This is a pre-published version of

Loehr, J., Addinsall, C., & Weiler, B. (2019). Understanding how context affects resilience and its consequences for sustainable tourism. In S. F. McCool & K. Bosak (Eds.), *A Research Agenda for Sustainable Tourism* (pp. 39-52). Cheltenham UK, Northampton, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

This chapter builds on the thinking and frameworks of previous literature and this book's earlier chapters, to examine how context can both constrain and facilitate resilience and sustainability in tourism. We use Vanuatu as an example to illustrate the theoretical concepts and finalise with a research agenda for future studies in this area.

1.0 Definitions, concepts and frameworks

An underlying assumption of this chapter is that tourism often has a high reliance on the natural and cultural environment, at scales ranging from a particular attraction (e.g. a national park or coastal/marine reserve) to a region or landscape (e.g. an island or mountain range) to an entire political entity (e.g. a state, province or country). As it facilitates interaction between visitors and the place they come to visit, a tourism destination can thus be regarded as a complex Social-Ecological System (SES), also described as human-environmental system (Ostrom, 2009), in that it includes both natural and societal resources (Becken, 2013; Ostrom, 2009). There has been increasing interest and demand in applying systems and socio-ecological approaches in tourism research (Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004; Mai & Smith, 2015; Ruiz-Ballesteros, 2011), highlighting the need to integrate the planning and management of the socio-cultural and the natural environmental elements of tourism (Cole & Browne, 2015; Heslinga et al., 2017).

When defining tourism as an SES, it should be acknowledged that tourism is a subsystem of a larger system (Boguslaw, 2001) and that it can be split into ever smaller subsystems, also referred to as system hierarchy (Skyttner, 1996). Therefore, the human and environmental elements of any destination will influence and be influenced by links to systems at scales above and below it in the hierarchy. In this chapter, we use the term scale to refer to a range between the broader system, e.g. at an international level, through to a narrow (e.g. local) system. Lew (2014) defined scales of tourism interest scaling from that of the entrepreneur to those that are publicly shared. Pressures for change occur at a variety of scales, whereby some may impact an individual entrepreneur, while others may

impact an entire community or social group (Lew, 2014). The appropriate scale for analysis of a tourism system should be chosen based on the problem under investigation.

Like any complex SES, the capacity for resilience, i.e. the ability to react to unexpected or unpredictable shocks and changes, is necessary for the effective functioning and development of tourism destinations (Ruiz-Ballesteros, 2011) and the capacity for sustainability for conserving what is valued by community members (Lew et al., 2016). A key element of managing for both sustainable and resilient destinations (see Lew et al., 2016 for a discussion on the two concepts) is understanding *context*, particularly the underlying processes and social interactions that take place between stakeholders at different scales of the system, as these influence stability and the capacity to adapt to change. By context we mean any number of biophysical, geographical, political, cultural or social factors and systems that independently and collectively distinguish a particular tourism destination. Of course, the influence of context on sustainability and resilience will be different at different scales.

Of particular relevance to this chapter's focus on context, there is a need to understand power and power relations, culture, and "cultural values, historical context and ethical standpoints of the kinds of actors involved" (Cote & Nightingale, 2012, p.480). Understanding goals and underlying values will help determine preferred resilience and sustainability approaches for the destination (Lew et al., 2016). For example, belief systems and practices that devalue and disempower women in decision-making will compromise capacity for long-term resilience (Cohen et al., 2016), particularly for sectors that are highly reliant on female knowledge, abilities, resources and networks (e.g. the local handicraft sector in Nepal, or the beach/resort massage sector in Bali). On the other hand, cultures with strong community values and extensive family ties can rely on those support networks for assistance in times of crisis, enhancing their capacity for resilience. An example is Samoa where tourism operators are strongly influenced by the Samoan belief system and Samoan way of life emphasising family values, social networks and reciprocity, all of which can serve as support in times of disruption (Parson et al., 2017). Assessing how these contextual characteristics are institutionalised and expressed at different scales of the tourism SES will allow understanding and harnessing of the underlying system structures.

