


CASE STUDY

Saving the tourism industry with staycation vouchers [version 1; peer review: 2 approved, 1 approved with reservations]

Ljubica Knežević Cvelbar ¹, Marko Ogorevc²

¹School of Economics and Business, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

²Institute for Economics Research, Ljubljana, Slovenia

V1 First published: 12 Nov 2020, 2:65
<https://doi.org/10.35241/emeraldopenres.13924.1>
 Latest published: 12 Nov 2020, 2:65
<https://doi.org/10.35241/emeraldopenres.13924.1>

Abstract

The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic has caused a humanitarian crisis that will be followed by an economic crisis. Tourism is one of the most affected sectors of the economy. Forecasts are devastating. Many local communities lost an important source of income and employees lost their jobs. In Slovenia, where tourism represents approximately 10% of GDP, the Government, consulting with experts and scientists, introduced staycation vouchers. Each resident received a voucher worth €200, while children up to 18 years old received one worth €50. Through this scheme, the Government was subsidising residents to go on vacation with €350 million. The initial results are positive - in the first seven weeks, approximately 15% of staycation vouchers were used. Industry representatives are optimistic and the tourism industry may end up with a 40% drop in total revenue instead of the forecasted 70% for the year 2020. The pandemic has had some positive outcomes, since holidays in Slovenia this year were available to all.


Keywords

tourism, COVID-19 crisis, staycation vouchers, Slovenia

Open Peer Review

Approval Status   

	1	2	3
version 1 12 Nov 2020			

1. **Birgit Pikkemaat** , University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria
2. **Tina Segota** , University of Greenwich, London, United Kingdom
3. **Albert Assaf**, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, Amherst, United States

Any reports and responses or comments on the article can be found at the end of the article.



This article is included in the **Business School**

Impact System collection.

Corresponding author: Ljubica Knežević Cvelbar (ljubica.knezevic@ef.uni-lj.si)

Author roles: **Knežević Cvelbar L:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Ogorevc M:** Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Methodology

Competing interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information: This paper was financed by the Ministry of Economic Development and Technology, Slovenia (grant number C2130-20-090013).

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Copyright: © 2020 Knežević Cvelbar L and Ogorevc M. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Knežević Cvelbar L and Ogorevc M. **Saving the tourism industry with staycation vouchers [version 1; peer review: 2 approved, 1 approved with reservations]** Emerald Open Research 2020, 2:65 <https://doi.org/10.35241/emeraldopenres.13924.1>

First published: 12 Nov 2020, 2:65 <https://doi.org/10.35241/emeraldopenres.13924.1>

Introduction

Globally, tourism is the fourth largest economic activity. It contributes 9% to the global GDP and accounts for 1 in 11 jobs worldwide (UNWTO, 2018). The number of international tourists has doubled over the past two decades. In 2019 1.4 billion tourists were traveling all around the world. Including domestic tourists, the number of tourists globally reached 6.2 billion annually (UNWTO, 2019). This growth in tourism comes at a cost, since tourism uses and pollutes water and air, generates waste, depletes natural resources, and contributes to global warming. Tourism is the fifth most polluting industry (UNWTO & UNEP, 2008). The industry's wider pollution profile contributed up to 12.5% of global warming, as tourism produces more than 35 million tons of solid waste (UNEP & UNWTO, 2012). It also produces social pressure in the local environment, causing overcrowding as well as cultural clashes between tourists and locals. Ensuring environmental and social sustainability was at the center of tourism development in the last decade.

The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic stopped tourism globally for approximately three months and has resulted in limited travel activities until a vaccine is developed and available to all. Globally we are facing high risks in traveling due to the health threats and limitations introduced by governments. Countries are listed as COVID-19 green, yellow, or red depending on their epidemiological situation, this is changing daily causing the problems for millions of travellers, making travel unappealing and quite stressful. Furthermore, fear and uncertainty are present among the population, substantially limiting the demand for tourism. Overnight, tourism moved from a situation of over-tourism to no tourism. This is an unprecedented situation, causing a lot of economic losses and suffering of millions of people in the local communities who depend on tourism.

