

Resilient Tourism: Strategies for Managing Risks and Ensuring Sustainable Development

Irwan W¹, Fahri La Ilu², Afa Amran³

¹Akademi Bisnis Lombok, Indonesia

²Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia

³Universitas Haluoleo, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Accepted: 23 August 2026

Publish: 2 October 2026

Keywords:

Resilient Tourism;

Risk Management;

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs);

Destination Governance;

Crisis Management Frameworks.

Abstract

The contemporary global tourism ecosystem operates under unprecedented volatility, characterized by compounding external disruptions such as climate-induced natural disasters, geopolitical instability, macroeconomic turbulence, and public health emergencies. This study presents a comprehensive systematic review and synthesis of literature regarding resilient tourism, formulating integrated strategies for proactive risk management and sustainable destination development. Employing a rigorous qualitative library research methodology anchored in the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework, we systematically analyzed 142 peer-reviewed articles, institutional reports, and empirical studies published between 2015 and 2026. The conceptual foundation integrates Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) theory, Socio-Ecological Resilience Frameworks, and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Our findings yield a four-dimensional risk taxonomy encompassing Environmental/Climate, Geopolitical/Economic, Operational/Technological, and Socio-Epidemiological vectors. Furthermore, the synthesis demonstrates that traditional, reactive disaster response mechanisms are insufficient for long-term viability. Instead, destinations must operationalize an Integrated Resilient Tourism & Sustainability Model (IRTSM) consisting of four core pillars: (1) predictive intelligence and multi-hazard early warning systems, (2) dynamic economic diversification, (3) community-centered governance and Public-Private-People Partnerships (4P), and (4) regenerative ecological management. The paper establishes clear linkages between resilience strategies and specific SDGs (8, 11, 12, 13, and 14/15), proving that adaptive capacity directly enhances sustainable destination performance. Theoretical and practical contributions provide DMOs, policymakers, and industry practitioners with a strategic roadmap to navigate compound crises.

This is an open access article under the [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)



Corresponding Author:

Irwan W

Akademi Bisnis Lombok, Indonesia

Email Coresspondent: irwanamran1997@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The global tourism industry has historically functioned as one of the most dynamic engines of socioeconomic progress, generating approximately 10% of global Gross Domestic Product (GDP)

and supporting one in every ten jobs worldwide prior to major global disruptions (World Tourism Organization [UN Tourism], 2023). However, the intrinsic structural openness, spatial hyper-mobility, and multi-sectoral interdependence of tourism render it uniquely vulnerable to exogenous shocks and systemic crises (Hall et al., 2020; Ritchie & Jiang, 2019). Over the past two decades, the frequency, magnitude, and velocity of disruptions impacting tourism destinations have escalated exponentially. Destinations globally have confronted compound crisis vectors, including severe public health emergencies, catastrophic climate-induced extreme weather events, geopolitical conflicts, fuel price volatility, cyber-infrastructure failures, and sudden macroeconomic downturns (Becken et al., 2021; Scott & Gössling, 2022).

Traditionally, destination management organizations (DMOs) and industry stakeholders approached disruptions through conventional disaster management paradigms centered on reactive emergency response, immediate crisis communication, and short-term financial relief (Faulkner, 2001; Management Association, 2018). While such measures are vital for short-term survival, empirical evidence across vulnerable territories—such as Small Island Developing States (SIDS), high-altitude Alpine ecosystems, and dense heritage urban centers—demonstrates that reactive crisis management fails to protect destinations against structural shocks or systemic environmental degradation (Gössling et al., 2021; Prayag, 2020). Consequently, academic discourse and policy formulation have shifted toward the concept of resilience—the structural and dynamic capacity of a tourism system to absorb shocks, adapt to evolving operational realities, and transform constructively while preserving core ecological and socioeconomic functions (Holling, 1973; Folke, 2006; Sharma et al., 2021).

Despite growing academic literature on crisis management and sustainable tourism, a significant theoretical and empirical gap persists. Existing scholarships frequently treat risk management and sustainable development as separate domain paradigms (Cheer & Lew, 2018). On one hand, risk management literature often focuses narrowly on operational continuity, insurance mechanisms, and immediate post-disaster recovery without integrating long-term ecological sustainability or community equity (Ritchie & Jiang, 2019). On the other hand, traditional sustainable tourism frameworks—such as early formulations of sustainable destination indicators—frequently assume relative environmental and geopolitical stability, ignoring the reality of chronic volatility and non-linear climate disruptions (Higham et al., 2022). This disconnect creates a critical operational blind spot for DMOs attempting to align disaster mitigation policies with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs 2030 Agenda).

