The 2016 Consensus on Advances in Destination Management

Pre-print version accepted for publication in
Journal of Destination Marketing & Management

03/03/2017

Stephan Reinhold[1]
Christian Laesser
Pietro Beritelli

University of St. Gallen
Institute for Systemic Management and Public Governance (IMP-HSG)
Dufourstrasse 40a, CH-9000, St. Gallen, Switzerland
Email: stephan.reinhold@unisg.ch
Phone: +41 71 224 2525

[1] Corresponding author

The 2016 Consensus on Advances in Destination Management

ABSTRACT

This article communicates the main insights of the third Biennial Forum on Advances in Destination Management (ADM), held in Vail, Colorado (USA). The substance of scholars' and practitioners' discussions can be divided into five topical domains: (1) relevance of experiences to the destination concept, (2) destination strategy and resilience, (3) the future of DMOs, (4) tourism taxation and regulation and (5) big data and visitor management. For each domain, we offer a goal-centered research agenda built on conference participants' collective sense-making efforts during the three-day conference, followed by a dedicated consensus session.

KEY WORDS

Destination Management, Consensus, Research, Practice, Agenda

The 2016 Consensus on Advances in Destination Management

1 INTRODUCTION

The Advances in Destination Management (ADM) forum has been seeking to integrate disparate research and innovation efforts on destination management since the Journal of Destination Marketing & Management published its first double issue in 2012. Every two years, ADM convenes engaged scholars and practitioners looking for theoretical answers and practical solutions to address the complex challenges of managing and marketing tourist destinations. Results of the first two forums were summarized in previous editions of the St. Gallen Consensus on Destination Management (Laesser & Beritelli, 2013; Reinhold, Laesser, & Beritelli, 2015). The third ADM forum crossed the Atlantic and assembled an international group of tourism professionals and researchers from June 17-19, 2016 in Vail, Colorado.

Like its predecessors, the 2016 Consensus on Advances Destination Management summarizes the main insights and results of this conference.

Based on consensus discourse methodology (Reinhold et al., 2015), we identified five topical domains that dominated sense making and discussion among conference attendees: (1) relevance of experiences to the destination concept, (2) destination strategy and resilience, (3) the future of DMOs, (4) tourism taxation and regulation and (5) big data and visitor management.

The subsequent sections contribute discussion points and avenues for future inquiry to the community of practitioners and researchers working on prospects for tourist destinations. In the spirit of ADM, we hope to inspire results relevant to both the practical and scholarly communities.

2 METHODOLOGY

The conference results covered draw on consensus discourse methodology developed in 2014 (Reinhold et al., 2015). Its five-step methodological procedure (cf. table 1) is characterized by three key strengths; first, it establishes an active discourse among conference attendees on the conference's main subjects; second, it continuously records sense-making in response to formal presentations, keynotes, and informal discussions and finally, it establishes agreement on the main conference insights in a research agenda, which seeks to inspire future contributions to the field based on collective interdisciplinary expertise of destination management scholars and tourism professionals.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE.

In total, we collected 79 notes across seven sessions, written by 22 actively contributing conference participants. Like at previous forums, about 15 percent of ADM participants were tourism professionals and the overall group mostly represented institutions from Australia, Europe, and North America. A full list of participants who contributed to this consensus is included in the acknowledgement section of this article.

Discussions in the approximately 165-minute consensus session centered on seven key issues, which we summarized to form the specified five topical domains. Consultation on the first consensus draft resulted in adding seven publication references and six amendments qualifying or elaborating on statements in the initial draft. As a result, all participants elected to support the consensus in its final form.

3 STRUCTURE

The subsequent sections represent the five domains around which the ADM forum's discussions and contributions evolved: (1) relevance of experiences to the destination concept, (2) destination strategy and resilience, (3) the future of DMOs, (4) tourism taxation and regulation and (5) big data and visitor management.

