themselves (Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015). Thus, before a system can become regenerative, it must first be restored so that it is then able to self-organise and regenerate (Glusac, 2020; Shapcott, 2020). Holliday (2020) suggested that it is useful to look at such regeneration as healing as it reminds us that, unlike machines, living systems are able to heal. This can help to address the tendency to focus on factors such as speed and problem-solving, and to unintentionally employ behaviours and approaches informed by the mechanistic worldview (Holliday, 2020), a worldview which is thought to have informed much of human's exploitation of nature (Robinson & Cole, 2015). However, it is important to recognise that it is not always possible for ecosystems to heal and return to their original state, for example if critical species have been lost. Instead, ecosystems may have to return to a new state where they are able to self-organise and regenerate (Axinte et al., 2019; Benson & Craig, 2014).

Linked to this notion of healing and making whole is the view that regeneration is about creating conditions that enable life to thrive (Pollock, 2019; Wahl, 2018). This view is informed by the belief that healthy living systems are adaptive, self-organising, and regenerative, and thus living systems need to be made healthy and whole so that they can adapt and flourish (Becken, 2019; Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015; Fath, Fiscuss, Goerner, Berea, & Ulanowicz, 2019; Gibbons, 2020; Pollock, 2019).

6.3 A regenerative continuum

When viewed together, these different views of regeneration have many common properties and seem to sit along a continuum from regeneration as doing good (paying it forward and back), to regeneration as healing and making whole, to regeneration as creating conditions conducive to life. For example, doing more good than harm may be the most manageable or accessible way to begin helping living systems to become regenerative. However, it seems that at a point it becomes important to look at the bigger picture and to make sure that, when

combined, the different forms of good being done are collectively helping and the whole system to thrive, rather than just certain aspects of the system (Gibbons, 2020). If this bigger picture is not considered there is a risk that certain aspects of the system will be given greater priority than others (Gibbons, 2020; Robinson & Cole, 2015). Once natural systems are 'healed' such that they resilient to perturbation and stressors (e.g., Benson & Craig, 2014), it could then be possible to focus on sustaining the conditions conducive to life, self-renewal, and evolution.

7. Pathways to regenerative tourism

There are various views on how regenerative tourism might be achieved, including whether there will be one pathway or multiple possible pathways to reach it. The following section will explore some of the main pathways that have been proposed for achieving regeneration and in particular regenerative tourism. Though many of the ideas, frameworks, and approaches detailed below do not provide a complete pathway towards regenerative tourism, they do highlight some of the important factors that, together, may be able to create a regenerative pathway.

7.1 Fundamental change in perspective

One of the central themes that emerged from the literature about regenerative paradigms and regenerative tourism was the notion that in order to move to a more regenerative state, there first needs to be a fundamental shift in the way people view and relate to Te Taiao, Planet Earth (Axinte et al., 2019; Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015; Dwyer, 2017; Gibbons, 2020; Pollock, 2019). This notion is frequently expressed with reference to Albert Einstein who stated that "we cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them" (Auckland Tourism, Events, & Economic Development, 2020, p.2). Thus, it is argued that true transformative change will require a change in our thinking and consciousness (e.g., Ateljevic, 2020; Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015; Dwyer, 2017; Pollock, 2019).

It is suggested that to become regenerative we must shift from our current mechanistic thinking, that Planet Earth is primarily a range of individual resources which humans, separate to the natural world, have the right to use for their benefit (Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015; Pollock, 2019; Robinson & Cole, 2015). Instead, it is argued, we must begin to understand and see that Planet Earth is made up of interdependent and interconnected systems, of which humans are a part, and that when these systems are healthy they are able to adapt and self-organise, and to support each other to flourish (Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015; Meadows 2008; Pollock, 2019). However, Dwyer (2017) raised an important point when suggesting that, regardless of the type of transformation or change in tourism related planning, research, or development, a change in the tourism paradigm will occur within the context of other broader changes. It is suggested that such changes are already beginning to take place and will likely lead us to rethink the way we look at the world, reconsider findings from previous tourism studies, and revise the way tourism is taught and practiced, as the argument for a paradigm change will become irresistible (Dwyer, 2017). Though seen as somewhat inevitable, Dwyer (2017) also acknowledged that these changes will take time.

Here it is important to note that, while there is a need to fundamentally change the way many people understand and engage with the Earth, many indigenous cultures already hold views of the world that reflect a more ecological or regenerative worldview (Gibbons, 2020; Matunga et al. 2020; Ulluwishewa et al., 2008). Ulluwishewa et al. (2008) suggested that such indigenous knowledge could provide valuable insight as to how prominent notions of

sustainability might be improved and how complex challenges with resources could be better addressed. Similarly, Tourism Industry Aotearoa (2019) asserted that the way people view the natural environment will change if their thinking is influenced by a Māori view of the world. It is suggested that such a worldview could help people to see the natural world as something to be cared for rather than exploited, and therefore such views and values ought to be put into practice in the tourism industry (Tourism Industry Aotearoa, 2019). The following section will further examine how Māori knowledge, values, and practices might help to inform a regenerative approach to tourism.

7.2 Mauriora Systems Framework

This section draws freely from Matunga et al. (2020), who proposed that the Mauriora Systems Framework (MSF) (Matunga 1993) can provide a robust framework for mana whenua to work together with management agencies to jointly develop regenerative outcomes. It is suggested that the MSF is particularly beneficial in that it is uniquely suited to the Aotearoa New Zealand context, and can help to encourage greater awareness and valuing of tikanga and mātauranga Māori. The MSF conceptualises Māori tikanga and values within a present-day planning, management, and decision-making context. At the centre of this framework is the notion of mauri, a life force that exists in all living things, which can act as a signifier of health, balance, and regenerative capacity. The aim of the MSF is to protect and enhance this mauri, informed by tikanga, and determined by the kaitiaki of a place, as determined by the affected tangata whenua (Matunga, 1993). In this way, Matunga suggested that the different components of the MSF cannot be altered or misappropriated and instead remain within the specific context of Te Ao Māori. Consistent with this, it is asserted that the MSF cannot be employed independently by destination management authorities or governments who are not the affected kaitiaki, however, it is suggested that non-Māori can instead work in collaboration with Māori to identify opportunities for collective action or collective pathways forward (Matunga et al., 2020).

