

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: FOR YOUR INFO: tourism preferences measure assessment template  
**Date:** Wednesday, 31 May 2017 10:54:07 a.m.  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

Hi [REDACTED]

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

As discussed, I think it would be a good idea if the team had a chat with [REDACTED] from DoC on tourism data. Her email is:

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]@doc.govt.nz

Have a read too of paper 3n Tourism Statistics discussed at the UN Statistical Commission this year:

<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/48th-session/documents/>

The bottom line is that there is widespread interest in measuring the impacts and pressures from tourism on the environment, but the questions that we are trying to answer are not yet defined and therefore there is no established methodology. Hence, all there is comes under body of evidence. There is no indicator because there are no agreed statistics or methods.

Regards

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 31 May 2017 10:01 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]@mfe.govt.nz; [REDACTED]@stats.govt.nz  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]@mfe.govt.nz  
**Subject:** RE: FOR YOUR INFO: tourism preferences measure assessment template

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

Hi [REDACTED]

Some comments below.

Adam, the DOC survey of New Zealanders doesn't sound like a goer? See thread below.

There must be some DOC admin data on visits to national parks, use of DOC huts etc. But DOC publicly uses the IVS to output international visitors to great walks, and its survey of New Zealanders to output domestic visitors to great walks.

As an alternative to the IVS, so far we have:

- Actual annual international visitor counts, by length of stay, and port/airport of arrival – International Travel and Migration
- Guest nights and length of stay by region and RTO (I think this is both domestic and international visitors, but not sure) – Accommodation survey

The pressure topic we are trying to measure is 'Resource use and management and other human activities – the pressure placed on land by rural and urban land use and management and the extraction and use of minerals and other resources.' YUK

Cheers

Withheld under  
section 9(2)(a)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@mfe.govt.nz]

**Sent:** Wednesday, 31 May 2017 9:00 AM

Withheld under  
section 9(2)(a)

**To:** [REDACTED]@stats.govt.nz>; [REDACTED]  
<[REDACTED]@mfe.govt.nz>

**Subject:** RE: FOR YOUR INFO: tourism preferences measure assessment template

Withheld under  
section 9(2)(a)

Hi [REDACTED],

Thanks heaps for your feedback – I think this one really needs some more thought to be developed into an indicator. I'd be keen to have a chat with you next time you're at MfE.

Some of my answers are below in red.

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@stats.govt.nz]

Withheld under  
section 9(2)(a)

**Sent:** Tuesday, 30 May 2017 5:59 p.m.

**To:** [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: FOR YOUR INFO: tourism preferences measure assessment template

Withheld under  
section 9(2)(a)

Thanks [REDACTED]

My gut is that the pressure template won't pass in its current state. As currently construed, it seems an indirect measure of a (somewhat gnarly) topic, and therefore of the pressure being placed on the land. As I looked more into this, though, I could see why you decided to frame the measure around the IVS. **Yip if it's an indirect measure can we even use it?** I think there is indirect in the sense of being a solid measure of part of a topic only, and indirect in the sense of being at best a proxy measure of a concept within the topic. For EA 2015, the topics were tighter so we did have a lot of indirect measures in the first sense. I think this one is indirect in the second sense.

For visitor counts, how about using the actual visitor arrival data instead? We have this data from Stats NZ's [International Travel and Migration dataset](#), derived from information contained in electronic records supplied by the New Zealand Customs Service, as well as from arrival and departure cards completed by passengers. This would work better for a map and be far more accurate. It outputs visitor numbers and change in visitor numbers, as well as some characteristics of those visitors, e.g. length of stay, and the NZ port/airport where they arrived. **I didn't consider this because it didn't look at the regions visited and the activities they participated in (which is what I thought we wanted from this indicator).** I'm not sure how we could do a map unless we just **showed the arrivals into the international airports.** Yes, I get it. It's the 'activities they participated in' which is stretching things a bit, especially given the IVS is a sample survey. We are having to infer quite a lot about the pressure being placed on land on the activities a sample of people are self-reporting. This is where the accommodation survey may come in useful as an alternative to the IVS– it shows regions where people are staying. Although I would need to check in what sense this is a survey/ what the sample frame is, and of course it would be solidly talking around the pressure.