To structure the discourse in these domains, we operationalized their content in the form of lead questions. The *first* domain focuses on tourist experiences: what are the roles of experiences in understanding the destination as sensory impressions and stories retold? The *second* domain centers on the role of strategies and strategy documents in shaping the future of destinations: what are realistic traits of strategic behavior and paradigms of strategic planning in destination settings? The *third* domain contemplates the future of DMOs and asks: what are the new activities and structures of destination management and how do they affect individuals working for DMOs? The *fourth* domain addresses tourism taxation and regulation as a research subject: what are reasonable principles of taxation and are they feasible in the light of innovation and competitiveness concerns? The *fifth* domain deals with big data as a way to draw new insights from spatial behavior and to optimize visitor management: how can we use big data and other practices to better understand and influence travel behavior and decision making?

Every section is divided into discussion and implications. While the word count of individual sections roughly corresponds to the richness and duration of discussions, it does not adequately reflect their vividness. This article concludes with a brief comparison between this consensus and its two predecessors.

4 DOMAIN 1: THE ROLE OF EXPERIENCE

Discussion

At the two previous ADM forums, ontological discussions dominated sessions on the destination as a theoretical concept. Conference attendees attempted to come up with - and agree on - a new definition to improve understanding of the fundamental nature of destinations (Laesser & Beritelli, 2013; Reinhold et al., 2015). This year, however, conference attendees no longer questioned destinations' natures. Instead, they vividly discussed the role of *experiences* in our understanding of destinations.

Conference attendees agreed that experiences are key to understanding tourist behavior (Gunn, 1972). Experiences explain why destinations attract certain spatial behaviors and provide a key to understanding the heterogeneous and multifaceted nature of the destination concept (Beritelli, Bieger, & Laesser, 2014; Larsen, 2007). Research subjects traditionally scrutinized, such as traveler needs, tourist services and infrastructures for accommodation and food are, in most cases, derived from other destination experiences that motivate and drive tourist behavior (Rickly-Boyd, 2009; Sternberg, 1997).

To deepen the discussion about the relevance of tourist experiences to advancing the marketing and management of destinations, a group of conference attendees pointed out that there are two meanings associated with the English term "experience" in the German language: *Erlebnis* and *Erfahrung*. The former refers to the procedural aspects of experiences and the momentary sensory impressions gained by engaging in certain (tourist) activities. The latter connotation refers to the more static notion of a memory retained of the specific activities. In principle, the dual notion of experience is nothing new. It was put forward by Larsen (2007) and connects tourist behavior to pre-trip expectations, on-site events and post-trip memories. The fact that destination marketing and management scholars at the conference were not really aware of how far the conceptual discussion on tourist experiences has progressed may indicate that there is a potential for integration across research streams.

In the attempt to connect experiences to actionable advice for destination marketing and management, conference attendees turned to the relevance of storytelling (cf. Rickly-Boyd, 2009). Stories allow tourists to structure and communicate their experiences (Escalas, 1998). This comes naturally, as significant parts of human memory are organized in terms of actors (who?) and activities (did what?) (Fiske & Taylor, 2013; Schank & Abelson, 1995) and is reflected in research conceptualizing destinations as storyscapes (Chronis, 2005; Rickly-Boyd, 2009). Conference attendees agreed that destinations can, potentially, tell many different experience-based stories for a variety of visitor groups. Marketing efforts should, therefore, focus on enabling storytelling ("setting the stage") and identify individuals who can act as multipliers of stories in different demand networks (e.g., market mavens (Feick & Price, 1987)).

Implications

Based on the above considerations, conference attendees arrived at two primary conclusions with relevance for future research on destination contexts experiences: first, how tourism supply can create a positive frame of conditions for experiences ("storyscape") in community-type destination settings (Chronis, 2005; Rickly-Boyd, 2009), although this premise is still under-researched. While there has been progress in understanding how individual memorable stories relate to tourist experiences (e.g., Park & Santos, 2016; Uriely, 2005) and their design (e.g., Tussyadiah, 2014), it is theoretically and practically interesting to identify what is conductive to tourists retelling stories peer-to-peer to influence future travel and buying decisions in demand networks. This includes the characteristics of those individuals most likely to act as multipliers in these networks - sometimes referred to as market mavens (Clark & Goldsmith, 2005).