In addition, there is a range of forces or drivers of change to the SES that influences a host destination's sustainability and resilience in the face of evolving tourism development. Drivers can be external to the chosen scope of a tourism SES, that is, influenced by a system at a higher scale (e.g. something that happens in the broader political system), or can be internal to the system under investigation itself (e.g. a change in aviation policy or services). In order to manage tourism SES in a way that it is not only sustainable but also resilient, any drivers and their impacts need to be understood. System thinkers have identified and discussed the notion of slow and fast variables (e.g. Crepin, 2007; Walker et al., 2012). Fast variables are usually those of concern to the users of the system, while slow variables shape fast variables and determine how these react to external drivers (Walker et al., 2012). In a tourism context, Lew (2014) introduced the scale, change and resilience (SCR) model, which highlights that change occurs at different rates and affects actors at different scales within the system, creating different contextual situations. As such, forces can occur as slow-change drivers (something that may take years or decades to have impact that is obvious and widespread) and fast-change drivers (an event that has a sudden and immediate impact) (Lew, 2014; Lew et al., 2016). Here, we build on this model by differentiating what happens within the system under investigation (internal), and at systems at a higher level in the hierarchy (external). An example of an external slow-change driver is climate change, while an example of an internal slow-change driver is demographic change within a destination. Slow-change drivers sometimes manifest as fast-change drivers (e.g. more frequent or extreme weather and natural events due to climate change; sudden epidemics that are possible, more likely or more widespread due to global human population movement). A terrorist attack is an example of an external fast-change driver, while a political coup is an example of an internal fast-change driver. Of course, separation into external vs internal is not straightforward as it depends on the scale of analysis. These forces may or may not impact the SES in other locations as well, but outcomes will be different due to the context of the system, which can then influence how the system reacts to those changes. For example, the response to a volcanic eruption or even a change of government will in part depend on the belief and value system of actors involved in the SES, the strength of social reciprocal networks, their perceptions of risk and their views on economic opportunity (Eiser et al., 2012). A volcanic eruption, for example, may be a problem at a local scale, but an opportunity at a broader scale.

In summary, the 4-cell framework of internal/external and slow/fast drivers focuses on where change is generated and at which rate. The impact of change, whether that change ends up being a facilitator or barrier to sustainable and resilient destinations depends on scale and on contextual factors such as power, culture and value systems. These determine how the SES will respond to those forces, and thus context plays an important part in SES planning, including tourism (Cote & Nightingale, 2012). At the very least, context will moderate how the system can and will react to internal and external forces. More fundamentally, context will determine the way the system reacts to types (internal/external, fast/slow) of change: will the change driver be perceived and responded to as a barrier or as an opportunity? And what will be conserved and protected (sustainability) and what will be adapted/changed into something new (resilience) (Lew et al., 2016). This is why the same drivers can result in different responses by a tourism destination, and why planning and management needs to understand and work with context. Table 1 provides examples of how context may influence sustainability and resilience under different areas of change. A thorough appreciation of the local context is therefore important for strategic tourism planning and policy interventions/strategies in order to determine and build sustainable and resilient tourism destinations.

Table 1. Areas of change and general examples of how context influences destination sustainability and resilience.

Areas/drivers of change	Examples of context acting as a facilitator	Examples of context acting as a barrier
Change in atmospheric/biophysical condition	Warming climate making it more attractive for tourism	Tropical climate that is subject to higher risk of extreme weather events
Change in biodiversity and landscape condition	Highly diverse natural environment, fertile soil/optimal agriculture conditions may contribute to resilience	Limited natural resources may contribute to vulnerability
Change in public health condition	Easy access to health care may contribute to resilience	Limited healthcare infrastructure may contribute to vulnerability
Change in social condition	Strong social networks may contribute to resilience	Weak social networks may make it vulnerable to civil unrest, inequality, vulnerability
Change in economic condition, livelihoods	Access to variety of markets, trade agreements/partners may contribute to resilience	Increasing access to a variety of markets may result in breakdown of informal traditional economic activities, unsustainable use of resources, impact social reciprocal systems which may contribute to vulnerability
Change in cultural condition, ethnicity	Strengthening of custom and traditional knowledge systems can promote sustainable use of resources, sustainable farming practices and support social reciprocal systems which may contribute to resilience	Breakdown of traditional governance systems can increase land disputes, unsustainable use of resources inequality and impact informal social safety nets which may contribute to vulnerability

Table 1 provides an over-simplification of how context determines the impacts and responses to change, as a destination might be resilient to change at one scale but not another as these hierarchical SES are adaptive and complex (Ostrom, 2009). For example, a destination at national scale may be resilient to a change in visitor demand caused by a weather event or incident (fast change variable) whereas at the local level it is vulnerable. In addition, the specific context of an SES also influences how systems at different scales are linked, e.g. through forms of governance determined by the political context, forms of social interaction and cultural norms.