7.3 Place-based approaches

To understand the relationships and connections within living systems it can be useful to adopt a place-based approach (Axinte et al., 2019; Reed, 2007). In relation to regenerative design, Reed (2007) stated that such a process begins with people trying to understand how living systems work in a place. Pollock (2019) implied that a place-based approach is also necessary for regenerative tourism, highlighting that, though there will be core regenerative principles that are universally applicable, the way in which these principles are expressed in place will vary. This is perhaps unsurprising given that places tend to have their own unique social, cultural, and environmental processes. Ulluwishewa et al. (2008) highlighted that Māori have developed such place-based knowledge over centuries of learning from, interacting and connecting with the natural environment. Recognising this need for a place-based approach to regenerative tourism, there is also a need for a collaborative approach that enables the use of place-based knowledge and experience (Axinte et al., 2019; Pollock, 2019). The following section will examine this collaborative approach in more detail.

7.4 Need for collaboration and co-creation

Regenerative tourism also requires collaboration, involving governments, tourism providers, local authorities, destination management operators, iwi, host communities, and tourists themselves (Pollock, 2019; Ulrich & Simmons, 2020). A number of different reasons are given for why such collaboration is important. For example, Pollock (2019) suggested that, due to our interconnectedness and interdependence, it is important that people work together and collaborate in order to affect change in the way tourism is undertaken and in

the way that we understand and interact with the world. Ulrich and Simmons (2020) highlighted that such collaboration is also required in order to encourage resilience within host communities, that being one of the broader goals of regenerative tourism. Axinte et al (2019) also argue that, though local authorities may be able to develop regenerative policies, plans, or strategies, they need the support of all members of the community to implement and if necessary adapt and improve them. Collaboration is also said to be important for developing a broad understanding of a specific places through the use of lived knowledge and experience alongside what is often referred to as expert or technical knowledge (Axinte et al., 2019).

Visit Flanders (2018), a Belgian tourism authority, expressed a similar notion proposing that one of the key elements for achieving transformational change in the tourism sector is through collaboration. As Holliday (2019) highlights, Visit Flanders provided a good example of this kind of collaboration in practice. In response to the increasingly negative impacts that tourism was having on both people and place, the local tourism authority brought local residents together to discuss what kind of invitations they wanted to extend to visitors and what kind of principles could be employed to ensure visitor encounters were meaningful (Holliday, 2019).

7.5 Iterative approaches

Robinson and Cole (2015) suggest that at present it is not necessarily clear how to measure progress in achieving net positive outcomes, particularly in relation to important ecological, cultural, or social factors. Recognising the current gaps in knowledge and lack of tools to measure progress, it has been suggested that an iterative approach ought to be adopted (Gibbons, 2020; Visit Flanders, 2018). In this way, people will be able to continue learning and refining their actions and methodologies. Cave and Dredge (2020) highlighted that there are already numerous examples of different forms of regenerative tourism taking place across the world and that these can work as prototypes or experiments to inform future moves to more regenerative practices. Though not in reference to regenerative tourism specifically, Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (2020) suggested that to achieve transformative change in the tourism sector, there is a need for greater experimentation. The need for an iterative process is also in line with the thinking that, rather than having clear problems and solutions, living systems are complex and changeable (Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015; Gibbons, 2020; Meadows, 2008). Thus, rather than aiming to return to or achieve a certain state, it is purported that the aim is instead to ensure that systems are healthy and able to adapt to change (Axinte et al., 2019; Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015; Gibbons, 2020).

7.6 Diverse economies framework

Cave and Dredge (2020) proposed that the concept of diverse economies could help to provide a pathway towards a more regenerative form of tourism. Specifically, it is suggested that by systematically analysing alternative economic practices in tourism, by valuing and developing measures for these economic practices, and by establishing policies to support these economic practices, it is possible to move towards more sustainable, transformative forms of tourism and to reduce the current reliance on capitalist practices (Cave & Dredge, 2020). This current reliance on capitalist practices, which are said to focus heavily on growth, profit, and resource use and exploitation, is what has caused some of the current challenges with tourism including over-tourism and resource degradation (Cave & Dredge, 2020; Matunga et al. 2020). Interestingly, Brouder et al. (2020) noted that the COVID-19 lockdowns also influenced people to change their behaviour to support and sustain local

businesses, something they suggest creates value that is not recognised in traditional forms of economics but is vital for ensuring local tourism industries are more resilient.

While it seems that there is value to be had from examining and learning from alternative or diverse economies, on its own the notion of diverse economies is perhaps not sufficient in of itself to provide a framework for or pathway towards regenerative tourism.

8. Measuring progress

There is general recognition that the ways in which success is currently measured in relation to tourism need to change as part of the move to regenerative forms of tourism (Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 2019). In part, this reflected a view that current measures are problematic as they tend to focus on measures such as economic growth and increasing tourism numbers as a way of determining the success of tourism. These measures do not acknowledge the other non-monetary values that can be produced as a result of tourism, nor do these measures acknowledge the full non-monetary and monetary costs of tourism.

8.1 Measuring flourishing

Given the view that regeneration is about achieving a flourishing, adaptive, and self-enhancing system, one possible option for measuring progress is through measuring the degree to which a place, including the various parts of the living systems within the place, is thriving and flourishing. Pollock (2019) suggests that in order to be able to use these measures, it is important that these measures are developed on a community-by-community basis as thriving will look different in different places. Visit Flanders has developed a range of alternative metrics to measure progress towards a more regenerative form of tourism. These include measures of civic pride (Pollock, 2019) and 'caring capacity', which is determined by asking local host communities' attitudes towards tourism (Andersson, 2019). One of the challenges with using this measure to determine progress toward achieving regenerative tourism is that it is likely to be difficult if not impossible to separate the impacts of tourism from other impacts. As notions of regeneration tend to remind us, the world is a complex and interconnected living system (Du Plessis & Brandon, 2015).

The New Zealand Government's (2020) Wellbeing Budget framework may help to provide insights into what measures or indicators could be used to measure progress in achieving flourishing, regenerative systems. Under this framework, the Government has "committed to putting the wellbeing of current and future generations of New Zealanders at the heart of everything we do" (New Zealand Government, 2020, p.5). Progress towards achieving wellbeing is then determined using a range of indicators or measures including GDP, but also including other measures that are thought to help in determining progress in line with non-financial values such as community strength and environmental protection (New Zealand Government, 2019).