The second conclusion refers less to contextual factors and individuals' characteristics and puts the stories center stage (Lichrou, O'Malley, & Patterson, 2014; Rickly-Boyd, 2009). To comprehend the link between experiences and stories retold, it is important to understand how experience-based stories morph and transform from the first impetus, to being memorized and later selectively retold in peer-to-peer settings. This may yield new insight as to how and to what extent these stories can be seeded, nourished and controlled (Chronis, 2012), given that travelers are co-producers of experiential narratives (Uriely, 2005). In addition, conditions might be different for stories with a negative connotation, but positive implications (e.g., an anecdote about a negative incident redeemed by standout service recovery with a "happy end") compared to those of exclusively positive valence (e.g., Vittersø, Vorkinn, Vistad, & Vaagland, 2000).

5 DOMAIN 2: DESTINATION STRATEGY AND RESILIENCE

Discussion

Conference attendees intensely discussed the role and relevance of destination strategy in attempts to actively influence the future of tourist destinations, providing impetus for the question: to what extent is destination strategy helping shape the future of tourism destinations?

The dominant emphasis on destination strategy in much teaching and research on destination development is outdated. It stems from the notion of an integrated, contingent plan that defines development trajectories for the entire tourism destination as the result of a planned, formal process (Mintzberg, 1990; Mintzberg & Lampel, 1999; Stokes, 2008) characterized by (more or less) stakeholder involvement (Sainaghi, 2006). Conference attendees agreed that this notion is no longer really valid, as it evolved in a hierarchically structured corporate world;

today, this concept needs critical scrutiny in pluralistic destination settings for at least four critical reasons.

First, given the heterogeneous nature of destinations as experience-based storyscapes and multiple production or business systems activated by visitors, a destination is unlikely to have one grand strategy for all its different demand and supply forms. Specialized plans are more likely to be developed for selected strategic projects and initiatives tied to a limited set of visitors activating specific business systems; these are attempts at controlled intervention in limited parts of the overall destination. Furthermore, this also implies that strategic processes happen in parallel and staggered fashion and that they integrate input from different stakeholders, but do not necessarily require every destination actor's participation (Beritelli, Reinhold, Laesser, & Bieger, 2015).

Second, in light of recent contributions on destinations as learning communities (Reinl & Kelliher, 2010, 2014), theoretical assumptions about complete information and a competitive environment "out there", to be discovered and interpreted, should be revisited. Many aspects of innovative strategic behavior are explorative in nature (McGrath & MacMillan, 1995) and require enactment, as well as sense-making from weak or equivocal stimuli, to enable learning (Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005).

Third, while strategic agency is a reasonable methodological assumption and conceptual approximation, those working on destination strategy must be wary of strategy retrofit and actors' potential retrospection biases when retelling tales of great strategic foresight. Even given individual strategists' or entrepreneurs' chance of outstanding achievements by developing game-changing strategic plans, the reality of strategy processes in destination settings is often more messy, emergent, opportunistic and incremental than traditional strategic planning approaches would suggest (Beritelli & Reinhold, 2010; Lindblom, 1959).

Finally, one of the most recent strands of strategy research (Lecocq, Demil, & Ventura, 2010) acknowledges that business systems, such as tourist destinations, might even completely lack a purposeful strategic development trajectory. That said, every economically relevant tourist destination has actors engaging in a set of related activities that create and capture value (Zott & Amit, 2010); running a business model co-creating value with visitors in the form of tourist experiences. But while each destination has one, or several, business models based on individual actors' behavior, it does not necessarily follow an overarching strategic plan that would provide their action with a clear sense of direction (Casadesus-Masanell & Ricart, 2010).

In sum, conference attendees suggested updating the collective understanding of destination strategy and strategic behavior in destination contexts. In a first step, this implies abandoning a fixation with destination strategy as a grand plan and creating artifacts (i.e., strategy documents). Instead, they unanimously encouraged destination actors and researchers to look for new ways to make best use of different sources of information, to try shaping business contexts, to negotiate opportunities and to concentrate efforts on those strategic destination interventions most likely to yield positive impact. It would be a misconception, however, to infer from the above discussion that the assembled community of managers and researchers was in favor of abandoning all planning efforts. Planning techniques are purposeful in the way they "discipline managers to look ahead, and to express goals and resource allocations" (Mintzberg, 2003, p. 185).

Implications

Conference attendees agreed on the following three research directions building on the outlined discussion points.