For more location specific data we may have to resort to the IVS. I see DOC uses the IVS to output visitor numbers to its Great Walks, which is in its favour, but the IVS response rate could be a con (do you know what this is, I couldn't find it in my searches). The sample is 8,900 which I assumed was the response rate, but would need to check. Response rate is what proportion of the 8900 sample actually completed the survey. Stats surveys normally have 85% plus response rate (partly because our surveys are compulsory). If considerably less than this responded to the survey, these people will have particular characteristics and not be representative of the population. I noted the methodological info went into a bit of detail about the two-pronged weighting that had to be applied, so it's a bit of an issue. Time series seems problematic given all the design changes over the years. Agreed

We would want to include in the measure domestic visitors as well, perhaps from DOC's annual survey of New Zealanders. The domestic visitor survey finished in 2012 so I didn't include it. The DOC annual survey of NZ'ers is more about their use and enjoyment of/attitudes toward PCL – is this how we want to frame this indicator? The sample size for 2016 was only 4,131. Their methodology is different before 2013 as well. They do break it down to specific recreation areas visited (e.g. Tongariro, Cathedral Cove etc). Ok. But we do need total visitors in this indicator, right? I wondered whether any information from the [Accommodation Survey](#) could shed insight into travel plans I guess we still need to figure out what we are trying to tell.. the pressure on infrastructure? Not infrastructure no. The pressure has to be on the land itself, as per the PSI framework (or how we are using it). But tourism infrastructure in itself is a pressure on the land environment...

FYI: I've double checked my initial concerns with Adam, who says relating the IVS to environmental domains is difficult, but he will look more closely into this tomorrow. Thanks [REDACTED], could you also see what his thoughts are on the DOC survey of NZ'ers as well? I'll copy him into this email.

Cheers

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@mfe.govt.nz]

**Sent:** Tuesday, 30 May 2017 2:28 PM

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

**To:** [REDACTED]@mfe.govt.nz>

**Cc:** [REDACTED]@stats.govt.nz>; Wes Patrick

<[REDACTED]@mfe.govt.nz>

**Subject:** FOR YOUR INFO: tourism preferences measure assessment template

Hi all

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

As per advice from [REDACTED] I've divided the indicators into two separate ones

- Pressure which includes the areas visited and the activities international visitors participated in (e.g. going to national parks)
- Impact which is the economic benefits and includes the expenditure

Happy to hear your thoughts and figure out what the 'story' is.

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

@ [REDACTED]: Data is available to download now if you want to update your tracker.

Withheld under section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] – let's discuss at the next team meeting if it's possible to get a regional breakdown of the expenditure from the database (<http://nzdotstat.stats.govt.nz/wbos/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=TABLECODE7574#>)

Cheers

Withheld under section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 30 May 2017 10:52 a.m.  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FOR YOUR REVIEW: tourism preferences measure assessment template

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

Hi [REDACTED]

Here's what I want to discuss this afternoon:

Measure assessment template - travel patterns of international visitors.docx  
<http://tepuna.mfe.govt.nz/otcs/cs.dll/properties/8840184>

- I suggest we change the name from tourism preferences to something else – perhaps travel patterns of international visitors or something similar.
- I need help figuring out which topic this goes under, the travel patterns stuff (areas visited and activities participated in) seems to be a pressure, but if we include economic expenditure information then it seems to be moving into the impact category.
- The activities participated in also included visits to national parks – yay!

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

[REDACTED]: I've attached this in case you have any input. It looks like it's been assessed as a Tier1 statistic already by StatsNZ, so hopefully QA will be pretty smooth.

Cheers

Withheld under section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]

Withheld under section 9(2)(a)

[REDACTED], **Environmental Reporting**  
Ministry for the Environment – Manatu Mo Te Taiao  
Mobile: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED]@mfe.govt.nz Website: [www.mfe.govt.nz](http://www.mfe.govt.nz)  
No.3 The Terrace, PO Box 10362, Wellington 6143

View the latest Environmental Reporting releases at: <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/more/environmental-reporting>

MfE\_logo

\*\*\*\*\*

Please Note: The information contained in this e-mail message and any attached files may be confidential information, and may also be the subject of legal professional privilege. It is not necessarily the official view of the Ministry for the Environment. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this e-mail is unauthorised. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail and delete the original. Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*

Released under the Official Information Act 1982