2.1 Vanuatu's context, the drivers of change and contextual factors

This chapter uses a case study of Vanuatu, a South Pacific Island state where tourism plays an important and growing role in its developing country economy. Vanuatu is located in the Southwest Pacific Ocean, 1,770km East of Australia and 800km West of Fiji (Fingleton, 2005). Vanuatu has a total land area of 12,190 square km encompassing 82 islands of volcanic origin (Cheer, 2013). The country is divided into 6 provinces and has a population of approximately 270,000 people, concentrated on 16 main islands. The majority of the population consists of Ni Vanuatu (people of Vanuatu) with over 80% residing in rural areas. There are 113 Indigenous languages spoken in Vanuatu in addition to Bislama (national language), English and French. Vanuatu gained independence in 1980 and has been classed as a Least Developed Country (LDC) by the United Nations (AusAID, 2011). Remoteness, inaccessibility, isolation and few economic resources affect the capacity of Vanuatu to shift out of its position as an LDC (Prasad & Giacomelli, 2012).

The United Nations labelling of Vanuatu as an LDC is fraught with contextual issues. In response to this there has been a call for a greater focus on the role of cultural, social and environmental resources as key components to resilience (Christensen & Mertz, 2010), arguing that there is a lack of empirical and interdisciplinary studies that specifically target small island dynamics and link social-economic and ecological processes. This is particularly relevant for Vanuatu as it is among the last remaining countries in the South Pacific where residents' livelihoods rely principally on the traditional economy, i.e. a subsistence economy that is based on a traditional governance system and utilises kinships networks and customary land ownership to access food and other resources and which often

occurs at lower system scales such as the community level. This contrasts and often clashes with the cash economy which is covered at a much larger system scale and in which “... the Western lifestyle and the capitalist economy are premised on ignoring the community (individualism), unsustainable use of the environment (consumerism) and removing food and social security – all basic foundations of the traditional economy” (Regenvanu, 2007, p. 1)

Addinsall (2017, p.23) highlights a hybrid economy that takes into consideration both the cash and traditional economy at a lower system scale as central to a sustainable approach to tourism in Vanuatu, noting the importance of “encouraging sustainable economic activity at the individual and household level while operating within reciprocal networks of exchange and obligation at the community level”, thereby acknowledging the importance of underlying cultural and community structures.

Therefore, more work is needed to understand the local context in Vanuatu, in particular the role of informal and formal institutions and how best to merge cultural and custom values, the cash economy and governance as a precursor for resilience.

2.2 Tourism in Vanuatu

Tourism has been held up as the biggest contributor to Vanuatu’s GDP, however Ni Vanuatu receive less than 10% of the total tourism expenditure (Stefanova, 2008). In addition, a variety of internal and external drivers of change impact tourism in Vanuatu (see Table 2). The Government’s priority on foreign investment in the tourism industry as well as the lack of control on capital flows and exchange rates (due to an open economy) has resulted in non-inclusive development, increased economic inequalities, dispossession of land and impacts on social systems (Stefanova, 2008). These social systems in Vanuatu are crucial to resilience in the absence of formal safety nets.

Tourism in Vanuatu relies on images of turquoise water, white sandy beaches, palm trees, a strong culture and smiling friendly faces (Harrison, 2004), with Ni Vanuatu being portrayed as the ‘happiest people on earth’ (Happy Planet Index, 2006; 2012; 2016). However, these images mask the real economic, environmental, social and governance issues in Vanuatu. External and internal drivers risk negatively impacting on the very qualities that attract people to visit Vanuatu. For example, the tourism industry in Vanuatu is concentrated in the capital city of Port Vila; exhibits high leakage,

foreign dominance and economic inequalities; relies heavily on imported foods; has resulted in dispossession of land; is responsible for large scale vegetation clearance, dredging of mangroves and estuaries, and coastal pollution; and is largely unregulated (Stefanova, 2008). These factors demonstrate that the government’s commitment to developing sustainable tourism in Vanuatu is often not realised (Harrison, 2004). However, “there are difficulties in estimating the extent of these issues due to the lack of reliable data on tourism impacts in countries [such as Vanuatu]” (Addinsall, 2017, pg. 50).

Table 2. Drivers of change impacting tourism in Vanuatu

	Fast	Slow
Internal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrading of facilities and infrastructure • Volcanic eruption • Pollution due to poor waste management practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographic change • Tourism policy and planning initiatives • Shift from subsistence to cash economy
External	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extreme weather events such as cyclones • Cruise industry decisions and actions • Foreign investment in targeted initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colonialisation and Westernisation • Climate change • Increased destination competitiveness • International standards and rising visitor expectations

Some of these internal and external drivers are particularly critical in driving the need for increased Government regulation of the tourism industry in Vanuatu. Acknowledging context specific characteristics such as alternative world views and knowledge systems is vital when considering sustainable tourism development in Vanuatu. Studies have found a positive relationship between resilience and a feeling of well-being among communities that are operating in hybrid economies that recognise both formal and informal processes (VNSO, 2012). With the absence of formal safety nets in Vanuatu, informal community and culturally based social protection systems occurring at lower system scale are vital to ensure resilience and protect particularly vulnerable people and environments from external change drivers such as macro-economic shocks and the impacts of climate change.