8.2 Māori measures and indicators

It has been suggested that a number of notions and practices can be used to measure progress in achieving regeneration and regenerative tourism. Ulluwishewa et al (2008) purport that Māori have various methods or practices for monitoring the health of the natural environment and the rate at which different parts of the natural environment are regenerating. They suggest that there are numerous *tohu* (indicators) which Māori use to

monitor ecosystem changes and to inform how they use and care for the natural environment (Ulluwishewa et al., 2008). Such indicators could be employed in order to help measure progress for achieving environmental regeneration.

The Māori notion of mauri is also thought to be a valuable measure of ecosystem health (Matunga 1993; Ulluwishewa et al., 2008) which it is suggested could be employed to help inform regenerative tourism (Matunga et al. 2020). According to the Māori worldview, all living things contain mauri, an essential life force. It is believed that mauri exists within all parts of ecosystems, including within people, and that if this mauri is harmed or reduced in anyway, then the health, wellbeing, balance, and regenerative capacity of the system will also be reduced (Matunga, et al. 1993; Ulluwishewa et al., 2008). Conversely, if mauri is enhanced, then it can be understood that the wellbeing and regenerative capacity of the system is also being enhanced or increased (Matunga et al. 2020; Ulluwishewa et al., 2008). In this way, it is suggested that mauri can be used as a measurement or indicator to determine whether progress is being made towards reaching a regenerative state (Matunga et al. 2020).

Te Taihū's (Top of the South Island of New Zealand) intergenerational strategy also provides a valuable example of how to measure progress in achieving complex and interconnected wellbeing outcomes (Wakatū Incorporation, 2020). The strategy outlines eight intergenerational wellbeing outcomes and a number of associated wellbeing and equity monitors to measure performance in each outcome area. The outcomes cover a wide range of themes including the natural world, economy, identity, people and communities, place, infrastructure, leadership, and knowledge. Importantly, the strategy also recognises the ways in which these different outcomes relate to or connect with one another and thus the strategy aims to address these outcomes collectively in context (Wakatū Incorporation, 2020). It seems that these wellbeing and equity monitors may be able to provide insight into how to measure regenerative tourism performance, particularly given that these monitors are informed by an understanding of the world that is largely consistent with regenerative notions about the human-natural world relationship, and by a desire to leave Te Taihū's taonga in a better condition for future generations (Wakatū Incorporation, 2020).

8.3 Regenerative economy indicators

Informed by Fath et al.'s (2019) 10 principles of a regenerative economy, Becken (2019) has developed a number of possible indicators for regenerative tourism in particular. These indicators include CO₂ emissions, resource consumption, distribution of economic benefits, enriched visitor experiences, and collective decision making. Some of these involve measuring the actual impacts on aspects such as the economy or the natural environment, while others measure actions which are thought to be linked to positive impacts. As highlighted above, it seems that there is value in adopting an iterative approach due to the complex and changeable nature of living systems, thus indicators such as these may also benefit from iterative developments or adjustments as understanding of health, restoration, and regeneration increase.

9. Regenerative tourism in the Aotearoa New Zealand policy context

While existing government and tourism industry strategies do not tend to emphasise the notion of regenerative tourism, many of the goals or aims expressed in such documents reflect goals or views related to regenerative tourism. For example, the New Zealand Aotearoa Government Tourism Strategy wants tourism to help “grow New Zealand-Aotearoa for all, improve the wellbeing of New Zealanders and to protect and restore our natural environment” (MBIE, 2019, p.2). This pre-Covid document aligns with the view that tourism that is regenerative should help to improve the health and wellbeing of both humans and the natural environment (Gibbons, 2020). Similarly, one of the primary purposes of the New Zealand Tourism Futures Taskforce, a taskforce developed to lead the way towards better long-term tourism outcomes post COVID-19, is to “advise on the broad options that will systematically align the tourism system to one that enriches both New Zealand and the wellbeing of New Zealanders, meaning that tourism will contribute more than it consumes against the four capitals: economy, society, environment and culture” (MBIE, 2020, para 12). This reflects Robinson and Cole’s (2015) notion that regenerative tourism is about creating net-positive outcomes. New Zealand Tourism Minister Stuart Nash has also acknowledged the need for change, and the importance of avoiding a return to a ‘business as usual’ form of tourism (Radio New Zealand, 2020). However, he suggests that the focus of tourism in New Zealand needs to be on sustainability and on attracting high spending and high value visitors that support this notion of sustainability, though what specifically is meant by ‘high value’ remains unclear (Radio New Zealand, 2020).

10. Findings from Part 1

The findings from this literature review suggest that currently there is no single shared view or understanding of what regenerative tourism means, what its relationship to other forms of tourism is, or how it is to be achieved and measured. However, there seems to be general agreement that the notion of regeneration needs to be accompanied by a significant change in the way tourism, and the wider place it takes place in, is viewed, understood, and related to. If this change does not occur, regenerative tourism risks becoming another variation of tourism that is criticised for greenwashing, maintaining the status quo, and unintentionally supporting unsustainable practices. This is not to say that there is not hope for regenerative tourism but that there is a need to engage in discussion now about what regenerative tourism might mean and might look like in a given place.

In order to achieve meaningful change towards regenerative tourism, there is a need for more place-based, collaborative approaches that help to develop a greater understanding of complex living systems and their interrelated and interconnected parts. Existing examples of aspiring regenerative tourism may also be able to provide useful insight into, and inspiration as to how to achieve a broader shift to regenerative tourism. In the Aotearoa New Zealand context, Māori values, views, processes, and practices can also help to contribute to more regenerative approaches to tourism. Importantly, Māori practices or frameworks such as the Mauriora Systems Framework can also provide opportunities for mana whenua to exercise rangatiratanga and for local communities and visitors to develop a greater awareness of mātauranga and tikanga Māori.

11. Introduction to Part 2

This section of the report outlines the main evolving themes as identified through an initial tranche of hui, zoom and informal conversations with iwi and various stakeholders in the region. These communications and discussions have included central and local government agencies; the RMA office of the mana and moana whenua iwi, Te Ātiawa; tourism operators; the tourism industry peak body; residents; and recreational users.

We have chosen not to attribute the views expressed to any particular sector or individual. Interestingly, it has been uncommon that any particular perspective or comment, once put forward and discussed, has not positively resonated in some way with others; it has been only the 'extent' of agreement with or priority of that statement which may have varied.