First, how should one define new guidelines for strategic development and strategy implementation if assumptions of destination planning are more akin to the messy reality of strategy practice than the controlled environment suggested by the planning school? How do these new guidelines address selected partners' expectations for lengthy documents and strategic plans at the overall destination level? Potential lines of inquiry could (1) investigate how demand for certain strategic documents relates to exaggerated expectations regarding the output, outcome and impact of destination strategies and (2) the actual performance of those actors in charge of implementation. The results of such studies would provide a substantive rationale to adapt interaction between destination actors and different funding agents.

Second, if tourist destinations do benefit from more decentralized strategic processes and operate, partially, without strategic directives, where are strategic capabilities located in destination settings and how do they evolve to allow for resilience (including crisis management related to safety and security concerns (Mair, Ritchie, & Walters, 2016))? The answer lies in the changing role of DMOs in destination settings (cf. Domain 3) and suggests a way forward by connecting future research on destination strategy to knowledge about destination governance and leadership (Beritelli & Bieger, 2014; Hristov & Zehrer, 2015).

Finally, how can different supply networks within destinations ensure mutually beneficial learning and dissemination of knowledge on strategically relevant issues when most available studies and data pools coarsely aggregate information at a destination level? Successful learning networks include a component of non-financial value dissemination in their business model that incentivizes the accumulation and sharing of strategically relevant knowledge.

6 DOMAIN 3: THE FUTURE OF DMOS

Discussion

The 2014 outlook on the future of DMOs was very pessimistic (Reinhold et al., 2015). However, judging from discussions in 2016, organizations in charge of destination marketing and management seem more durable than previously anticipated. Conference attendees reported instances of bricolage and experiments indicating how DMOs start to adapt and evolve their processes, structures, and activities in response to their challenging business context. It seems that these organizations have started to dissolve their organizational boundaries and that projects and networks are starting to dominate planning, as well as daily activities. For individuals working for DMOs, this implies flexibly taking part in multiple supply networks, frequently requiring them to shift perspectives and simultaneously adhere to multiple success definitions. Furthermore, these changes imply that DMOs morph into a new form of tourism service provider, which enables and facilitates co-creation of tourist experiences in destination settings with a changing portfolio of activities.

Overall, conference attendee's observations seem to match the more nuanced understanding of recent conceptualizations discussed in this paper about destinations as multifaceted systems and experience-based storyscapes. Anecdotes of observed change in destination structures in the U.S. and Central Europe also seem to reflect the notion of liquid organizations evoked in the 2014 consensus (Reinhold et al., 2015).

Implications

Based on the observed (admittedly still nascent) pattern of DMO evolution, conference attendees arrived at three conclusions with implications for future research:

First, are existing DMO business models hindering the adoption of new processes and skewing their perspectives in terms of change priorities? This question is linked to the general concern of destination management scholars about these organizations' ability to purposefully develop the way they create and capture value to increase destinations' productivity. The ability and propensity to change is linked to a DMO's alternative self-concept (i.e., reason to exist), as well as to the contingencies set by its governance.

Second, assuming the ability to change, what will new core processes of a destination management organization entail? Conference attendees suggested looking into processes such as (1) moderation and management of conceptual processes and projects, (2) experience design, (3) active sales promotion, (4) incoming tour operating with destination agents (e.g., regaining control of the value chain and recovering cash flow) and (5) life-cycle management of tourism destinations. While these hints might be misconstrued as a simple linear evolution of the DMO, attendees considered it the starting point to question new organization and structure possibilities to increase destination productivity. In addition, this chain of thought addresses previous concerns about whether there will still be an archetypical organization in charge of destination management and marketing, even if it is process-based.

Finally, what are the implications of change in destination management processes and activities for future job profiles and education requirements? While flatter hierarchies and process-based work might be considered job enrichment, changing destination management work environments will also provide fewer typical career paths and less promotion opportunities. At the same time, management and facilitation of multiple parallel processes will be cognitively more taxing. This would require future destination managers to develop a different education profile and skill set focusing less on administration, public relations and marketing campaign management.