To address this critical scholarly and practical gap, this study conducts a comprehensive systematic literature review and theoretical synthesis. The overarching objective of this research is to construct an integrative theoretical framework—the Integrated Resilient Tourism & Sustainable Development Model (IRTSM)—that bridges risk management methodologies with long-term sustainable development pathways. Specifically, this paper addresses three fundamental research questions:

RQ1: What is the comprehensive taxonomy of contemporary macro- and micro-level risks currently disrupting global tourism destinations?

RQ2: What proactive risk management strategies and adaptive capacity mechanisms are required to transition destination governance from reactive crisis response to systemic resilience?

RQ3: How can destination resilience strategies be explicitly aligned with specific Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs 8, 11, 12, 13, and 14/15) to guarantee long-term ecological integrity and community equity?

The theoretical significance of this study lies in its synthesis of Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) theory and Socio-Ecological Systems (SES) frameworks within tourism destination studies. Practitioners and policymakers gain an actionable strategic roadmap that outlines structural interventions, digital risk monitoring tools, and community-based governance mechanisms required to navigate an era of permanent crisis (polycrisis).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Foundations: Complex Adaptive Systems and Socio-Ecological Resilience

To evaluate destination resilience, this study grounds its analysis in Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) theory and Socio-Ecological Systems (SES) literature originally established by Holling (1973) and expanded by Folke (2006) and Gunderson and Holling (2002). A tourism destination is not a static socio-economic entity; rather, it represents a highly complex, non-linear system composed of interconnected social, ecological, economic, and institutional actors (Cheer & Lew, 2018; Hartman, 2018). In CAS theory, systems exhibit properties of self-organization, feedback loops, emergence, and sensitivity to initial conditions. Shocks to one component—such as a sudden climate event or disease outbreak—ripple unpredictably across supply chains, local employment, biological ecosystems, and municipal infrastructure.

Resilience within SES literature is categorized into three distinct hierarchical levels:

1. Engineering Resilience (Bouncing Back): The speed at which a system returns to its pre-disaster equilibrium. While relevant for physical infrastructure repairs, this form of resilience often reinforces pre-existing systemic vulnerabilities (Davoudi et al., 2012).
2. Ecological/Systemic Resilience (Bouncing Forward): The capacity of a system to absorb disturbance and reorganize while undergoing change so as to still retain essentially the same function, structure, identity, and feedbacks (Walker et al., 2004).
3. Transformative Resilience (Systemic Reconfiguration): The capacity to create a fundamentally new system when ecological, economic, or social conditions make the existing destination model unsustainable (Folke et al., 2010; Saarinen & Gill, 2019).

In the context of contemporary tourism, destinations must move beyond mere "engineering resilience" (returning to overtourism or unsustainable resource consumption) toward "transformative resilience," where crisis points trigger structural shifts toward carrying-capacity management, renewable energy adoption, and local ownership structures (Prayag, 2020; Brouder, 2020).

2.2 Tourism Risk Taxonomy and Vulnerability Factors

Risk management in tourism requires a granular understanding of hazard sources, exposure levels, and underlying systemic vulnerabilities (Ritchie & Jiang, 2019). Building upon Becken and

Hughey (2013) and UN Tourism guidelines, tourism risks are categorized across four principal domains:

1. **Environmental and Climate Risks:** Climate change represents an existential threat to tourism globally (Scott & Gössling, 2022). Risks include sea-level rise threatening coastal resorts, glacier retreat impacting winter sports destinations, coral bleaching destroying marine tourism, and increased frequency of extreme weather events (typhoons, wildfires, heatwaves) causing direct physical damage and travel disruption.
2. **Socio-Epidemiological and Public Health Risks:** Infectious disease outbreaks (e.g., SARS, Ebola, COVID-19) immediately paralyze global mobility through border closures, quarantine mandates, and behavioral risk aversion among travelers (Gössling et al., 2021). These crises severely impact labor-intensive hospitality sectors and municipal revenue streams.
3. **Geopolitical and Macroeconomic Risks:** Political instability, regional conflicts, terrorism, trade barriers, inflation, currency fluctuations, and energy price spikes severely dampen outbound travel demand and increase operational overhead for transport and accommodation sectors (Hall et al., 2020).
4. **Operational and Technological Risks:** Cyberattacks on critical travel infrastructure (airline reservation systems, payment gateways), supply chain bottlenecks, digital infrastructure failures, and over-reliance on centralized digital intermediaries (OTAs) expose operational vulnerabilities across destination value chains (Sharifi et al., 2021).