Strategies focused on growth notoriously exclude environmental and social benefits and costs in their analyses, whereas traditional economic activities are often based on sustainability (Anderson, 2011). Allen (2008) suggests the continued push for Vanuatu to enter into a capitalist economy, with the introduction of a system of freehold or individual title and deregulation of the market could lead to sharp socio-economic differentiation and, in the long term, the emergence of a landless peasantry. The approach to tourism in Vanuatu has largely supported a capitalist approach. Therefore, some government intervention and industry regulation, together with a genuine recognition of local context, e.g. informal and traditional internal processes, are needed to prevent the tourism industry from passing on the costs of environmental degradation, cultural commodification and social displacement to the most vulnerable (Addinsall et al., 2016).

2.3 Tourism policy making and planning responses to foster sustainability and resilience

The Vanuatu government (like many South Pacific Governments) is now reconsidering how tourism has been approached in the past (operating within a free market ideology) and assessing the need for government intervention and industry regulation (Schilcher, 2007). However, it can be argued that for tourism to truly contribute to sustainable development and be therefore labelled as 'sustainable' (within a Vanuatu context) it needs to better incorporate local context and align with Ni Vanuatu values, focusing on equity instead of growth. This would require an ideological change to how tourism is developed, moving from the margins of capitalism, with a focus on consistent growth, to alternative economic ideologies based on Ni Vanuatu world views, such as community benefits from tourism investments.

The approach to development in Vanuatu in recent years is often described as 'sustainable', with the development of national policies and plans based on sustainability. For example, the release of the National Sustainable Development Plan (NSDP) (2016-2030) as the highest level policy framework is an attempt to further extend linkages between resources, policy and planning to Vanuatu's culture, custom, traditional knowledge and Christian principles putting forward cultural heritage as the foundation of an inclusive society. The NSDP (2016-2030) demonstrates a strong attempt to address the disconnection between policy and custom, using phrases such as "Cultural heritage as the

foundation of an inclusive society”; “traditional and social safety nets”; and “balance the interface between formal and traditional governance systems”. However, separating the NSDP goals into ‘society’, ‘environment’ and ‘economy’ pillars fails to apply a holistic view on system boundaries. A review of governmental policies and documents alongside communications with government and tourism industry stakeholders reveals an increasing focus on growing the tourism industry and export sectors in Vanuatu with concern expressed as to the ability of national environmental, tourism planning and investment legislation to ensure growth is sustainable and equitable. There is also limited evidence of the NSDP (2016-2030) influencing governmental decisions surrounding tourism development (Spooner, 2018). For example, within the tourism related indicators of the NSDP (2016-2030) there is no mention of tourism’s role in protecting environmental resources; providing opportunities for vulnerable groups of people; increasing the level of local ownership of tourism businesses; protecting and respecting culture; and sustainable waste, water and energy management.

Ensuring a sustainable, inclusive and resilient tourism industry is largely influenced by environmental and social factors (Addinsall et al., 2018). Addressing ecological and social damage to host populations from tourism was brought to attention decades ago, yet it is only recently that these concepts are starting to gain traction in Vanuatu (Addinsall et al., 2016). To gain a better understanding of how these factors interact in the face of diverse change variables (Table 2) and at different system scales, local context needs to be more thoroughly considered.

The Government in Vanuatu has been pressured for some time by external forces emphasising neoliberal discourses of ‘growth’, ‘efficiency’, ‘reform’, and ‘governance’, while only a handful of NGOs and researchers are challenging current economic and trade policy arrangements in the South Pacific (Addinsall et al., 2015a; Addinsall et al., 2015b; Addinsall, 2017; Anderson & Lee 2010; Simo, 2010; Regenvanu, 2009). The current system as well as external and internal change drivers (Table 2) make it virtually impossible for Ni Vanuatu to compete with foreign investors in the tourism industry, with evidence of little benefits from the tourism industry flowing to Ni Vanuatu.

3.1 Actions taken to deal with change drivers and the importance of understanding context

For some time the Vanuatu Department of Tourism (DoT) has acknowledged the need for developing policy and plans to regulate the tourism industry. A key driver for increased government regulation in Vanuatu was the desire from government to see increased local participation in the tourism industry, particularly in the outer islands. However, with this increase in local participation issues have arisen that have manifested in negative reviews by visitors following their holidays with respect to lack of infrastructure, poor customer service, and substandard hygiene.