7 DOMAIN 4: TAXATION AND REGULATION

Discussion

At most, taxation and regulation have been considered side or contextual issues at previous destination management and marketing conferences. However, two contributions looking at tax compliance in the context of the sharing economy and tax reporting practices in the lodging and hospitality sector put them center stage in discussions at this year's ADM forum. Discussion started with consensus on the status quo; tax regimes and fees vary widely for different tourism destinations. These regimes differ in five important aspects: (1) the object taxed (e.g., the overnight, the visitor, the supplier selling a service), (2) filing and reporting requirements (e.g., physical carbon copy receipts collected daily or fixed percentage on annually reported VAT account), (3) for what collected tax revenues can be used (e.g., general funds or earmarked revenues), (4) to what extent tax revenues actually benefit tourism and (5) how often taxed subjects are audited.

In the consensus session, conference attendees primarily focused on three of these issues: the object taxed, use of tax revenues and associated benefits. First, in the presentation on taxation within the sharing economy, attendees challenged the objects being taxed for tourism purposes. In many settings, taxes are levied according to standard industry definitions. However, as new entities envision the same jobs-to-be-done without a tax burden, it becomes necessary to question the industry-specific definition of taxability.

Second, conference attendees contended that tourism-related taxes should be levied for a particular purpose. This process, known as earmarking, is intended to create transparency and accountability, as well as help destination actors to devise mechanisms to stabilize the annual tax revenue influx. Having just paid a US$ 35 daily resort fee for Vail, conference attendees highlighted the negative practice of collecting tax-linked tourism fees in the U.S. and Canada, whose ultimate uses are unclear to many visitors. The discussion highlighted one major issue related to earmarking practices; in certain areas - for example, parts of Florida - tourism is the most productive business sector in gross revenues, which implies that collected tax revenues need to be purposefully redirected for political reasons to other governance domains, such as education and infrastructure maintenance.

Finally, conference attendees agreed that monetary inflow for tourism-related purposes is not the only potential benefit of a tax regime. To some degree, taxes can also be used to influence tourist behavior; in destinations like Venice, Italy, taxes and fees are used to reduce the strain from overcrowding.

As an intermediate conclusion, conference attendees suggested three basic rules for tourism-related taxation; first, whenever possible, all tourism business (if not public services or places) should sustain itself without transfer payments and subsidies. Second, if funds are collected for tourism purposes, this should - whenever possible - avoid state intervention (e.g., tourism improvement districts in the U.S. and U.K.) and be limited in time frame and purpose; third, if state intervention is really necessary, taxes levied should be earmarked.

Implications

Based on the above considerations and lack of research in this domain, conference participants agreed on three areas that warrant further research on tourism taxation and regulation. They emphasize that rethinking and re-innovating tourism taxation regimes are potential research fields with benefits low hanging fruits and high practical relevance.

First, what are the implications of taxing objects based on standard industry definitions? The advent of the sharing economy lodging business model implies a shift in objects that should be taxed. New tourism-related business models may be taxed based on activity-based definitions of the tax object. This would help to even the stakes for innovation and competition with new business models, which challenge existing rules of the game across traditional industry borders (Burgelman & Grove, 2007). Future research should consider the cost-benefit trade-offs of innovation and taxation in this setting to suggest how to deal with de-/regulation of lodging and hospitality ventures.

Second, does the optimal level of taxation follow the logic of an inverted U-shape or a Laffer curve in terms of taxation's implications for compliance and destination competitiveness? From a policy perspective, it would be highly relevant to reliably determine what antecedent concepts can predict the optimal level of tourism-related taxation for specific destination settings. Research in this area needs to consider behavioral implications of tax compliance, as well as competitiveness implications for destinations in terms of short-term price levels and the capacity to invest tax revenues for long-term viability. To this end, existing work on taxes and competitiveness (Lee, 2014), tax revenue allocation (Litvin, Smith, & Blackwell, 2012) and tax compliance (Hamilton, Marshall, & Hobson, 2012) provide starting points.

Third, should taxes be levied on business potential or actual business outcomes? For now, governments levy most tourism-related taxes based on business outcomes such as overnights and turnover. In effect, the tax system punishes successful business and, depending on the level of taxation, fosters low levels of tax compliance. In contrast, economists praise the virtues of taxing business potential instead, as is the case for property taxes. This potential-based approach is characterized by relatively low efficiency costs, a benign impact on growth, and high score on fairness (Norregaard, 2013). Despite these advantages, these types of levies remain unpopular because they are salient and hard to avoid.