This section has been developed in isolation from the literature review to ensure the perspectives reported here are not inadvertently influenced by that literature review to equally ensure this section of the report accurately reflects the tone and tenor of the discussions.

12. Situational context for discussions

Conversations about the notion of regenerative tourism in Tōtaranui and the Marlborough Sounds should be understood and framed in the context of evidence highlighting the current state of environmental indicators. In Tōtaranui and the wider Marlborough Sounds the mauri and wairua¹ are suffering and the Marlborough Sounds are widely perceived as 'hurting'.

Strongly associated with this are concerns about the continuing decline of cultural values and the frustrations of tangata whenua iwi with regard to their ability to meet their post-settlement aspirations for revitalisation of 'place and people'.

Social wellbeing, amenity and landscape values are also being eroded over time and with visitor numbers often outweighing resident numbers, many of those values are feared to be undergoing a fundamental shift.

In considering the role and impacts of the tourism sector in Marlborough one must acknowledge the economic value the industry creates and supports and, by extension, the social values this can support. Tourism was Marlborough's eighth largest industry sector in 2019² (based on GDP³ -circa \$222.5m). It is highly probable that the figure underestimates the full measure the industry's contribution to GDP, as indirect services to the sector are poorly accounted for (e.g. vessel maintenance and repairs, fuel for self-servicing tourists).

A further backdrop to discussions are increasing concerns from governance, iwi and stakeholders (including the tourism sector) with the growing volume and impacts of tourism. These impacts effect a wide array of values (cultural, amenity, landscape, biodiversity, environmental) and the ability of supporting infrastructure to cope. The effects are felt across the Marlborough Sounds, the small servicing townships and across the road networks.

Consequently, there are critical and 'tricky' challenges in defining and (more so) establishing potential management and performance frameworks for regenerative tourism. Many of these

¹ Soul and/or Spirit

² Based on GDP. Source <https://ecoprofile.infometrics.co.nz/Marlborough%2bRegion/Tourism/TourismGdp>

³ Recognising that GDP is not a proxy for 'value' and cannot account for non-financial costs and adverse effects, nor for that matter financial costs, associated with the industry.

replicate key challenges the Sustainable Seas National Science Challenge⁴ has found regarding attempting to co-develop and implement Ecosystem-based Management in Aotearoa New Zealand). These ‘tricky’ aspects include:

- Multiple, cumulative, inter-connected and interacting effects,
- Differing and fluid scales of geographic governance, management relating to the measurement of effects,
- Temporal and spatial aspects relating to:
 - Establishing appropriate placed-based baselines and tracking performance across a range of indicators incorporating, for example, the four well-beings (environmental, cultural, social and economic), and
 - Understanding shifting baselines, particularly for qualitative measures, and
 - Understanding cumulative effects, and
 - Understanding hysteresis, including across intrinsic values.

13. Observations and insights from discussions

There are high levels of inter-connectedness between tourism activities, the physical environment within which tourism occurs and the activities and values of other users; creating ‘wicked’ problems. ‘Wicked’ problems are situations with multiple and competing goals, and uncertainty around cause-and-effect relationships (Ludwig, 2001; Berkes, 2012). A ‘messy’ context refers to problems that are interconnected – solving one problem will affect another.

The complexities of these matters, coupled with no current clear definition of regenerative tourism reflect that the concept itself is relatively new and still evolving. People also reflected on the need to recognise and ground/include important Māori tikanga ā-iwi such as kaitiakitanga⁵ and manaakitanga⁶, along with the history of the people and the place (including legends and myths).

We note that generally people believed a critical review of tourism in the Marlborough Sounds is urgently required and timely. This would be collaboratively co-developed, and the outcome would be a long-term, inter-generational strategy to frame future development of the sector. Implementation also needs to be founded upon securing a healthy and thriving natural world to build capacity as a place and community to respond to a rapidly changing world.

There was general support for further enquiry into regenerative tourism within Waikawa, Picton/Waitohi and the wider Tōtaranui/Queen Charlotte Sound. A summary table of discussions is presented in Appendix 1.

⁴ www.sustainableseaschallenge.co.nz

⁵ “Kaitiakitanga is an inherent obligation we have to our tūpuna (*ancestors*) and to our mokopuna (*grandchildren*); an obligation to safeguard and care for the environment for future generations. It is a link between the past and the future, the old and the new, between the taonga (*treasures*) of the natural environment and the tangata whenua (*local people, hosts, indigenous people of the land*).” (Selby et al., 2010)

⁶ “Manaakitanga focusses on positive human behaviour and encourages people to rise above their personal attitudes and feelings towards others and towards the issues they believe in”. “The aim is to nurture relationships and as far as possible to respect the mana of other people...” (Mead, 2016).

14. Working propositions of regenerative tourism

From the conversations, we present two propositions of regenerative tourism for further analysis and discussion:

1. A stable regenerative state: A continuing regenerative state is a state of healthful self-renewal, a self-perpetuating harmonious balance. It is an arrival point, an aspiration rather than a target and, in consequence, it is a guiding motivator for the hikoi that takes that direction – applied kaitiakitanga.”⁷
2. Regenerative tourism seeks to improve and maintain positive environmental conditions, while contributing to restoring and safeguarding the social and cultural fabric of a communities in which it is embedded. Tourism is therefore part of place and subservient to the needs of people and the environment.

⁷ Paraphrased from Shapcott (2020) Kaitiaki o Te Taiao Office, Te Ātiawa Manawhenua Ki Te Tau Ihu Trust.