There has not been a pandemic resulting with global lockdown in recent human history, so this crisis was unexpected (Gallego & Font, 2020). In our view this has been a shock for most of the economies and governments of the world, since many expected the SARS scenario from 2003. Yet, as we are witnessing the world ended up in this humanitarian crisis, which may be followed by an economic crisis. The question of the scope of the upcoming economic crisis still remains uncertain. Furthermore, the pandemic is unpredictable since its timeframe is unknown, and tourism is at the front line. Global forecasts are devastating. The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) (2020) forecasted three possible scenarios, predicting a drop in international tourism arrivals of 58% (scenario 1), 70% (scenario 2) and 78% (scenario 3) in 2020.

Tourism businesses globally were facing an immediate crisis on both the supply and demand side. Companies were closing down and employees were not going to work. In China, more than 40% of businesses were closed, while in Europe 70–90% were shut down, most commercial airplanes were grounded, events were cancelled and cruises ships stayed in ports (STR, 2020). Demand was limited due to the restrictions on mobility.

On top of this, we have to consider that tourism and hospitality businesses are high leverage businesses, meaning that they have high investments as well as high operating-fixed costs. Even a business operating successfully before the pandemic crisis can only survive in these conditions for a maximum of a few months. Local communities around the world will have to survive without their annual income, governments with no taxes, and [the whole economic ecosystem drained of essential resources](#).

The realities on the ground are tough and, without interventionism, the prospect of recovery would be quite uncertain. We can only expect a slow long-term recovery. [Current predictions](#) are that tourism recovery will take place for up to 18 to 24 months after the recovery of the global economy. Four main factors that will impact recovery are:

- (1) The situation with borders – what restrictions will be in place?
- (2) Time – how long will the crisis last?
- (3) Governments – which measures will be taken to support companies and workers?
- (4) Companies' crisis management – will companies have the knowledge to restructure on such short notice?

In this paper, we focus on government measures implemented to help the tourism industry on the path of recovery. Specifically, the paper is focused on the case of Slovenia, in which the Government decided to stimulate domestic demand with staycation vouchers. The University of Ljubljana, School of Economics and Business, together with its Center of Excellence, leader of Slovenian Research and Innovation Partnership in Tourism (SRIPT), worked closely with the Government, initiating this idea, and providing the necessary economic impact analysis. SRIPT connects the Government, academia, and industry, co-creating a fruitful environment for innovation and knowledge-driven research. All of the main tourism stakeholders in Slovenia are part of this cluster, which had an important role in mitigating the impacts of the COVID-19 crisis on tourism.

The development of the staycation vouchers scheme and its impacts on the Slovene tourism industry is explained within this case study. While helping to develop this scheme, experts from the School of Economics and Business tried their best to think about the future and, while securing income for thousands of employees, to also consider the impact of the industry on the environment. This crisis is an opportunity to rethink tourism development and openly discuss new avenues that are less invasive to, and more resilient for, the natural and social environment.

Staycion vouchers

To help the tourism industry to overcome and survive the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, most governments and international associations were focusing on proposing “supply-side” measures focused on helping companies. During the lockdown, this was the only right strategy. Governments, with almost

no exceptions, introduced [liquidity and loan guarantee schemes as well as labour cost compensation](#). The World Tourism and Travel Council (WTTC) in March 2020 advised governments globally to subsidise salaries and protect the income of millions of employees, and also to extend vital interest-free loans to tourism companies to ensure their liquidity. The WTTC also advised a waiver of all government taxes, dues and financial demands on the travel sector for the next 12 months, until March 2021.

The European Travel Commission (ETC) also published a [Tourism Manifesto](#) in March 2020. Similarly, the ETC proposed measures to protect workers and their incomes, short- and medium-term loans to overcome liquidity problems, fiscal relief for both operators and destinations as well as passing of a temporary airport slots waiver. They further proposed establishing the EU Coronavirus Response Investment Initiative Fund and the launching of the European Unemployment Reinsurance Scheme to help the industry to overcome the crisis at the EU level.

Most of the proposed measures were introduced during the lockdown when tourism companies were forced to close their businesses. Yet, after the pandemic was under control in most of the EU, economies started to open again. Tourism was the last on the opening list. Businesses could not operate in the same manner due to hygienic and precautionary measures and, even if open, most premises were empty in the first days and weeks of operation. Furthermore, the uncertainty of the pandemic and the threat of an economic crisis following this reduced the population's willingness to spend.

