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This diagnosis identifies an **action framework** to contribute to the recovery of the tourism in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). This action framework includes:

(i) The **adaptation of biosafety protocols** to face SARS-CoV-2, reinforcing the real and perceived safety in tourist organizations and destinations.

(ii) The **identification of a management framework**, which establishes the **basis** to respond in an agile and effective way to future sanitary crises.
Summary

An analysis on the adequacy of existing biosafety tourism protocols in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) was developed, detecting gaps and concluding that:

- LAC region has extensively developed protocols to face COVID19, but there is a lack of harmonization in measures and in their level of specificity that negatively affects user’s perception on safety and that must be corrected.

- In LAC protocols, there is a high level of coverage of those points identified by health experts as of higher risk of contagion (Risk Nodes RN), compared to the coverage of protocols in other regions. Even so, the research concludes that there is a lack of concrete measures for some risk nodes in the protocols, especially in local transportation, ports and airports, as well as for the transmission mode by aerosols. There is also a lack of definition regarding the contingency plans to be deployed by tourist organizations, when needed. The coverage of risk nodes (RN) that are not yet covered is required.

- After a year of pandemic, new researches on the transmission of the virus, the beginning and consolidation of the vaccination process, and given that the risk is not static, the inclusion of the variability of the risk is needed, an issue that has so far not been addressed in the protocols analyzed.

Secondly, the management framework for these protocols in terms of implementation, communication and control shall be revised, in order to ensure their effectiveness. The following conclusions were drawn:

There are decisive factors that influence the effectiveness and compliance of the protocols and that should be considered in the management framework, such as the level of mandatory compliance of protocols and the contribution of the different public-private agents of the destination in the implementation, communication and control processes.

Lack of measures related to the implementation, communication and control generates distrust, confusion, as well as a perception of improvisation and lack of coordination. It is necessary to make an effort in this area to regain confidence and reactivate the tourism sector, especially with regard to control measures, since it is observed that most of them do not exist or, having been defined, have not been put into practice. Although there is no “ideal” control system, there are some alternatives based on self-evaluation, public-private collaboration and other cost-effective measures that allow effective monitoring of compliance.
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Tourism:
• Key activity in generating GDP, employment and investments in LAC
• One of the sectors most affected by COVID-19 (restrictions, mobility, lockdowns)
• Multiplier effect of the tourism impact

May-August 2020:
• Biosafety protocols in the tourism industry

2021:
• Vaccination (logistic and supply problems, new variations of the virus, side effects, uneven administration)
• Knowledge of virus and its different transmission modes
• Experience in the implementation of protocols

COVID-19 IMPACT

Caribbean
-61% tourism Jobs
-62% tourism GDP

Latin America
-44% tourism Jobs
-44% tourism GDP

Biosafety protocols are still crucial and indispensable to guarantee the highest levels of safety for users and employees of the tourism sector to generate confidence and promote the reactivation of the sector.

CONSIDER LEARNED LESSONS

ESTABLISH THE BASIS TO MANAGE FUTURE CRISIS
Make a diagnosis on the adaptation of current biosafety tourism protocols to generate safer tourist spaces and services in LAC and recover the confidence of the user.

Specific objectives

• Identify Risk Nodes (RN) that should be covered in protocols considering the transmission modes of the SARS-CoV-2.

• Identify needed implementation, communication and control mechanisms.
SCOPE OF THE DIAGNOSIS

Geographic
Countries in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) and in another world regions

Sectorial
Hospitality (accommodation and restaurants), local transportation and tourist areas (ports, airports and beaches)

Time period
Documents published until January 2021

Sources of information

Secondary sources
150 Revised protocols
Public / private
International, national, regional and subregional

Primary sources
467 Surveys
(23 Countries)
1 focus group
to final users

4 Webinar workshops
with tourism authorities and services providers in LAC

43 Interviews
to authorities, experts, service providers, consumers associations
Revised protocols

LAC region:
- Argentina
- Brazil
- Chile
- Colombia
- Costa Rica
- Jamaica
- Mexico
- Panama
- Peru
- Dominican Republic

Other regions:
- Australia
- Spain
- Hong Kong (China)
- Israel
- New Zealand
- Portugal
- Seychelles

In addition:

Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA), Brazilian support service for Micro and Medium Business (SEBRAE), Pacific Asia Travel Association (PATA), World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO)
Interviewed entities