Implementing regulation of the tourism industry requires determining what the needs of Ni-Vanuatu and stakeholders are at a smaller scale and how to align them with meeting sustainable social, economic, cultural and environmental goals. At a larger scale, the country as a system can be resilient and sustainable, while the sustainability of sub-systems at smaller scales such as outer islands or at the community level is compromised. The development of the Vanuatu Sustainable Tourism Policy (2018-2030) and mandatory tourism sector standards are seen as ways of responding to these and other external and internal forces. These regulation processes seek to meet key environmental, social, cultural and economic objectives at a range of scales from: the international level (Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO), and International Year of Tourism for Sustainable Development); regional level (South Pacific Tourism Organisation (SPTO)); national level (National Sustainable Development Plan (2016-2030), other government plans and policies); and sectorial level (Vanuatu Strategic Tourism Action Plan (VSTAP) 2014-2018).

To be specific, the Vanuatu Government saw a need for policy guidelines, the implementation of baseline standards in tourism products, enhanced service quality, and the management of risk, all aimed at achieving long-term sustainability. As a result, government passed the Tourism Councils Act (2012) to allow for the introduction of the Vanuatu Sustainable Tourism Policy (2018-2030) and mandatory tourism sector standards.

The Vanuatu Sustainable Tourism Policy (VSTP) (2018-2030) provides a guiding framework and direction for the Government of Vanuatu and all stakeholders to develop their tourism sector in a sustainable manner. The VSTP is a “living” and flexible document that represents a stepping stone of what will be an on-going consultative process of incorporating key messages from stakeholders across Vanuatu (Addinsall et al, 2018), aligning and realigning policy across government sectors

where required, and responding to slow and fast internal and external drivers. Collaboration between tourism and other sectors as well as adaptability between policies and plans are both essential in order to support sustainability initiatives and linkages that strengthen the tourism sector and Vanuatu as a country. The VSTP focuses on enhancing the resilience of Vanuatu's SES including its cultural, social and ecological systems in the face of the changes, complexity and uncertainty that typify 21st century Vanuatu.

It needs to be noted that many previous attempts had been made to develop policy and standards in Vanuatu, with minimal success in implementation (Spooner, 2018). In response to these failed attempts to introduce policy and international standards programs, Vanuatu government stressed the need for a policy and program that would fit the Vanuatu context and that industry would embrace. DoT also changed its approach of employing largely external, foreign aid-funded, short-term consultants to develop the policy and standards to funding a highly-skilled local (Ni-Vanuatu) in the role of full-time Principal Accreditation Officer, who would be charged to lead both the policy development process and the development of tourism standards. Another key difference is that the approach taken by the Principal Accreditation Officer (Jerry Spooner) in developing the policy and standards was to embrace a very high level of stakeholder engagement. A wide range of stakeholders from the tourism industry, central and local government, community, and local cultural groups in Vanuatu were engaged in the development of the policy and standards over a 2-year time frame. Consultation with outer island stakeholders is continuing. This example highlights how the complex adaptive SES that is Vanuatu tourism is organising itself, after a few failed attempts, to maintain its key function and identity, a sign of system resilience (Walker et al., 2011).

The Tourism Standards were developed under a program entitled The Vanuatu Tourism Permit and Accreditation Program (VTPAP), launched in 2015 by the Vanuatu Department of Tourism (DoT) to ensure tourism operators are operating at, or above, minimum standards throughout Vanuatu's tourism sector. A focus of the program is that Vanuatu is perceived by visitors as a safe and reliable destination that showcases Ni-Vanuatu culture and identity as well as the country's natural assets as tourism attractions. The VTPAP Program seeks to ensure quality service and facilities are being provided to all tourists and build safety and reliability into Vanuatu's tourism brand (Spooner, 2015).

The VTPAP can be seen as a first step in supporting higher quality tourism experiences being delivered, which allows Vanuatu to be more competitive in the South Pacific leading to enhancement of the Vanuatu economy through the translation into increased visitor numbers. VTPAP is customised to all tourism businesses in both urban and rural areas/outer islands. It provides incentives through promotional, marketing, training and capacity building opportunities for these tourism businesses. It also encourages dispersal of tourists to these rural areas which creates spill over effects – expenditure in other local businesses. Increasing tourist arrivals directly links to the VSTP and NSDP objectives. In terms of GDP, VTPAP's purpose is to protect the industry and increase revenue. The VTPAP program supports tourism stakeholders that have had little engagement in the formal economy to manage other businesses in a way that is competitive while still supporting their traditional roles.