One of the first papers discussing the impact of lockdown on aggregate spending was by [Andersen et al. \(2020\)](#). They found that aggregate credit card spending in Denmark dropped by around 25% following the shutdown. Spending dropped dramatically (70%) on items where restrictions were imposed specifically in travel, restaurants, and personal services. [Guerrieri et al. \(2020\)](#) further report that lockdown had negative spill-overs, not just on closed sectors of the economy but also on those that remained open, through this drop in demand. This supply shock initiated these spill-overs ([Guerrieri et al., 2020](#)). Demand was affected due to the health risks; visiting public spaces like shops or restaurants was not appealing which reduced consumption ([Eichenbaum et al., 2020](#)). This changing dynamic on the demand side further reduced economic activity, and if consumers would further respond to lay-offs, falling asset prices ([Gormsen & Koijen, 2020](#)) and an uncertain financial outlook ([Baker et al., 2020](#)), this demand crisis would be substantially decrease private consumption. As [Andersen et al. \(2020\)](#) stated "the epidemic may mark the beginning of a demand-driven economic meltdown" (pp.89).

These were the main arguments that experts from the School of Economics and Business were communicating publicly and in discussions with governmental officials, even if open tourism businesses were threatened by the demand-driven meltdown. Therefore, actions needed to be taken to stimulate demand and enable sustainable economic activities until recovery.

Due to the pandemic, many tourism businesses had to pivot their marketing efforts onto domestic or regional markets. Yet tourism is undoubtedly related to a change in the usual place of residence. It is related to movement to discover different places and cultures. A focus on mainly the domestic market was never the point. So the question was how to stimulate the domestic market, the only market on which tourism suppliers could count after the lockdown, and within the expected demand meltdown? The answer proposed by the group of experts in Slovenia, including the authors of this paper, was by stimulating local demand using tourism staycation vouchers.

We believe that idea was controversial. Is it smart and reasonable that governments subsidise holidays for their residents? Is it fair that the rich and the poor will receive the same subsidies? What will be the redemption rate? What will be the effect of vouchers on additional spending, and what will be the multiplying effects on the economy? Will all destinations and operators equally benefit from this measure? Those were open questions for which the science and research did not have a clear answer.

Staycation vouchers in Slovenia

The Slovenian Government assisted the tourism industry with several waves of governmental help. The first package of help was directed towards tourism companies, to support and finance salaries for all employees that were "on hold" during the lockdown. The second package of help included loans with government guarantees and was focused on reducing companies' liquidity problems. Tourism companies used both packages of governmental help but warned that they needed more assistance ([Government of Republic of Slovenia, 2020](#)).

As stated, at that point, alternative solutions for industries highly affected by the pandemic were being explored, and the idea about staycation vouchers emerged. Professors and experts from the School of Economics and Business, University of Ljubljana were part of the government consulting group, working closely with the Government on the preparation of the Coronavirus Intervention Measures. Together with representatives of the tourism industry, the idea was adopted, and actions had to be taken fast since the summer season was approaching. Political goodwill was in favour of staycation vouchers. The media was extremely interested in the topic, and staycation vouchers were covered in news headings for weeks.

The main calculation done by the team from the School of Economics and Business was an evaluation of the economic impacts of staycation vouchers. Input-output tables were used to provide estimations. Estimations were based on the existing multipliers with guest structures that were quite different from the guest structure that was expected in 2020 after the great lockdown and COVID-19 pandemic. Keeping in mind all the limitations of this approach, existing data (input-output tables for Slovenia for 2014. Tables were elaborated based on supply and use tables published in 2017) were used to provide at least an approximation of the intervention impact. Input-output tables contain a matrix of intermediate transactions between sectors, final demand, exports, and imports in constant prices.

Value-added was measured by value-added in basic prices and gross wages.

Based on several scenarios, the Government of Slovenia accepted the one proposing a staycation voucher for each person with permanent residence in Slovenia on the 13th of March 2020. Residents older than 18 received a voucher worth €200 and residents younger than 18 a voucher worth €50. Each individual is entitled to redeem the voucher for accommodation or accommodation with breakfast from the 19th of June to the 31st of December 2020. The scheme accounts for approximately **€350 million or 0.72% of GDP in 2019**. The impacts of staycation vouchers on the economy and employment are presented in [Table 1](#).