References

- Andersson, J. (2019). *What is the opportunity of regenerative tourism?* Retrieved from <https://medium.com/activate-the-future/understanding-the-opportunity-of-regenerative-tourism-894136cafd3b>
- Ateljevic, I. (2020). Transforming the (tourism) world for good and (re)generating the potential 'new normal'. *Tourism Geographies*, 3, 467-475.
- Auckland Tourism, Events, and Economic Development. (2020). COVID-19: Developing a Destination AKL Recovery Plan.
- Axinte, L. F., Mehmood, A., Marsden, T., & Roep, D. (2019). Regenerative city-regions: a new conceptual framework. *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, 6(1).
- Becken, S. (2019). *Regenerative Tourism: Concept, case studies and a (brief) critique.*- unpublished work. Department of Conservation.
- Benson, M. H. & Craig, R. K. (2014). The End of Sustainability. *Policy Review*, 27(7), 777-782.
- Berkes, F. Implementing ecosystem-based management: evolution or revolution. *Fish and Fisheries* 13, 465-476.
- Brouder, P., Teoh, S., Salazar, N. B., Mostafanezhad, M., Pung, J. M., Lapointe, D., Higgins Desboilles, F., Haywood, M., Hall, M. C., & Clausen, H. B. (2020). Reflections and discussions: tourism matters in the new normal post COVID-19. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 735-746.
- Çakar, K., & Uzut, S. (2020). Exploring the stakeholder's role in sustainable degrowth within the context of tourist destination governance: the case of Istanbul, Turkey. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*. 1-6.
- Cave, J. & Dredge, D. (2020). Regenerative tourism needs diverse economic practices. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 503-513.
- Ceridwen, O. (2007). Regenerative tourism: A case study of the resort town Yulara. *Open House International*, 32(4), 42-53.
- De Pecol, C. (2016). *Global Understanding through Regenerative Tourism*. Retrieved from <https://ecohusky.uconn.edu/2016/04/01/global-understanding-through-regenerative-tourism/#>
- Du Plessis, C. & Brandon, P. (2015). An ecological worldview as basis for a regenerative sustainability paradigm for the built environment. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 109, 53-61.
- Dwyer, L. (2017). Saluting while the ship sinks: the necessity for tourism paradigm change. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(1), 29-48.
- Fath, B. D., Fiscus, D. A., Goerner, S. J., Berea, A., & Ulanowicz, R. E. (2019). Measuring regenerative economics: 10 principles and measures undergirding systemic economic health. *Global Transitions*, 1, 15-27.
- Gibbons, L. V. (2020). Regenerative – The New Sustainable? *Sustainability*, 12(13).
- Glusac, E. (2020). *Move Over, Sustainable Travel. Regenerative Travel Has Arrived*. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2020/08/27/travel/travel-future-coronavirus-sustainable.html
- Holliday, M. (2019). *Travel to Tomorrow: An Emerging Visions for the Tourism Industry*. Retrieved from michelleholliday.com/travel-to-tomorrow-an-emerging-vision-for-the-tourism-industry/
- Holliday, M. (2020). *The Opposite of Regeneration and the Need for Healing*. Retrieved from michelleholliday.com/the-opposite-of-regeneration-and-the-need-for-healing/
- J. Walter Thompson Intelligence (2018). *The New Sustainability: Regeneration' Trend Report*. Retrieved from www.jwtintelligence.com/trend-reports/the-new-sustainability-regeneration/

- Lovins, H. L. (2016). Needed: A Better Story. *Humanistic Management Journal*, 1(1), 75-90.
- Ludwig, D. 2001. The era of management is over. *Ecosystems* 4, 758-764.
- Matunga, H (1993). In C. Blackford & H. Matunga, *Social, cultural and spiritual effects of hazardous substances and new organisms*. (pp 12-20). Unpublished Report for the Ministry for the Environment. Lincoln University.
- Matunga, H., Matunga, H., & Urlich, S. C. (2020). From Exploitative to Regenerative Tourism: Tino Rangatiratanga and Tourism in Aotearoa NZ. *MAI Journal*, 9(3), 295-308. Retrieve from www.journal.mai.ac.nz/sites/default/files/MAI_Jrnl_2020_V9_3_Matunga_2.FINAL_.pdf
- Meadows, D. H. (2008). *Thinking in systems a primer* (edited by Wright, D). Chelsea Green Publishing, Vermont.
- Mead, H.M. 2016. *Tikanga Māori, Living by Maori Values*. Huia, Wellington.
- Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. (2019). *New Zealand Aotearoa Government Tourism Strategy*. Retrieved from <https://www.mbie.govt.nz/dmsdocument/5482-2019-new-zealand-aotearoa-government-tourism-strategy-pdf>
- Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. (2020). *Terms of reference for New Zealand Tourism Futures Taskforce*. Retrieved from www.mbie.govt.nz/immigration-and-tourism/tourism/tourism-recovery/tourism-futures-taskforce/terms-of-reference/
- New Zealand Government. (2019). *The Wellbeing Budget*. Retrieved from <https://www.treasury.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2019-06/b19-wellbeing-budget.pdf>
- New Zealand Government. (2020). *Wellbeing Budget 2020: Rebuilding together*. Retrieved from <https://www.treasury.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2020-05/b20-wellbeing-budget.pdf>
- Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 2019. *Pristine, popular ... imperilled? The environmental consequences of projected tourism growth*. Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, Wellington.
- Pauly, D. (1995). Anecdotes and the shifting baseline syndrome of fisheries. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 10(10), 430.
- Pollock, A. (2019). *Regenerative Tourism: The Natural Maturation of Sustainability*. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/activate-the-future/regenerative-tourism-the-natural-maturation-of-sustainability-26e6507d0fcb>
- Radio New Zealand. (2020). *Government looks to minimise costs of tourism to New Zealanders*. Retrieved from <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/political/430795/government-looks-to-minimise-costs-of-tourism-to-new-zealanders>
- Reed, B. (2007). Shifting from 'sustainability' to regeneration. *Building Research & Information*, 35(6), 674-680.
- Robinson, J. & Cole, R. J. (2015). Theoretical underpinnings of regenerative sustainability. *International Journal of Research, Development and Demonstration*, 43(2), 133-143.
- Roseland, M. & Spiliotopoulou, M. (2018). Sustainability in North America: The Canadian Experience. In: R. Brinkmann & S. Garren (Ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Sustainability*, (pp. 635-652).
- Selby, R., Moore, P.J.G., Mulholland, M. (eds) (2010) *Māori and the Environment: Kaitiaki*. Huia, Wellington.
- Shapcott, I. (2020). *Net Enduring Restorative Outcomes* – unpublished kaupapa of the Te Ātiawa o Te Waka a Maui Rohe Management Office, Waikawa, NZ
- Sheller, M. (2020). Reconstructing tourism in the Caribbean: connecting pandemic recovery, climate resilience and sustainable tourism through mobility justice. *Journal of sustainable tourism*, 1-14.