3.2 A contextual approach: power, culture and values in the Vanuatu context

Accommodating for the local context in the consultation process of the VSTP and the VTPAP development and implementation enabled voices of stakeholders that are commonly missing in the development of Government policy, plans and actions to be heard. Examples of this were holding meetings in Bislama, managing outspoken dominate people in workshops, and organising one-on-one interviews with stakeholders that were not comfortable to contribute in workshops. This wide consultation allowed for Government to ensure that when the VSTP and VTPAP were operationalised.

Early in the process of developing the VTPAP it became evident that simply taking an existing standards or accreditation program and applying it to the tourism sector in Vanuatu was not possible: the cultural and economic context required that the international tourism standards be adapted. Several strategies and approaches ensued. Some key lessons emerge from this case study that relate to context. Firstly, the large scale buy-in to the program to date can be attributed to the investment of time in the development and implementation of the VTPAP. Secondly, employing a Ni-Vanuatu (i.e. not a foreign national) as Principal Accreditation Officer, with language, cultural and social skills, knowledge and approaches that are appropriate to the context, proved critical. As an educated multi-lingual with a deep understanding of the complexities of tourism operations in Vanuatu, Spooner was

able to gain the trust and support of both locals and expatriate tourism operators, government personnel, appropriate authorities within communities and stakeholders of all ages and gender. Thirdly, extensive engagement with stakeholders following proper custom protocol helped ensure a better acknowledgement of context and thus the creation of a destination specific program that is relevant and workable in the Vanuatu tourism industry. Finally, this stakeholder engagement was largely facilitated by embracing and engaging with existing power-brokers, namely, functioning and active tourism associations and the Local Government Tourism Councils in each Province of Vanuatu. Making tourism permits conditional on being a member of an active tourism association further streamlined stakeholder engagement activities.

The Decentralisation and Local Government Regions Act No.1 of 1994 sees more power allocated to Provincial governments to manage their Provinces autonomously, however the structure of Vanuatu's national government still heavily influences decision making at provincial level. As a result of colonisation, which has been an external slow driver of change, Vanuatu's national government operates within a western influenced manner even though Vanuatu gained its independence in 1980. This presents challenges when the internal drivers such as informal, traditional economy and custom intersects with Government.

In response to these challenges, the VTPAP sought to provide more influence to both provincial government systems and custom aligning more to the Decentralisation Act. This was achieved by working within provincial, custom and community structures to develop the standards to meet their local context, over taking a top down approach to development and implementation. Through the development of the VTPAP operational plan it has been highlighted that every province manages their standards program suited to their context, ensuring custom governance, provincial local government structure, and the informal traditional economy is taken into consideration. For example, in the TAFEA province the majority of the tourism products are located outside of municipal areas (Central Business Areas) so fall under the responsibility of the provincial government. This is in stark contrast to the SHEFA province where the majority of the tourism businesses are located within the capital city. Thus, TAFEA would have the Secretary General sign off on the tourism permits before the National Government (Director of Tourism) as opposed to SHEFA where National Government signs off on all tourism permits. Custom and cultural considerations were also considered in the

VTPAP by incorporating criteria such as a written consent from area chiefs for any tourism permit renewals and for new permit applications.

The ongoing continuous improvement plan for VTPAP together with the roll out of the VSTP (2018-2030) are internal slow drivers that are responding to external drivers such as the development of the Global Sustainable Tourism Council (GSTC) criteria for hotels and tours as well as destinations. Meeting global standards makes it possible and appropriate for Vanuatu to work towards becoming a GSTC-certified destination. This continuous improvement will seek to attract visitors who are quality visitors – higher yield, longer stay, culturally aware and environmentally responsible while at the same time providing tourism operators with guidelines to reduce their organisation's impact on the natural and socio-cultural environment. As such, the VSTP (2018-2030) and the VTPAP frames sustainable tourism not as a discrete set of tourism products, but as something for the entire tourism and non-tourism sectors to work towards. The premise of the VSTP (2018-2030) and the VTPAP is that Vanuatu will thrive and survive when all forms of tourism strive to be more responsible and sustainable.

4.1 Research Agenda

The previous sections highlight by way of a case study of Vanuatu how policy-making and planning can better harness context to build resilience and sustainability. In addition, this case study helps uncover where further research is needed both in the South Pacific context and elsewhere.