8 DOMAIN 5: BIG DATA AND VISITOR MANAGEMENT

Discussion

The potential of "big data" to help better understand travel decisions and manage visitor behavior was a point of unanimous agreement throughout presentations in different thematic sessions. Notwithstanding its potential, discussions in the consensus session revealed a more nuanced stance toward the use of big data, including mobile phone data (Shoval & Isaacson, 2007), peer-to-peer communication initiated by visitors about tourist experience (e.g., tweets) (Sevin, 2013), and geolocation tracking based on visitor cards, and other volunteered geographic information embedded in holiday snapshots, etc. (Önder, Koerbitz, & Hubmann-Haidvogel, 2014). In particular, conference attendees raised five concerns.

First, while promising, tourism research relying on big data still has quite a way to go before it can connect observations in the form of data points to actionable advice. Isolated cases of company-type destinations such as Disney resorts aside, the currently available big data on many destinations does not (yet) substitute for conversations and engagement with visitors on-site.

Second, resources and expertise are not yet sufficient to effectively learn from - and manage - big data in tourism. This issue might, however, be temporary; conference attendees expect that big data management tools will become easier to handle, mediators will structure data in ever more meaningful ways and new generations of academics and professionals will be trained to deal with big data.

Third, despite achievements in this domain, the way that big-data-based research is now being presented provokes marvel at its potential and a bias towards demonstrating what we can descriptively display. Thus, conference attendees highlighted the need for significant contributions that demonstrate the use of big data to answer real questions and create actionable advice. The second concern discussed above pointed to the lack of technical skills and resources, while this point stresses the importance and necessity of domain knowledge and theory to make sense of available data volume. This is a key challenge for both researchers and tourism managers (McAfee, Brynjolfsson, Davenport, Patil, & Barton, 2012).

Fourth, regular use of big data will probably become necessary for destination and visitor management when the automation of frequent to real-time measurement and interpretation of large volumes of visitor observations tied to particular travel motives are achieved. In working toward this goal, data triangulation issues, transparency and accountability in handling visitor data must be addressed.

Finally, until such solutions become economically, technically, and legally feasible, destination management and marketing can make better use of direct field observations and knowledge of local actors as proxies to reconstruct visitors' spatial behavior. Given the precarious funding of many destination-wide endeavors, the marginal benefit of 2016 big data applications seem still low.

Implications

Finally, conference attendees concurred about three directions for future research in this domain; first, how can we meaningfully connect available data on tourism-relevant spatial behavior with travel motives and decision-making, given that we still mostly collect data using traditional travel surveys and similar tools? Second, how can we transform data into meaningful and actionable information without succumbing to statistical opportunism (Beritelli et al., 2014)? The premise underlying these questions is: we ought to use data as a means to an end, rather than understand data as an end in itself. And finally, how can tourism service providers, DMOs and other destination actors take ownership of relevant data in a context characterized by fragmented production in networks? Large parts of "big data" are collected across a multitude of providers and travel interfaces operated by different intermediaries, such as search engine providers (Google) and credit card companies.

9 COMPARISON TO PREVIOUS ADM CONSENSUSES

From an attitude perspective, discussions in 2016 continued to reflect the previous (self-) critical attitude toward the present state of research and practice in destination management and marketing. Moreover, the underlying drivers (i.e., increased competition, complex and diverse business context and diminishing finances for many traditional destination actors) remained unchallenged. The same is true for the shared concern about producing rigorous research that results in workable advice for the practice of destination marketing and management across all presented topical domains.

Compared to previous editions, the 2016 consensus offers three new topics (domains 2, 4, and 5) and two thematic extensions (domains 1 and 3). In other previous topical domains, discussions have stalled; for the first time since 2010, a definition of “the destination” seems unimportant. While conclusions among tourism researchers vary about details, there seems to be a consensus on: (1) the complex multi-faceted nature of destinations, (2) importance of visitors’ spatial behavior not corresponding to administrative destination boundaries and (3) spatial behavior activating business systems or networks that co-create or co-produce experience as productive output. Hence, there were no new or contested attempts at defining destination. Similarly, previous gaps in destination governance, destination branding and communication, as well as sustainability - identified in 2014 - remained unaddressed at the conference.