- Tourism Industry Aotearoa. (2019). *Tourism 2025 & Beyond*. Retrieved from https://tia.org.nz/assets/Tourism-2025/59e63f563b/TIA_T2025+B-Doc_A4_v11.pdf
- Ulluwishewa, R., Roskrugge, N., Harmsworth, G., & Antaran, B. (2008). Indigenous knowledge for natural resource management: a comparative study of Māori in New Zealand and Dusun in Brunei Darussalam. *GeoJournal*, 73, 271-284.
- Ulrich, S. & Simmons, D. (2020). *Regenerative Tourism: Towards place-based net enduring restorative outcomes* – unpublished work. Lincoln University.
- Visit Flanders. (2018). *Travel to tomorrow*. Retrieved April 14, 2020, from https://issuu.com/toerismevlaanderen/docs/2018_toertrans_mag_210x260mm_en_web
- Wahl, C. (2018). 'Regeneration' hits the mainstream, but what about the deeper practice? Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@designforsustainability/regeneration-hits-the-mainstream-but-what-about-the-deeper-practice-746c4aa7ea1b>
- Wakatū Incorporation. (2020). *Tūpuna Pono: Being Good Ancestors*. Retrieved from www.tetauihu.nz
- Williams, S. (2020). *Whole industry needs to take sustainable tourism journey* – TIA. Retrieved from <https://www.tourismticker.com/2020/10/09/whole-industry-needs-to-take-sustainable-tourism-journey-tia/>

Appendix

The table below records the key themes and associated discussion points from informal conversations held in late 2020.

Arising Discussion Points:	Broad Description:	Further Discussion Points:
<p>1. Definition of Regenerative Tourism.</p>	<p>When we talk about Regenerative Tourism, what is it we are referring to, in terms of both Activities and Outcomes.</p> <p>What are the elements/dimensions we should be seeking to regenerate in a Regenerative Tourism context?</p> <p>How do we consider, and the manage effects across different geographical and temporal scales?</p> <p>The definition of Tourism (and Tourists) in the Marlborough Sounds is multi-faceted and varies based on perspective.</p> <p>The below discussion point ('Destination or Journey?') is a critical philosophical question, the answer to which largely determines whether Regenerative Tourism is a perpetually looping and renewing process or a definitively achieved set of outcomes.</p> <p>As it stands, currently there appears to be consensus that a Regenerative Tourism state would be something that exists in a state of constant renewal.</p> <p>All discussion points outlined in this document will help inform the definition and, similarly, inform development pathway options and management and performance frameworks.</p>	<p>There is neither a consistent nor agreed definition across Aotearoa New Zealand of Regenerative Tourism. The process of developing such a definition will need to engage multiple parties and perspectives.</p> <p>When considering tourism and tourists in the Marlborough Sounds context what activities, undertaken by whom, are we referring to?</p> <p>There are the clear and obvious examples of tourism where people that enter/travel through the Marlborough Sounds do so by a particular means of transport and/or undertake a particular activity(s), like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cruise Ship passengers. • Interisland ferry passengers. • Take a guided cruise and/or tour. • Walk the -or part of the- Queen Charlotte Track. • Stay overnight in a lodge or other rented accommodation. <p>In other scenarios it is clear whether activities are tourism or recreational. This is the case where visitors to the Marlborough Sounds are more 'self-catering' and don't rely (or don't rely heavily) of the provision of what we might consider to be Sounds-based tourism services. This group are more likely to undertake a variety of activities. Examples in this group are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People residing permanently outside the area that undertake day trips to the Sounds with their own water-borne transport (launch/runabout) when holidaying in the region, but not staying in the Sounds. • People residing outside the area with vessels kept in/on Marina berths or mooring in the areas who do not reside permanently in the Sounds but spend multiple days in the Sounds on their vessels. • People that own a holiday home or bach in the Sounds that reside permanently in Marlborough. • People that own a holiday home or bach in the Sounds that do not reside permanently in Marlborough.

		<p>Many in this second grouping may not consider themselves 'tourists', while others do.</p> <p>The <i>immediate</i> response to 'what is we might seek to regenerate' varies greatly based on perspective; ranging from regenerating the tourism sector itself as an economic (profit) proposition through to ensuring tourism activities provide for the regeneration of the wellbeing of the natural environment and associated cultural and community values.</p> <p>Amongst other things, spatial and temporal considerations lead to questions regards the appropriateness and management of offsets, and the scales at which these might be applied. For instance; where adverse effects of a tourism 'event' occur in one place and cannot be avoided/mitigated at the place, is it appropriate to 'offset' those effects with a positive event elsewhere? And, if so, is there a limit to the geographic scale at which that offsetting might occur?</p> <p>Considering all these, and other, aspects will help establish management and performance frameworks.</p>
<p>2. Regenerative Tourism; a Destination or Journey?</p>	<p>Or, more likely, both.</p> <p>The subject of potential pathway(s) to achieving a Regenerative Tourism state is regularly raised. In essence the key question here is; "<i>Is it possible, in practice, to arrive at a truly regenerative state?</i>". Or, in other words; '<i>is there an end point when we can all stop?</i>'.</p> <p>With messy problems in a wicked, fast moving and constantly changing world no single state of being exists for more than a moment in time. The <i>process and outcomes</i> of defining and delivering Regenerative Tourism (principles, values, objectives, metrics) must be constantly reviewed and renewed. This will require high levels of engagement and collaboration with co-governance and co-management with iwi and stakeholders to gain the necessary long term commitment.</p> <p>Working propositions/tentative definitions:</p>	<p>The current declining state of much of the natural world, including the Marlborough Sounds, provides the context for this discussion point.</p> <p>This has led to a developing mantra around the processes to Protect, Restore and Enhance¹⁰ the natural world before true regeneration can occur.</p> <p>Any place, with its accompanying social, cultural and economic values, cannot reach a regenerative state unless the environment (as the critical enabler of wellbeing of those values) is healthy and in a regenerative state.</p> <p>Across the Marlborough Sounds there exists a range of environmental states when it comes to ecological health and function. It may be possible to, at a smaller scale, move the more healthy small-scale environments directly from protect to regenerating.</p> <p>If we focus on achieving wellbeing for the natural environment, social, cultural and economic wellbeing will follow a similar</p>