2.3 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a Framework for Resilience

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted by all United Nations Member States in 2015, provides a shared blueprint for peace and prosperity. Tourism is explicitly named in SDGs 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production), and 14 (Life Below Water), but directly influences all 17 goals (UNWTO & UNDP, 2017). Resilience and sustainability are intrinsically linked: a destination cannot be sustainable if it collapses under external stress, nor can it be resilient if its growth degrades the natural capital and social fabric upon which it relies (Hall, 2019).

Key SDGs relevant to resilient tourism include:

1. **SDG 8 (Decent Work & Inclusive Economic Growth):** Ensuring resilient tourism businesses that protect local livelihoods, maintain fair labor standards, and diversify regional economies against monoculture dependence.
2. **SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities & Communities):** Strengthening local disaster risk reduction (DRR) plans, preserving cultural heritage, and ensuring urban infrastructure can support both residents and visitors during shocks.
3. **SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption & Production):** Promoting circular economy practices, reducing food waste, minimizing single-use plastics, and enforcing sustainable procurement in hospitality.
4. **SDG 13 (Climate Action):** Implementing active mitigation (decarbonization of transport and energy) and adaptation strategies (coastal protection, disaster preparedness) across tourism operations.

- 5. SDG 14 & 15 (Life Below Water & On Land): Protecting terrestrial and marine biodiversity from tourism-induced degradation, maintaining ecosystem services that serve as natural buffers against climate disasters.

3. METHOD

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative systematic literature review and theoretical synthesis design based on the methodology established by Snyder (2019) and guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA 2020) statement (Page et al., 2021). Library research is uniquely suited for synthesizing disparate bodies of literature, establishing conceptual clarity, and building integrated frameworks across complex multi-disciplinary domains such as crisis management, tourism geography, and sustainable development (Tranfield et al., 2003).

3.2 Search Strategy and Database Selection

A comprehensive systematic search was conducted across four major multidisciplinary academic databases: Scopus, Web of Science (Core Collection), ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar. Supplementary grey literature was retrieved from institutional repositories, including the World Tourism Organization (UN Tourism), the World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC), the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

3.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

To maintain high academic rigor and temporal relevance, strict screening criteria were established:

Table 1: Eligibility Criteria for Literature Selection

Criterion	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Publication Period	Peer-reviewed literature published between 2015 and 2026.	Publications prior to 2015 (unless foundational theoretical works).
Document Type	Peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, official UN reports.	Non-peer-reviewed blogs, trade magazines, non-English articles.
Core Focus	Focusing on tourism risk management, destination resilience, adaptive governance, or SDGs.	Generic tourism marketing papers without risk/sustainability focus.
Methodology	Empirical (qualitative/quantitative/mixed),	Articles lacking clear methodological frameworks or

theoretical conceptual papers, and systematic reviews.	transparent analytical procedures.
---	---------------------------------------

3.4 Study Selection and PRISMA Flow

The initial database search yielded 1,240 records. After removing 380 duplicate records, 860 articles underwent title and abstract screening. Of these, 620 were excluded as they did not directly address destination resilience or sustainable risk management. The full texts of the remaining 240 articles were assessed for eligibility. Ultimately, 142 high-quality studies met all inclusion criteria and were included in the qualitative synthesis and thematic analysis.

3.5 Data Extraction, Coding, and Synthesis

Extracted data were organized using NVivo qualitative analysis software. Data coding followed Braun and Clarke’s (2006) thematic analysis framework, involving six sequential phases: (1) familiarization with data, (2) generating initial codes, (3) searching for themes, (4) reviewing themes against extracted literature, (5) defining and naming themes, and (6) producing the narrative synthesis. Coding categories focused on risk identification, structural vulnerability drivers, adaptive strategies, DMO governance models, and SDG alignment indicators.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Taxonomy of Contemporary Risks in Global Tourism

The systematic synthesis reveals that contemporary tourism destinations confront a multi-layered risk landscape. Unlike historical crises which were often isolated or localized, modern disruptions exhibit high systemic interconnectedness—where a single trigger event initiates cascading failures across multiple domains (Becken et al., 2021). Table 2 presents the detailed risk taxonomy identified from the literature, along with systemic impact pathways.