We are looking forward to continuing these discussions and evaluating their impact at the 4th Advances in Destination Management Forum in Switzerland from June 13 to 15, 2018.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the following colleagues listed in alphabetical order for their active participation, support, and invaluable contributions to this consensus: Salvador Anton Clavé, Geoffrey Crouch, Alan Fyall, Samuel Heer, Marion Joppe, Clemens Klötringer, Jieqing Luo, Brendan Paddison, Rick Perdue, Leana Reinl, Chris Romer, Miriam Scalione, Franz Schmidt,

Sandy (Ye) Shen, Thomas Steiner, Jürg Stettler, Jason Stienmetz, Gabby Walters, and Florian Zach.

TABLES

Consensus discourse methodology

Step	Action	Purpose
1	Record critical thoughts, propositions, and intermediate conclusions on cards and pin boards	Record sense-making throughout the conference Support attendees' recall Avoid overemphasizing contents and discussion toward the end of the conference
2	Interpretive content analysis	Discern the domains that preoccupied conference attendees throughout the conference Identify topical clusters that transcend the individual conference sessions Stimulate vivid and critical discussion on the state-of-the-art of destination management research
3	Consensus discussion with real-time commented transcript	Discussion and substantiation of identified topical clusters in terms of collective interpretation and research avenues Identification of links among topical clusters and matters discussed Expression of approval or dissent on written formulation
4	Ex-post consultation on written consensus	Collect afterthoughts, publications references, and recommendations Qualification of and elaboration on first written draft of consensus based on attendee's expertise in different domains
5	Vote on final consensus	Expression of overall solidarity in sentiment and belief with the statements presented in the consensus on advances in destination management.

REFERENCES

Beritelli, P., & Bieger, T. (2014). From destination governance to destination leadership–defining and exploring the significance with the help of a systemic perspective. *Tourism Review, 69*(1), 25-46.

Beritelli, P., Bieger, T., & Laesser, C. (2014). The New Frontiers of Destination Management Applying Variable Geometry as a Function-Based Approach. *Journal of Travel Research, 53*(4), 403-417.

Beritelli, P., & Reinhold, S. (2010). Explaining decisions for change in tourist destinations: The garbage can model in action *Managing Change in Tourism: Creating Opportunities-Overcoming Obstacles* (Vol. 4, pp. 137).

Beritelli, P., Reinhold, S., Laesser, C., & Bieger, T. (2015). *The St. Gallen Model for Destination Management* (1 ed.). St. Gallen: IMP-HSG.

Burgelman, R. A., & Grove, A. S. (2007). Cross-boundary disruptors: powerful interindustry entrepreneurial change agents. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 1*(3/4), 315-327.

Casadesus-Masanell, R., & Ricart, J. E. (2010). From Strategy to Business Models and onto Tactics. *Long Range Planning, 43*(2/3), 195-215.

Chronis, A. (2005). Coconstructing heritage at the gettysburg storyscape. *Annals of Tourism Research, 32*(2), 386-406.

Chronis, A. (2012). Tourists as Story-Builders: Narrative Construction at a Heritage Museum. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 29*(5), 444-459. doi:10.1080/10548408.2012.691395

Clark, R. A., & Goldsmith, R. E. (2005). Market mavens: Psychological influences. *Psychology and marketing, 22*(4), 289-312.

Escalas, J. E. (1998). Advertising narratives: What are they and how do they work. *Representing consumers: Voices, views, and visions*, 267-289.

Feick, L. F., & Price, L. L. (1987). The market maven: A diffuser of marketplace information. *The Journal of Marketing*, 83-97.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (2013). *Social cognition: From brains to culture*: Sage.

Gunn, C. (1972). *Vacationscape: Designing tourist environments*.

Hamilton, A., Marshall, S. B., & Hobson, H. A. (2012). Cities versus Online Travel Companies Liability for Room Occupancy Taxes. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 53*(4), 357-364.

Hristov, D., & Zehrer, A. (2015). The destination paradigm continuum revisited: DMOs serving as leadership networks. *Tourism Review, 70*(2), 116-131.

Laesser, C., & Beritelli, P. (2013). St. Gallen Consensus on Destination Management. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 2*(1), 46-49.

Larsen, S. (2007). Aspects of a Psychology of the Tourist Experience. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 7*(1), 7-18.