As we can see from [Table 1](#), the expected drop in the hospitality industry revenues in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic was 70% in comparison with 2019; this means that the industry would lose €1.36 billion in 2020. Since the hospitality industry is related to many parts of the economy, a loss of revenue in the tourism industry contributes to revenue losses in retail, agriculture, transport and other industries. The total losses for the Slovenian economy would be €2.1 billion in 2020 or 4% of the GDP in 2019. In terms of employment, 5,774 employees' jobs were threatened.

If staycation vouchers were introduced, the demand would increase to approximately €512 million, the Government would subsidise €350 million, and an additional €162 million would come from additional private consumption. The total

multiplicative effects on the economy would be €0.8 billion, and 1,614 jobs would be saved. These numbers have shown that by introducing this measure, the losses in the industry could be reduced by one-third in 2020.

The Government decided to proceed with this solution. The tourism voucher scheme in Slovenia was introduced by the [Act of the Intervention Measures to Mitigate and Remedy the Consequences of the COVID-19 Epidemic](#), adopted on the 29th of May 2020 with an effective day on the 31st of May 2020.

While proposing this measure, it was highly important to design the implementation plan. It had to be simple and clear to residents and operators. The Financial Administration of the Republic of Slovenia (FARS) developed an app that related the tax number of the resident to the staycation voucher, meaning the resident could use the voucher several times until the whole amount was used. Furthermore, the implementation was simple. The resident stayed in the hotel and at checkout reported that part of the bill would be paid with vouchers. The value of the voucher was deducted from the bill and the resident paid the rest. The used staycation voucher is sent to the FARS and [reimbursed twice a month](#). The whole procedure is simple, clear, easy, and green.

During the discussion period and after this measure was implemented, specific market failures occurred. We expected that some of the operators would increase their prices or had a higher price for guests that would use staycation vouchers to pay for their services. This happened in practice and

Table 1. Multiplicative impacts of the staycation vouchers.

Variable	Accommodation and restaurants/bars	Tourism agencies	Total
Drop-in income due to COVID-19	70%	70%	70%
Value of the staycation vouchers	€300,000,000	€50,000,000	€350,000,000
Additional spending due to the staycation vouchers	€150,000,000	€12,500,000	€162,500,000
Drop-in demand due to COVID-19	-€1,058,460,000	-€310,660,000	-€1,369,120,000
Multiplicative effect on production	-€1,636,427,132	-€485,732,171	-€2,122,159,303
Multiplicative effect on gross salaries	-€882,971,851	-€344,954,154	-€1,227,926,005
Multiplicative effect on employment	-2,020	-3,753	-5,774
Increase in demand due to staycation vouchers	€450,000,000	€62,500,000	€512,500,000
Multiplicative effect on production	€695,720,395	€97,721,820	€793,442,215
Multiplicative effect on gross salaries	€375,391,921	€69,399,455	€444,791,376

Source: SORS (2020); own calculations.

unfortunately, self-interests were still prevailing in some cases. The Government had to impose a high penalty for all operators that tried to misuse this scheme.

As stated, the scheme was launched on the 19th of June, and during the first three weeks, 5% of the vouchers were used, with hotels reporting a significant increase in demand until the end of August. The [latest data](#) from the 10th of August show that 15% of all vouchers were used. Most of the hotels on the coast and spa hotels are fully booked (reporting 80% to 95% occupancy in July). In August it was especially difficult to find a vacant room in most of the Slovene spa, Alpine, and coast destinations. In communication with the industry, the preliminary feedbacks are indicating that city hotels so far have not benefited considerably from the scheme. For seaside resorts, mountain resorts and thermal-spa resorts, the forecasts for September to December are good and demand for weekend breaks is high. Hoteliers in those areas in our opinion are quite positive about this scheme and estimate that it will help them to finish the year 2020 with a 40% drop in comparison with the year 2019. Considering the forecasts from the beginning of 2020, when a 70% drop in demand was expected, this would be quite a success for the Slovenian tourism industry.

Conclusion

This case from Slovenia has shown that tourism staycation vouchers, with all their potential disadvantages, were a success, and probably more efficient than VAT reduction for tourism and hospitality companies. Yet, we cannot expect that governments will be paying for our holidays forever. Therefore, new paths for long-term recovery will have to be paved.

This crisis will bring challenges for tourism but also encourage us to rethink and redesign for future development. The growth of tourism in the last decade was unsustainable. Many destinations were challenged with extensive growth experiencing a high negative pressure on the environment and local population

quality of life, without solutions regarding how to proceed and enable environmental and social sustainability. The crisis offers an opportunity to restructure and improve. We need to aim towards being not only smarter and more resilient but also focusing on increasing the quality of residents' lives while preserving natural resources.