¹⁰ Paraphrased: Kaitiaki o Te Taiao Office, Te Ātiawa Trust, 2020

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While acknowledging there remain questions and work-ons regards specificity⁸, the following best summarises Regenerative Tourism, as a synthesis of those conversed with; “A stable regenerative state: A continuing regenerative state is a state of healthful self-renewal, a self-perpetuating harmonious balance. It is an arrival point, an aspiration rather than a target and, in consequence, it is a guiding motivator for the hiko that takes that direction – applied kaitiakitanga.”⁹ • More recently the following was developed; “Regenerative tourism seeks to improve and maintain positive environmental conditions, while contributing to restoring and safeguarding the social and cultural fabric of a community that it is part. Tourism is therefore part of place and subservient to the needs of people and the environment.” 	<p>(though perhaps lagging) trajectory towards wellbeing (given humans reliance on the natural environment).</p> <p>Regardless, building towards Regenerative Tourism requires a sound strategy and associated implementation plans with review and reset periods defined.</p> <p>It also requires strong political, iwi, community leadership and champions.</p> <p>There needs to be developed amongst governance, management and stakeholder groups an ethos of constant scanning and improvement in terms of policy, legislation, monitoring and practice. This needs to be enabled with appropriate management infrastructure and demonstration of appropriate behaviours.</p>
<p>3. Are there Principles & Values of Regenerative Tourism and, if so, what might they be and how do we keep ‘the list’ current?</p>	<p>Yes, there are Principles and Values that consistently arise through discussions held to-date. They are noted in the next column.</p> <p>When managing in circumstances which constantly evolve and/or change and the detail can become overwhelming. Adopting a set of high-level principles and values can help frame and test the development of desired outcomes and supporting setting of objectives and decision making. They become the yardstick for management.</p> <p>Principles and Values focus on the important ‘things’ we want to achieve as outcomes from a process and, importantly, how we will achieve them. Bottom-lines can also be included within that context.</p> <p>They do not have the same level of specificity as objectives or performance indicators.</p> <p>Emotionally and intellectually, people (from across governance and stakeholder sectors) need to be collectively¹¹ taken on the</p>	<p>Nature has THE voice.</p> <p>Humans ground their behaviours around the principles of kaitiakitanga and manaakitanga.</p> <p>Initial action premised upon ‘do less harm’ moving to a ‘do no harm’ paradigm.</p> <p>Though there is an issue with the ‘do less harm’ approach. If tourism has degraded a place, doing less harm may alleviate but not stem the degradation.</p> <p>‘Learn by Doing’, with aspiration setting and mobilisation/implementing occurring concurrently.</p> <p>Te ao Māori approach and indigenous philosophies must be bought into the broader perspective. This should include, where appropriate, cultural indicators.</p>

⁸ For example, in this definition; there seems to be tension between ‘stable’ and continuing, a number of terms undefined, such as “healthful self-renewal” (what does that look like?); self-perpetuating harmonious balance (what does that mean?) and balance between what exactly?

⁹ Paraphrased; Kaitiaki o Te Taiao Office, Te Ātiawa Trust, 2020

¹¹ Adopting a collective and collaborative approach helps strengthen social processes and outcomes.

	<p>journey; communication and education must form a critical part of the mahi.</p>	<p>Holistic and integrated philosophic approach to management (different 'drivers' related to each other; e.g. marketing associated with environmental impacts associated with cultural values).</p> <p>Protect, Enhance and Restore ethos to all we do. This does not preclude advancing economic outcomes but rather doing so in a manner that also delivers outcomes supporting the Protect, Enhance and Restore ethos.</p> <p>Recognises inter-generational equity (across multiple criteria) with a 'gifts and gains' approach; always gifting to nature and future generations.</p> <p>Handling of matters associated with scale and offsetting will require overarching principles to frame (e.g. how to handle the costs and impacts of international travel).</p> <p>We should be moving from an idiom of growth. Tourism has been perceived and clean and light touch industry. There is broadening acknowledgement that this is not the case.</p> <p>Education is often mentioned as a critical aspect (and often alongside 'respect'). Education and communication processes and outcomes will likely benefit from high-level principles.</p> <p>Educating 'captive' audiences (e.g. on organised tours, transport) is an easier task than those whom are largely self-catering. There are opportunities to develop a new marketing paradigm centred on Regenerative Tourism.</p>
<p>4. What are the (broad) Outcomes sought from Regenerative Tourism initiatives?</p>	<p>The types of outcomes sought from Regenerative Tourism include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mauri and Wairua of the Marlborough Sounds and its' people are thriving. • Tourism actively contributes to improved Cultural and Social outcomes. • The effects of tourism activities are individually and collectively understood, and a plan is developed to move the sector through the Protect, Enhance, and Restore paradigms. • In achieving the above, the Tourism sector in the Marlborough Sounds becomes understood and valued by local communities. 	<p>All outcomes must be Papatūānuku centric (nature is THE primary stakeholder), outcomes must lead towards Papatūānuku thriving.</p> <p>There is strong sentiment that people need to thrive alongside Papatūānuku, though what this means varies.</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environmental wellbeing are both tracking poorly in the Marlborough Sounds¹².</p> <p>For the 2019 year, tourism was the 8th largest industry in Marlborough (measured in terms of GDP, 7.3% of total GDP). Tourism GDP grew 5.8% compared to an overall growth of 2.8% for that year).</p>

¹² Marlborough District Council, State of Environment reporting.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That, as a bottom-line, the tourism industry is economically and environmentally sustainable. <p>There will be more. In terms of defining and aligning supporting objectives and specific indicators for these types of outcomes, it is too early in the process to achieve that, though some common themes do evolve and are discussed below.</p>	<p>There is concern regards the growth of tourism and associated impacts on a range of values. A Regenerative Tourism strategy with outcomes closely linked to and supporting better environmental, social and cultural outcomes is required.</p> <p>Regenerative Tourism likely creates a more stable and enduring economic paradigm.</p> <p>Any such strategy should speak to the Te Taihū: Intergenerational Strategy¹³ and the Kotahitanga mō te Taiao Strategy¹⁴</p> <p>Looking for outcomes that are aspirational and inter-generational with practical on the ground practice today moving us towards that aspiration.</p> <p>Part of broader DOC focus to Up-weight Destination Marketing, develop Destination Management Plans and Destination Capability and Development.</p>
<p>5. How do we know we are on the pathway(s) to successful implementation of Regenerative Tourism; Measurement Frameworks.</p>	<p>Measuring progress towards achieving a Regenerative Tourism state requires establishing an ongoing monitoring regime (including establishing past and present baselines alongside desired future states?) of relevant information and knowledge (quantitative and qualitative) with underpinning data able to be efficiently updated.</p> <p>Discussions to date highlight that such frameworks must include a broad suite of indicators aligned with the key outcomes sought and the values that different sectors and stakeholders deem important.</p>	<p>A broad range of indicators will need to be developed to manage and assess progress towards Regenerative Tourism.</p> <p>A practical, and likely staged, approach needs to be adopted.</p> <p>All parties must be engaged in development and maintenance (management) of such a framework.</p> <p>We can start now with some low hanging fruit.</p>
<p>i. Objectives (Specific)</p>	<p>While recognising that determining and working towards specific objectives is important, most people spoken with to date recognise it is too early in the process to be considering specific objectives.</p>	<p>Objectives must link to Definition and be evolve alongside future conversations.</p> <p>Some initial focus areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecosystems (not just 'significant' ecosystems) are Protected, Enhanced and Restored. Recognise that humans are part of any ecosystem; social and socio-economic revitalisation is important. Industry sector is 'sustainable'.