• The Civil Aviation Authority of Colombia
• Airports of Peru
• Sodis Alliance
• AMResorts
• European Association of Consumers for Standardization (ANEC)
• Municipality of Aracatí (Brazil)
• Association of the Gastronomic Industry (ACODRES)
• Association of Hotels, Restaurants and Cafes of Europe (HOTREC)
• Associations of Hotels, Restaurants and Casinos of Peru (AHLRCA)
• Tourism Authority of Panama (ATP)
• Municipality of Maceió (Brazil)
• Caribe Hospitality
• Casa Andina Hotels
• Centre for Tourism training (CENFOTUR)
• National Council of Ground transportation of Peru
• Argentine Consumers
• National Corporation of Consumers and users of Chile (CONADECUS)
• Cruise Lines International Association (CLIA)
• Decameron Hotels
• Despegar.com
• Gastronomic Business Federation of the Republic of Argentina (FEHGRA)
• GHL Hotels
• Punta Cana Group
• Hilton Hotels
• Libertador Hotels
• Costa Rica Tourism Board
• Keteka
• Meliá Hotels International
• Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism of Peru
• Ministry of Tourism of Argentina
• Ministry of Tourism of Belize
• Ministry of Tourism of Brazil
• Ministry of Tourism of Paraguay
• Bahamas Ministry of Tourism and Aviation
• Organization of Brazilian World Heritage Cities
• Municipality of Salvador de Bahia
• Municipality of Santa Marta
• Tourism Secretary of Mexico
• National Tourism Service of Chile (SERNATUR)
• National Union of Consumers and Users of the Republic of Panama (UNCUREPA)
Objective:

Identify risk nodes (RN) where it is necessary to define measures to minimize the transmission risk.
Transmission Modes

**Identification of transmission modes**

**Airborne transmission through aerosols**
Drops of 5 microns or smaller size can remain suspended in air for a variable time, and reach distances longer than 2m.

**Droplet transmission**
Produced when the infected person coughs, sneezes or talks. These drops reach trajectories of up to 2m.

**Contact transmission**
When touching contaminated surfaces with secretions from infected people and then putting hands on the oral, nasal or conjunctival mucosa.

The risk is NOT STATIC (it is variable)

**Safety distance**
(<2m)

**Ventilation**
natural, forced interior/external)

**Time of exposure**
(> 15 min.)

**Relative humidity**
(<40%)

**Respiratory protection**

The combination of these factors increases or reduces the risk of transmission
## RISK MODULATING FACTORS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Risk</th>
<th>Moderate Risk</th>
<th>More Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Safety Distance Between Users</strong></td>
<td>Safety Distance</td>
<td>More Safety Distance Between Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closed Spaces and Not Well Ventilated</strong></td>
<td>Ventilation</td>
<td>Outdoors Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Time of Exposure</strong></td>
<td>Time of Exposure</td>
<td>Reduced Time of Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Without Face Mask</strong></td>
<td>Respiratory Protection</td>
<td>With an Appropriate Face Mask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humidity &lt;40%</strong></td>
<td>Relative Humidity</td>
<td>Humidity Between 40% - 60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**THE RISK ALSO INCREASES WHEN PEOPLE SPEAK, SHOUT OR SING AND DECREASES IF THEY ARE IN SILENCE.**
2) Determination of variables

Objective:
Identify critical management variables to evaluate their coverage degree in current protocols and find best practices.

**VARISK**
- These are the Variables related to the management of the Risk Nodes (RN) that are identified in the risk maps.
- They vary depending on each subsector/tourist area

**VICC**
- These are the Variables related to the Implementation, Communication and Control in the tourist organizations and destinations.

Analysis of the coverage degree in analyzed protocols:
- **<50% of protocols**
- **50% < < 75% of protocols**
- **>75% of protocols**

*VARISK= Variables Related to the Management of Risk Nodes.
*VICC= Variables Related to the Implementation, Communication and Control.
Critical management variables (VARISK and VICC)

Secondary sources

Protocols
Evaluate the coverage degree of risk nodes (RN) on the current protocols.

Identify contents related to implementation, communication and control of protocols.

Primary sources

INTERVIEWS
To detect aspects related to the implementation, communication and control that are carried out in countries

SURVEYS
To compare the level of safety perceived by final users against the level of coverage of risk nodes (RN)

WEBINAR WORKSHOPS
To detect aspects related to the implementation, communication and control in tourist organizations and carried out in countries

*VARISK= Variables Related to the Management of Risk Nodes.
*VICC= Variables Related to the Implementation, Communication and Control.
**Scope and Specificity of Reviewed Protocols**

- Accommodation protocols in general
- Specific protocols (for instance, categorized hotels, hostels or campsites).

- Protocols for all types of food and beverage establishments including bars, restaurants, take away services and delivery, among others.

- Measures for transport operators or infrastructure managers.
- Transport vehicles: tourist buses, public and private transport, rental vehicles and shuttles operated by hotels, among others.