In this sense, the avenue for future development would probably not be going back to the local or regional economy. Once we have experienced a global and diverse world, it may be challenging to step back towards exploring local areas. But being more genuine and respectful to the environment would be the right way to go.

Furthermore, this crisis and the case presented herein have shown that high dependency on tourism can be more of a threat than a benefit. Tourism is fragile to external shocks, and governments around the world should reconsider more stable and sustainable development models that are not depending on a sole industry.

This case can be a good example also for other tourism-dependent countries, where many individuals are under the threat of losing their jobs, and whole communities are under the threat of losing an important source of income. This crisis gives us the time to reinvent tourism, let's do it properly this time.

Data availability

Underlying data

The raw data needed to replicate this analysis are publicly available from the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia ([SORS - Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia, 2020](#)): <https://pxweb.stat.si/SiStat/sl>

All data are under the copyright of the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia and are available royalty-free and given for free use to all users.

References

Andersen AL, Hansen ET, Johannesen N, *et al.*: **Consumer responses to the COVID-19 crisis: Evidence from bank account transaction data.** 2020.
[Reference Source](#)

Baker S, Bloom N, Davis S, *et al.*: **COVID-Induced Economic Uncertainty.** Working paper. 2020.
[Reference Source](#)

Eichenbaum MS, Rebelo S, Trabandt M: **The macroeconomics of epidemics.** Working paper. 2020.
[Reference Source](#)

Gallego I, Font X: **Changes in air passenger demand as a result of the COVID-19 crisis: using Big Data to inform tourism policy.** *Journal of Sustainable Tourism.* 2020; 0(0): 1–20.
[Publisher Full Text](#)

Gormsen NJ, Kojien RS: **Coronavirus: Impact on stock prices and growth expectations.** Working paper. 2020.
[Publisher Full Text](#)

Government of the Republic of Slovenia: **The governmental help to economy to mitigate COVID-19 crisis.** 2020.
[Reference Source](#)

Guerrieri V, Lorenzoni G, Straub L, *et al.*: **Macroeconomic Implications of COVID-19: Can Negative Supply Shocks Cause Demand Shortages?** Working paper. 2020.
[Reference Source](#)

SORS - Statistical Office of Republic of Slovenia: **Symmetric input-output table at basic prices, product by product, current prices, NACE/CPA Rev.2, 64 branches/products (ESA 2010).** 2020; [Accessed: 2020-05-04].
[Reference Source](#)

STR: **COVID-19 impact on hotel performance.** 2020.

UNWTO: **UNWTO Tourism Highlights, 2018 Edition.** Madrid: UNWTO. 2018.
[Reference Source](#)

UNWTO: **UNWTO Tourism Highlights, 2019 Edition.** Madrid: UNWTO. 2019.
[Reference Source](#)

Open Peer Review

Current Peer Review Status:   

Version 1

Reviewer Report 22 December 2020

<https://doi.org/10.21956/emeraldopenres.15007.r27233>

© 2020 Assaf A. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Albert Assaf

Isenberg School of Management, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, Amherst, MA, United States

This case study is timely and focuses on interesting strategies. Governments and tourism organizations around the world may benefit from the Slovenian response to the pandemic. The idea of the staycation voucher is new and it is interesting to see that it was successful in the context of the Slovenian tourism industry. Potentially, similar strategies may be adopted by other tourism destinations around the world.

Having said the above, this case study may benefit from careful copy editing. It is unnecessary lengthy in some parts and suffer from several grammar mistakes.

Is the background of the case's history and progression described in sufficient detail?

Yes

Is the background of the case's history and progression described in sufficient detail?

Yes

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Yes

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Yes

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Yes

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Yes

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

Yes

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Yes

Is the case presented with sufficient detail to be useful for teaching or other practitioners?

Yes

Is the case presented with sufficient detail to be useful for other practitioners?

Yes

Is the argument information presented in such a way that it can be understood by a non-academic audience?

Yes

Does the piece present solutions to actual real world challenges?

Yes

Is real-world evidence provided to support any conclusions made?

Yes

Could any solutions being offered be effectively implemented in practice?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Tourism Economics

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.