Vanuatu, the South Pacific and other contexts

- More work is needed to understand the role of informal and formal institutions and how best to merge cultural and custom values, the cash economy and governance as a precursor for resilience.
- The Vanuatu Tourism Permit and Accreditation Program is only a first step. It helps ensure that basic standards are met, and paves the way for quality tourism experiences being delivered, which allows Vanuatu to be more competitive. However, further research is needed to better understand how long term sustainability and resilience can be achieved and implement at all social and geographical scales.

- Due to the specific nature of the tourism sector in Vanuatu and other South Pacific islands where tourism, communities and the environment are strongly interlinked, more empirical and interdisciplinary studies are needed that specifically target such small island contexts and link social-economic and ecological processes to identify context specific solutions to questions around resilience and sustainability.

Tourism destinations, change and resilience

We identified different types of change drivers (e.g. internal vs external; slow vs fast change) impacting Vanuatu's tourism sector. To ensure resilient and sustainable tourism destinations can be built and maintained, a better understanding is needed of tourism SES, in particular:

- What variables make up the system, what are the dominant processes that influence decision making and what are the context specific characteristics that influence system dynamics?
- How do these change types influence tourism and tourism stakeholders at different scales of the system and what does that mean for the overall resilience of the system?
- How do and how should responses differ between reacting to fast and slow change drivers (e.g. disaster risk reduction vs. building long term adaptive capacity)?
- When we think about tourism resilience, to what degree do we need to consider lower scale systems and the larger scale system?
- How can tourism be a tool to enhance resilience of the wider system?

References

- Addinsall, C. 2017. Agroecology and sustainable rural livelihoods: Interdisciplinary research and development in the South Pacific, Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), School of Business and Tourism, Southern Cross University, Lismore.
- Addinsall, C, Glencross, K, Scherrer, P, Weiler, B & Nichols, D 2015a. Agroecology and sustainable rural livelihoods: a conceptual framework to guide development projects in the Pacific Islands. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems*, 39(6), 691–723.
- Addinsall, C, Glencross, K, Rihai, N, Kalomor, L, Palmer, G, Nichols, D & Smith, G 2015b. Enhancing agroforestry in Vanuatu: striking the balance between individual entrepreneurship and community development. *Forests, Trees and Livelihoods*, 25(1), 78–96.
- Addinsall, C, Scherrer, P, Weiler, B. & Glencross, K. 2016. An ecologically and socially inclusive model of agritourism to support smallholder livelihoods in the South Pacific. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*.
- Addinsall, C, Weiler, B. & Spooner, J. 2018. Vanuatu Sustainable Tourism Policy, Appendices, Vanuatu Department of Tourism.
- Allen, M. 2008. Land reform in Melanesia, State, Society and Governance in Melanesia, Briefing Note, Number 6, ANU, Canberra.
- Anderson, T. 2011. Melanesian land: the impact of markets and modernisation. *The Journal of Australian Political Economy*, 68, 86–107.
- Anderson, T & Lee, G. 2010. 'Introduction: understanding Melanesian customary land', in T Anderson & G Lee (eds), *In defence of Melanesian customary land*, AID Watch, Sydney, Australia, 2–4.
- AusAID. 2011. Australia and the least developed countries: partners in development, viewed 30th December 2013, <https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/corporate/annual-reports/ausaid-annual-report-2010-2011/02performance.html>.
- Becken, S. 2013. Developing a framework for assessing resilience of tourism sub-systems to climatic factors. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 43, 506-528.
- Boguslaw, R. 2001. Systems Theory Encyclopedia of Sociology. 2nd ed., Vol. 5, pp. 3102-3106). New York: Macmillan Reference USA.
- Cheer, J.M. 2013. Outer island tourism in the South Pacific and the Millennium development goals: understanding tourism's impacts, in KS Bricker, R Black & S Cottrell (eds), *Sustainable tourism and the Millennium development goals: effecting positive change*, Jones and Bartlett Learning, Burlington, US, 23–36.