¹³ See <https://www.tetauihu.nz/#mihi-welcome>

¹⁴ See <https://www.doc.govt.nz/contentassets/cf2bf2f877544dc29594442365ca797c/kotahitanga-mo-te-taiao-strategy.pdf>

<p>ii. Performance Indicators Metrics</p>	<p>Specific metrics to plan (set targets) for, monitor and review progress towards achieving Regenerative Tourism objectives.</p> <p>Set realistic (SMART¹⁵) targets for indicators across a range of categories, including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity and ecological function and wellbeing • Cultural wellbeing (multi-cultural) • Social wellbeing • Financial inputs and outputs <p>Incorporate the full of cost and benefit of tourism activity across those indicators.</p> <p>Reflect a progressive, iterative approach based on mix of pragmatism and stretch/aspirational targets.</p> <p>Understanding existing baseline measures for critical indicators important.</p>	<p>Look at whether aligning with Treasury's Wellbeing Framework is sensible and how that might be developed.</p> <p>Baselines required across a range of metrics for different dimensions and values (environmental, social, cultural, economic).</p> <p>We should consider moving away from an anthropocentric model for measuring success. If we are to put Te Taiao first, then economic indicators should be set within/as a subset of cultural and social wellbeing's.</p> <p>Part of the Regenerative Tourism journey is changing behaviours, therefore Regenerative Tourism measures need to extend well beyond economic (GDP) indicators.</p> <p>Could eventually develop an element activity-based management (based on modelling anticipated outcomes of certain activities in certain sectors) in association with more qualitative measures.</p> <p>A part of this is addressing concerns emerging regarding overcrowding, capacity of supporting infrastructure (of which nature is the most critical), the social licence to operate and the need to understand what values are being adversely impacted.</p> <p>Regenerative Tourism needs to demonstrate positive outcomes beyond a simple supporting of environmental initiatives.</p> <p>It seems likely that managing to Carrying Capacity concepts (for a range of indicators and at different scales) should be a key metric.</p> <p>Cultural indicators play an important role, while recognising that as a result of accelerating rate of climate change, some traditional indicators may no longer be as relevant. That said, the management philosophy associated with those indicators remains relevant and this scenario offers opportunity to further explore mātauranga Māori and more western based management philosophies.</p> <p>The Marlborough Marine Futures process is recognised as having done a good job establishing the different community and marine environment values and there may be lessons to be learnt looking at that process and outcomes.</p> <p>Starting is important (It is a Journey?).</p>
--	---	--

¹⁵ SMART; **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**elevant, **T**imely)

iii. Offsets	Is it appropriate that the adverse effects of an activity be 'compensated' for, say, with a financial contribution to 'a fund' which may (or may not) help mitigate those direct effects and/or used to support enhancement or restoration of ecosystems not function connected to where those adverse impacts were given effect to?	<p>Many people, given the current state of ecological wellbeing, believe offsetting is inappropriate and the focus should be on avoiding, or at least mitigating, in-situ.</p> <p>If offsetting is to be used (particularly through the form of financial contributions), then the people most strongly associated with where to adverse impacts occur feel those funds should be applied to that place.</p> <p>Management at larger scales however suggests that, at times, 'sacrifices' need to be made.</p> <p>Concern that such an approach seems to 'permit' (or accept) adverse effects in one place over another.</p> <p>Does there need to be a close geographic association or ecosystem connectivity between the where the effect and the offsetting occur?</p> <p>Does there need to be a close association between the type of effect and the type of offsetting?</p> <p>May not necessarily be a financial contribution, but there may be times this is appropriate (could be called a 'guilt' tax!).</p>
Who needs to be involved; why, what role(s) do they have and how do they become and stay engaged?		
i. Governance		<p>Treaty Partners Agencies (DOC, MBIE, MfE, MPI, MDC, others?) Tourism Industry sector</p>
ii. Stakeholders		<p>Iwi, hapū, whanau NGO's, local and national 'Most' impacted (therefore aware?) communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inter-generational sounds families • Permanent residents • Bach owners • Landowners • Youth¹⁶ <p>Random community members¹⁷. Tourism Sector and other closely associated businesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport providers

¹⁶ Marlborough secondary schools run a variety of courses interacting with/covering environmental matters. May pay to interview students in those courses and those from families making a living and/or regularly recreating in the Marlborough Sounds.

¹⁷ Careful consideration here. Most people not informed or aware of Marlborough Sounds management issues outside of aquaculture, fishing (Scallops and Blue Cod) and sedimentation.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodation providers (in Marlborough Sounds) • Experience providers (kayaking, eco-tourism, other guides) • Hospitality sector, small centres/towns • Outward Bound <p>Forestry Owners, Marine Farmers, Commercial Fishers</p>
iii. Ambassadors	Idea floated that if/as projects proceed an 'Ambassador' type role could be created to facilitate communication and education across a broad range of stakeholders.	
6. Learning by doing; an argument for Case Study development.	Though in part a principle this point was raised consistently and worthy highlighting.	<p>We can't afford to be the possum caught in the headlights.</p> <p>Develop strategy with concurrent short term development projects which can in turn help test and informed strategy development.</p> <p>This also helps generate interest and support.</p> <p>We don't know if some things can work until we try, so don't be afraid to DO something (in a considered way); then review and improve.</p> <p>Replicable and up-scalable initiatives should be tested/prototyped.</p>