Lecocq, X., Demil, B., & Ventura, J. (2010). Business models as a research program in strategic management: An appraisal based on Lakatos. *M@n@gement, 13*(4), 214-225.

Lee, S. K. (2014). Revisiting the impact of bed tax with spatial panel approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 41*, 49-55.

Lichrou, M., O'Malley, L., & Patterson, M. (2014). On the marketing implications of place narratives. *Journal of Marketing Management, 30*(9-10), 832-856.

Lindblom, C. E. (1959). The science of" muddling through". *Public administration review*, 79-88.

Litvin, S. W., Smith, W. W., & Blackwell, C. (2012). Destination marketing, accommodation taxes, and mandated tourism promotional expenditures: may be time to reconsider. *Current Issues in Tourism, 15*(4), 385-390.

Mair, J., Ritchie, B. W., & Walters, G. (2016). Towards a research agenda for post-disaster and post-crisis recovery strategies for tourist destinations: a narrative review. *Current Issues in Tourism, 19*(1), 1-26.

McAfee, A., Brynjolfsson, E., Davenport, T. H., Patil, D., & Barton, D. (2012). Big data. *The management revolution. Harvard Bus Rev, 90*(10), 61-67.

McGrath, R. G., & MacMillan, I. C. (1995). Discovery-driven planning. *Harvard Business Review, 73*(4), 44-54.

Mintzberg, H. (1990). The design school: reconsidering the basic premises of strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 11*(3), 171-195.

Mintzberg, H. (2003). *The strategy process: concepts, contexts, cases*: Pearson education.

Mintzberg, H., & Lampel, J. (1999). Reflecting on the strategy process. *Sloan Management Review, 40*(3), 21-30.

Norregaard, M. J. (2013). *Taxing Immovable Property Revenue Potential and Implementation Challenges*: International Monetary Fund.

Önder, I., Koerbitz, W., & Hubmann-Haidvogel, A. (2014). Tracing Tourists by Their Digital Footprints The Case of Austria. *Journal of Travel Research*, doi:0047287514563985.

Park, S., & Santos, C. A. (2016). Exploring the Tourist Experience: A Sequential Approach. *Journal of Travel Research*. doi:10.1177/0047287515624017

Reinhold, S., Laesser, C., & Beritelli, P. (2015). 2014 St. Gallen Consensus on destination management. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 4*(2), 137-142.

Reinl, L., & Kelliher, F. (2010). Cooperative micro-firm strategies: leveraging resources through learning networks. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation, 11*(2), 141-150.

Reinl, L., & Kelliher, F. (2014). The social dynamics of micro-firm learning in an evolving learning community. *Tourism management, 40*, 117-125.

Rickly-Boyd, J. M. (2009). The Tourist Narrative. *Tourist Studies, 9*(3), 259-280. doi:10.1177/1468797610382701

Sainaghi, R. (2006). From contents to processes: Versus a dynamic destination management model (DDMM). *Tourism management, 27*(5), 1053-1063.

Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1995). Knowledge and memory: The real story. *Knowledge and memory: The real story. Advances in social cognition, 8*, 1-85.

Sevin, E. (2013). Places going viral: Twitter usage patterns in destination marketing and place branding. *Journal of Place Management and development, 6*(3), 227-239.

Shoval, N., & Isaacson, M. (2007). Tracking tourists in the digital age. *Annals of Tourism Research, 34*(1), 141-159.

Sternberg, E. (1997). The iconography of the tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24*(4), 951-969.

Stokes, R. (2008). Tourism strategy making: Insights to the events tourism domain. *Tourism management, 29*(2), 252-262.

Tussyadiah, I. P. (2014). Toward a Theoretical Foundation for Experience Design in Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 53*(5), 543-564.

Uriely, N. (2005). The tourist experience: Conceptual Developments. *Annals of Tourism Research, 32*(1), 199-216.

Vittersø, J., Vorkinn, M., Vistad, O. I., & Vaagland, J. (2000). Tourist experiences and attractions. *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*(2), 432-450.

Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science, 16*(4), 409-421.

Zott, C., & Amit, R. (2010). Business Model Design: An Activity System Perspective. *Long Range Planning*, *43*(2/3), 216-226.