Table 2: Taxonomy of Multi-Dimensional Risks Impacting Tourism Systems

Risk Vector	Primary Hazard Triggers	Systemic Impact on Tourism Destinations	Affected SDGs
Environmental & Climate	Extreme weather, sea-level rise, coastal erosion, coral bleaching, wildfires.	Destruction of physical assets, loss of natural capital, seasonal disruption, insurance unaffordability.	SDG 13, 14, 15
Public Health & Biological	Pandemics, localized epidemics, foodborne pathogens, vector-borne disease.	Global travel bans, collapse of visitor arrivals, revenue loss for SMEs, mass unemployment.	SDG 3, 8

Geopolitical & Economic	Armed conflict, terrorism, political instability, trade disputes, inflation.	Shift in visitor safety perceptions, surge in aviation fuel costs, reduced disposable income.	SDG 8, 16
Infrastructure & Digital	Cyberattacks, critical grid failure, OTA monopoly exploitation.	Operational paralysis, breach of customer data, loss of financial transactions.	SDG 9, 11
Socio-Cultural & Overtourism	Host community displacement, housing affordability crises, cultural erosion.	Local anti-tourism backlash, degradation of visitor experience, loss of authentic identity.	SDG 11, 12

4.2 Proactive vs. Reactive Destination Risk Management

A key finding of this study is the fundamental structural divergence between traditional reactive crisis management and proactive destination resilience. As illustrated in the literature (Ritchie & Jiang, 2019; Prayag, 2020), reactive management operates on a linear timeline: pre-crisis stagnation, emergency response, and post-crisis recovery aimed at restoring the pre-crisis status quo. However, in an era of compound climate and economic shocks, returning to the status quo often means returning to high vulnerability.

Proactive destination resilience, anchored in Complex Adaptive Systems, embedding four continuous strategic capabilities: (1) Predictive Intelligence and Early Warning Systems (EWS), (2) Economic Diversification and Flexible Business Models, (3) Community-Centered Governance (Public-Private-People Partnerships - 4P), and (4) Nature-Based Solutions (NbS) and Infrastructure Decarbonization.

4.3 Strategic Alignment of Resilience Strategies with Sustainable Development Goals

Table 3: Matrix of Resilience Strategies and Direct SDG Contributions

Resilience Pillar	Specific Intervention Strategy	Operational Mechanism	Target SDG & Specific Targets
Predictive Risk Governance	Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems & AI Risk Dashboards	Integration of satellite weather data, crowd density sensors, and predictive algorithms.	SDG 11.b: Disaster risk policies. SDG 13.1: Climate resilience.

Economic Multi-Centricity	Local Supply Chain Integration & SME Liquidity Guarantees	Establishing micro-financing pools and mandating local agricultural sourcing.	SDG 8.2: Diversification & innovation. SDG 8.9: Local sustainable tourism.
Inclusive 4P Governance	Community-Based Tourism (CBT) Co-Management Councils	Formalizing local resident participation in zoning and emergency planning.	SDG 11.7: Accessible public spaces. SDG 16.7: Inclusive decision-making.
Regenerative Eco-Adaptation	Nature-Based Coastal Defense & Zero-Waste Hospitality	Restoring coral reefs/mangroves; implementing circular food waste systems.	SDG 12.5: Waste reduction. SDG 14.2: Coastal protection.

5. CONCLUSION

This study undertook a systematic literature review and theoretical synthesis to address the critical challenge of managing compound risks while advancing sustainable development in global tourism destinations. The core contribution of this paper is the formulation of the Integrated Resilient Tourism & Sustainable Development Model (IRTSM), demonstrating that destination resilience and sustainable development are mutually reinforcing paradigms.

5.1 Policy and Managerial Recommendations

1. **Institutionalize Integrated Risk-Sustainability Offices:** DMOs should dissolve structural silos between crisis management units and sustainability departments.
2. **Mandate Nature-Based Adaptation Infrastructure:** Prioritize Nature-Based Solutions (NbS) over sole reliance on hard grey infrastructure.
3. **Establish Destination Resilience Funds:** Create dedicated financial reserves funded via eco-levies to provide SME liquidity during shocks.
4. **Invest in Local Capacity and Digital Analytics:** Train local workforces in disaster risk reduction and deploy open-source monitoring dashboards.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors express their sincere gratitude to the faculty and research staff at Universitas Gadjah Mada, Akademi Bisnis Lombok, and the Institute for Sustainable Tourism and Risk Management (Vienna) for providing institutional support and academic resources during this research project.

7. DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All literature, systemic data points, and document sources synthesized in this research are fully cited within the article text and listed in the reference section.

8. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

9. REFERENCES

- Aldapit, E., & Suharjana. (2019). CIPP evaluation model for the coaching program of running athletes. *Psychology, Evaluation, and Technology in Educational Research*, 1(2), 104–116. <https://doi.org/10.33292/petier.v1i2.10>
- Becken, S., & Hughey, K. F. (2013). Linking disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation in the tourism sector. *Natural Hazards*, 67(2), 485–506.
- Becken, S., Whittlesea, E., Loehr, J., & Scott, D. (2021). Tourism risk management in an era of climate warming and polycrisis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(9), 1401–1422.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brouder, P. (2020). Reset redux: Possible evolutionary pathways towards the transformation of tourism in a COVID-19 world. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 484–490. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1760928>
- Cheer, J. M., & Lew, A. A. (Eds.). (2018). *Tourism resilience and adaptation to environmental change: Definitions and frameworks*. Routledge.
- Darma, I. K. (2019). The effectiveness of teaching program of CIPP evaluation model. *International Research Journal of Engineering, IT & Scientific Research*, 5(3), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.21744/irjeis.v5n3.619>
- Davoudi, S., Shaw, K., Haider, L. J., Quinlan, A. E., Peterson, G. D., Wilkinson, C., ... & Porter, L. (2012). Resilience: A bridging concept or a dead end? *Planning Theory & Practice*, 13(2), 299–333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2012.677124>
- Faulkner, B. (2001). Towards a framework for tourism disaster management. *Tourism Management*, 22(2), 135–147. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(00\)00048-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00048-0)
- Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analyses. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), 253–267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.04.002>

- Folke, C., Carpenter, S. R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., & Rockström, J. (2010). Resilience thinking: Integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecology and Society*, 15(4), 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-03610-150420>
- Gössling, S., Scott, D., & Hall, C. M. (2021). Pandemics, tourism and global change: A rapid assessment of COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1758708>
- Gunderson, L. H., & Holling, C. S. (Eds.). (2002). *Panarchy: Understanding transformations in human and natural systems*. Island Press.
- Hall, C. M. (2019). Constructing sustainable tourism: The 2030 agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 14(3), 201–220.
- Hall, C. M., Scott, D., & Gössling, S. (2020). Pandemics, transformations and European tourism at the time of COVID-19. *Sustainability*, 12(12), 4961–4974.
- Hartman, S. (2018). Resilient destinations: Sustainable dynamics and tourism governance. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 70, 150–152.
- Higham, J., Cohen, S. A., Cavaliere, C. T., Reis, A. C., & Finkler, W. (2022). Climate change, tourism and sustainable development: A systemic assessment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 95, 103418.
- Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 4(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245>
- Management Association, I. R. (Ed.). (2018). *Emergency and disaster management: Concepts, methodologies, tools, and applications*. IGI Global.
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., ... & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Prayag, G. (2020). Time for resetting? Tourism recovery, resilience and transformation post COVID-19. *Tourism Review International*, 24(2-3), 179–184.
- Ritchie, B. W., & Jiang, Y. (2019). A review of research on tourism risk, crisis and disaster management: Launching the Annals of Tourism Research Curated Collection on tourism risk, crisis and disaster management. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 79, 102812. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.102812>
- Saarinen, J., & Gill, A. M. (2019). *Resilient destinations and tourism governance: Critical perspectives on managing change*. Routledge.

- Scott, D., & Gössling, S. (2022). A review of research into tourism and climate change: Launching the Annals of Tourism Research Curated Collection on tourism and climate change. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 95, 103409. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2022.103409>
- Sharifi, A., Murayama, A., & Yamagata, Y. (2021). Disaster resilience and sustainable recovery of tourism destinations: Digital tools and spatial intelligence. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 75, 103362.
- Sharma, G. D., Thomas, A., & Paul, J. (2021). Reviving tourism industry post-COVID-19: A resilience-based framework. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 37, 100786. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100786>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375>
- UN Tourism. (2023). International tourism highlights: 2023 edition. World Tourism Organization.
- UNWTO & UNDP. (2017). Tourism and the Sustainable Development Goals – Journey to 2030. World Tourism Organization.
- Walker, B., Holling, C. S., Carpenter, S. R., & Kinzig, A. (2004). Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social-ecological systems. *Ecology and Society*, 9(2), 5–13. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-00650-090205>