Reviewer Report 07 December 2020

<https://doi.org/10.21956/emeraldopenres.15007.r27231>

© 2020 Segota T. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Tina Segota 

Business School, Department of Marketing, Events and Tourism, University of Greenwich, London, United Kingdom

In the Introduction, the first paragraph introduces the tourism industry rather generically. I do understand where this comes from; however, I would much rather like to see an introductory paragraph which discussed the importance of mobility and in-person experience to tourism. Since the pandemic, the mobility was limited and in-person experiences have stopped because of the virus and social distancing measures. This is why tourism, as an industry based in in-person experience, has been so severely hit by the pandemic. This is why I believe a better introduction of the problem is needed to 'invite' the reader to further engage with the case study.

I would suggest changing the heading of 'Staycation vouchers' to 'Coping strategies for the tourism industry'. What you are describing in the first few paragraphs are how different organisations and governments approached crisis management and then you introduce a specific activity by the Slovenian government. Therefore, the staycation vouchers were only one of the coping mechanisms – a unique one in the world (they were later applied by Italy as well with some limitations).

Moreover, the lockdown resulted in many countries shutting their borders, which has a significant impact on international travel. Therefore, this needs to be emphasised in order to justify the focus on the domestic market.

When you say that workers were 'on hold', did you mean that the employees were furloughed? Being 'on hold' needs a slightly better explanation as the meaning can have various connotations. Moreover, what you are describing in the first paragraph of the 'Staycation vouchers in Slovenia' is how the government financially supported tourism and hospitality businesses through its 'financial packages'. I suggest that you rewrite the heading for this section to reflect this but also the path to staycation vouchers.

The third paragraph where you describe how you came to the calculations and the idea of vouchers needs a better description. From what is presented, there is very limited information what guided your analysis and proposed scenarios/solutions. Be more descriptive.

Please, make sure your terminology is unified throughout the case study. Firstly you talk about the government helping tourism companies, and then you talk about the hospitality industry. These two are not entirely the same and there is also a big difference in how covid affected accommodation facilities, transportation, tourist agencies, F&B sector etc. Be more specific in your writing to indicate which sectors were offered financial help and to justify why accommodation facilities were the only ones where the vouchers could have been used (and not for F&B or travel packages).

One thing not mentioned is how the vouchers could have been used across different family members. I believe that those with severe inability to travel could 'gift' their vouchers to other closely-related family members. This is important to know as it adds to the mobility and accessibility issues of travel and tourism.

I would avoid calling the implementation of vouchers green. In your opening paragraph, you were saying how tourism is one of the biggest polluters and then you go and describe the

implementation being green. Having an electronic transaction instead of the paper one is not as green as you think as you still need to use some resources to produce the electricity. In Slovenia, these do not come from solely reusable sources; therefore, I wouldn't call your solution green at all. Avoid making claims you cannot support with any data or research. If you can, then make this claim but a reference is needed.

Moreover, have you tested if the implementation process was perceived as simple, clear and easy? Clear and easy for whom? Where are testimonials? If this was only your expert's group perception, then consult the local media, which heavily reported on the implementation process not being perceived as clear and easy as reported in this case study.

What other limitations did you anticipate, and how did you address them? Please, refer to my previous comment on accessibility and mobility issues. Even though the proposal is good, there are still some resident groups unable or unwilling to travel. This needs to be better addressed so that the context of the voucher transfer system among family members is understood. Also, what happened with F&B? Why vouchers could not be used for F&B, but only for accommodation or accommodation with breakfast? – more explanation is needed as this essential industry sector was neglected and criticized the voucher scheme publicly via local media.

In your concluding paragraph in Staycation vouchers, you write that the domestic market was a great success for the Slovenian Coast. Traditionally, this has been the case for the Slovenian Coast, as indicated by Šegota and Mihalič (2018): domestic market accounts for more than 42% of overnight stays in the Slovenian Coast. There was a downward trend (2010-2014) due to the domestic market shifting its interest to international travel; however, with the covid pandemic, social distancing and borders closed, to what extent was it expected that the domestic market would stay locally and most of them would 'flock' to Slovenian Coast in summer (as you report on 80-95% occupancy rates)?