- Christensen, AE & Mertz, O. 2010. Researching Pacific Island livelihoods: mobility, natural resource management and nissology. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 51(3), 278–87.
- Cohen, P. J., Lawless, S., yer, M., Morgan, M., Saeni, E., Teioli, H. and Kanor, P. 2016. Understanding adaptive capacity and capacity to innovate in social-ecological systems: Applying a gender lens. *Ambio* 45 (3) , 309–321.
- Cole, S., & Browne, M. 2015, Tourism and Water Inequity in Bali: A Social-Ecological Systems Analysis. *Human Ecology*, 43(3), 439-450.
- Cote, M., & Nightingale, A. J. 2012, Resilience thinking meets social theory. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(4), 475-489.
- Crépin, A.-S. 2007. Using fast and slow processes to manage resources with thresholds. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 36,191–213.
- Eiser, J.R, Bostrom, A., Burton, I., Johnston, D.M., McClure, J., Parton, D., van der Pligt, J. and White, M.P. 2012. Risk interpretation and action: A conceptual framework for responses to natural hazards. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 1, 5-16.
- Farrell, B. H., & Twining-Ward, L. 2004. Reconceptualizing Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(2), 274-295.
- Fingleton, J., 2005. Introduction, privatising land in the Pacific: a defence of customary tenures, discussion paper no. 80, The Australia Institute, Canberra, Australia.
- Happy Planet Index (2006; 2012) What's so great about living in Vanuatu, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/magazine/5172254.stm
- Harrison, D. 2004. Tourism in Pacific Islands. *Journal of Pacific Studies*, 26(1&2), 1-28.
- Heslinga, J.H., Groote, P. & Vanclay, F. 2017. Using a social-ecological systems perspective to understand tourism and landscape interactions in coastal areas. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 3 (1), 23-38.
- Lew, A. A. 2014. Scale, change and resilience in community tourism planning. *Tourism Geographies*, 16(1), 14-22.
- Lew , A. A., Ng, P. T., Ni, C.-C., & Wu, T.-C. 2016. Community sustainability and resilience: similarities, differences and indicators. *Tourism Geographies*, 18(1), 18-27.
- Mai, T. & Smith, C. 2015. Addressing the threats to tourism sustainability using systems thinking: a case study of Cat Ba Island, Vietnam. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(10), 1504-1528.

- NSDP (2016-2030) National Sustainable Development Plan, Vanuatu 2030 The Peoples Plan, Republic of Vanuatu.
- Ostrom, E. 2009, A General Framework for Analyzing Sustainability of Social-Ecological Systems. *Science*, 325(5939), 419-422. doi:10.1126/science.1172133
- Parson, M., Brown, C., Nalau, J. & Fisher, K. 2017. Assessing adaptive capacity and adaptation: insights from Samoan tourism operators. *Climate and Development*.
- Prasad, BC & Giacomelli, A. 2012. Trade Policy Framework, Department of External Trade (DET) & Ministry of Trade, Commerce, Industry, and Tourism (MTCIT), Port Vila, Vanuatu.
- Regenvanu, R 2009. The traditional economy as a source of resilience in Vanuatu, in T. Anderson & Lee, G. (eds), *In defence of Melanesian customary land*, AID/WATCH, Sydney, Australia, 30–34.
- Regenvanu, R. 2007. The Traditional Economy – What's it all about? *MILDA*, Retrieved from <http://milda.aidwatch.org.au/resources/documents/traditional-economy-whats-it-all-about>
- Ruiz-Ballesteros, E. 2011. Social-ecological resilience and community-based tourism. *Tourism Management*, 32(3), 655-666.
- Schilcher, D. 2007. Growth versus equity: the continuum of pro-poor tourism and neoliberal governance. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(2–3), 166–93.
- Simo, J. 2010. Land and the traditional economy: “Your money, my life” Hu i kakae long basket blong laef?, in T. Anderson & Lee, G. (eds), *In defence of Melanesian customary land*, AID/WATCH, Sydney, Australia, 40–4.
- Skyttner, L. 1996. General systems theory: origin and hallmarks. *Kybernetes*, 25(6), 16-22.
- Spooner, J. 2015. *Information Pack, Vanuatu Tourism Permit and Accreditation Program*, Vanuatu Department of Tourism.
- Spooner, J. 2018. Interview, Vanuatu Department of Tourism, Port Vila, 6th June, 2018.
- Stefanova, M. 2008. The price of tourism: land alienation in Vanuatu. *Justice for the Poor – briefing notes January 2008*, 2(1), viewed 20 January 2012, <<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/862021468245413815/pdf/436860BRI0J4P010Box327368B01PUBLIC1.pdf>>.
- VNSO 2012. Alternative indicators of well-being for Melanesia, Vanuatu pilot study report, Vanuatu National Statistics Office (VNSO), Malvatumauri National Council of Chiefs, Port Vila, Vanuatu, viewed 12 October 2015, < <http://www.vnso.gov.vu/>>.
- Walker, B. H., Carpenter, S. R., Rockstrom, J., Crépin, A.-S. and Peterson, G. D. 2012. Drivers, "slow" variables, "fast" variables, shocks, and resilience. *Ecology and Society*, 17(3): 30.

Walker, B.H., Gunderson, L., Kinzig, A., Folke, C., Carpenter, S. & Schultz, L. 2006. A Handful of Heuristics and Some Propositions for Understanding Resilience in Social-Ecological Systems. *Ecology and Society*, 11(1):13.