Based on which data/results do you say that tourism staycation vouchers are 'probably more efficient than VAT reduction for tourism and hospitality companies'? This is an unsupported claim and only your opinion. Please, refer back to many sectors being neglected in the scheme. What you refer as tourism staycation voucher benefitted accommodation providers the most and neglected others. To support your claims, you need to provide a multiplier effect and some comparisons with the VAT reduction and many employees being furloughed.

References

1. Šegota T, Mihalič T: Elicitation of tourist accommodation demand for counter-seasonal responses: Evidence from the Slovenian Coast. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*. 2018; **9**: 258-266 [Publisher Full Text](#)

Is the background of the case's history and progression described in sufficient detail?

Partly

Is the background of the case's history and progression described in sufficient detail?

Partly

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Yes

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Yes

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Not applicable

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Not applicable

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

No source data required

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

No source data required

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Partly

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Partly

Is the case presented with sufficient detail to be useful for teaching or other practitioners?

Partly

Is the case presented with sufficient detail to be useful for other practitioners?

Partly

Is the argument information presented in such a way that it can be understood by a non-academic audience?

Partly

Does the piece present solutions to actual real world challenges?

Partly

Is real-world evidence provided to support any conclusions made?

Partly

Could any solutions being offered be effectively implemented in practice?

Partly

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: sustainable tourism, seasonality, tourism marketing, Slovenia

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of

expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Reviewer Report 24 November 2020

<https://doi.org/10.21956/emeraldopenres.15007.r27230>

© 2020 **Pikkemaat B.** This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Birgit Pikkemaat 

Department of Strategic Management, Marketing and Tourism, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

Thank you for sharing this interesting case study with us! Congratulations to Slovenia and SRIPT for developing staycation vouchers which seemed to stimulate domestic travel demand and helped tourism industry during summer 2020. Some minor remarks which could improve the quality of the paper from my side:

1. UNWTO (2020) predicted three possible scenarios for a drop in international tourism arrivals - can you add some data about the real drop in Europe or selected European countries so far?
2. More general remark: your article sounds sometimes as the pandemic is over, but in many European countries we are actually faced with second lockdown which hits again tourism industry and does not allow to open hotels, gastronomy and bars. e.g. "Yet, after the pandemic was under control in most of the EU, economies started to open again."
3. You write "current predictions are that tourism recovery will take place for up to 18-24 months after recovery of the global economy." Please add references or arguments which supports your predictions.
4. As you focus on government measures implemented to help tourism industry during COVID-19 the reader might be interested to get one or two more examples of incentives countries offered to domestic markets to stimulate travel demand.
5. Marketing efforts onto domestic or regional markets have been focused by lots of NTOs in 2020 and were successful. But its success depends highly on the ratio between domestic and international arrivals in a country. Can you give some data about Slovenians source markets and importance of domestic demand before COVID-19?
6. Do you have updated data:.."latest data from the 10th of August show that 15% of all vouchers.." and again: .."the forecasts for Sept to Dec are good and demand for weekend breaks is high." (7) please add some references to the conclusion part to underpin your arguments for the future development of tourism.

Once again, thanks for the interesting paper and the successful example from Slovenia how to

stimulate domestic demand and thus boost tourism industry during (and hopefully soon after) COVID-19.

Is the background of the case's history and progression described in sufficient detail?

Yes

Is the background of the case's history and progression described in sufficient detail?

Yes

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Yes

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Yes

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Not applicable

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Not applicable

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

Yes

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Yes

Is the case presented with sufficient detail to be useful for teaching or other practitioners?

Yes

Is the case presented with sufficient detail to be useful for other practitioners?

Yes

Is the argument information presented in such a way that it can be understood by a non-academic audience?

Yes

Does the piece present solutions to actual real world challenges?

Yes

Is real-world evidence provided to support any conclusions made?

Yes

Could any solutions being offered be effectively implemented in practice?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: innovation and product development, destination development, destination management, entrepreneurship and small tourism businesses, sustainable tourism, quality of life

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.

Comments on this article

Version 1

Reader Comment 20 Nov 2020

Marcelo Oliva, None, Sociologist, independent, Chile

Dear Ljubica and Marko,

Some reviews here. I hope it can offer some help (actually, just suggesting adding more data).

Cheers. (You can create an account in Hypothes.is, and also get Firefox and Chrome extensions).

Cheers from Chile

<https://hypothes.is/groups/YrjWAoXZ/turismo-social>

Competing Interests: I have no competing interests that might influence my judgement.