- Specific protocols for beaches (maritime, fluvial and lacustrine).
- General protocols for outdoor and entertainment spaces (applicable to beaches).

- National protocols and for airport concessions or management companies.
- Some protocols refer to International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), World Health Organization (WHO) and guidelines provided by the authorities.

- Protocols for cruise ports, marinas and tourist piers (maritime, fluvial and lacustrine), private management or concessions.
- Most of them have not been able to be widely implemented.
Results of Variables of Risk Management (VARISK) and User’s Perceptions
The coverage of Risk Nodes (RN) in lodging protocols is HIGH.

### VARISK - Risk Nodes (RN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included in protocols</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LAC region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check-in and check out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check-in</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key/card delivery</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of lifts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of common spaces</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering service</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilation: indoor spaces</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Included in protocols

Relative humidity

Use of shared equipment of cleaning
Staff areas (canteens, rest areas, dressing rooms and toilets)
Supplier management
Waste management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative humidity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LAC region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VARISK - Risk Nodes (RN)

Low
Medium
High

ACCOMMODATION

User’s Perceptions

51% of users perceive accommodations as unsafe spaces

It is necessary to reinforce the communication of protocols and, to a lesser extent, improve risk nodes (RN) with lower coverage.
The coverage of Risk Nodes (RN) in restaurants’ protocols is MEDIUM-HIGH.

**VARISK - Risk Nodes (RN)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welcome</th>
<th>Preparation of the space</th>
<th>Accommodation and allocation</th>
<th>Tables mounting and dismantling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Menu</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Bar service</td>
<td>Table service</td>
<td>Take away / Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing/Exit</td>
<td>Payment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Included in revised protocols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LAC region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🍋</td>
<td>🍋</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🍋</td>
<td>🍋</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🍋</td>
<td>🍋</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🍋</td>
<td>🍋</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🍋</td>
<td>🍋</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🍋</td>
<td>🍋</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🍋</td>
<td>🍋</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🍋</td>
<td>🍋</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is perceived as the safest subsector. It is a subsector with a high level of exposition to the virus due to the characteristics of its spaces.

It is necessary to reinforce the coverage of Risk Nodes (RN) in the protocols with specific measures and improve communication.

* In general, they are closed spaces, with poor ventilation at times, with users without a mask and in social activity – eating and talking.
The coverage of Risk Nodes (RN) in local transportation's protocols is MEDIUM-LOW.

### VARISK - Risk Nodes (RN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Included in revised protocols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service area</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket sales area</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting area</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luggage handling</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside the vehicle</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilation</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Low**

**Medium**

**High**
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION

User’s Perceptions

84% of users perceive this subsector as unsafe.

It is necessary to check that all risk nodes (RN) are covered with safety measures that are properly communicated.

The inside of the vehicle is perceived as unsafe, although the coverage level is HIGH.
The coverage of Risk Nodes (RN) in local beaches protocols is MEDIUM.

**VARISK - Risk Nodes (RN)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accesses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users flows (capacity control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sand area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play and recreational areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access walkway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets and dressing rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers and footbaths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users/rest areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessionaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid and rescue services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Included in revised protocols

Total

LAC region
**User's Perceptions**

70% of users perceive beaches as unsafe spaces.

It is necessary to increase the coverage of risk nodes (RN) with specific measures.
Current protocols focus more on strategic and transversal aspects than risk nodes (RN), such as the conditions of entry and exit during the pandemic, required tests, necessary forms to be completed by the travellers or quarantine indications.

Several risk nodes (RN) present a low coverage, as the protocols do not include specific measures.

Some of the protocols refer to the recommendations of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), a specialized organization of the United Nations (UN) that promotes safe development of international civil aviation. These recommendations cover practically all risk nodes (RN); therefore, the detailed coverage analysis of ICAO’s protocol is included.
The Risk Nodes (RN) coverage in airports’ protocols is MEDIUM-LOW

**VARISK - Risk Nodes (RN)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Check-in area</th>
<th>Inspection and control</th>
<th>Departure terminal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Check-in / Documentation</td>
<td>Scanner / Trays</td>
<td>Vending machines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolleys and luggage</td>
<td>Luggage handling</td>
<td>Control / Customs</td>
<td>Toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auto Check-in</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catering services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waiting areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smoking areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Included in revised protocols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total protocols</th>
<th>LAC region</th>
<th>ICAO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk Nodes (RN) map and coverage level in LAC
### User’s Perceptions

73% of users perceive airports as unsafe spaces.

It is necessary to establish specific measures for risk nodes with lower coverage. *

---

*The survey to users about airports and ports spaces was developed together since these spaces share travelers’ itinerary and therefore, risk nodes.*
The Risk Nodes (RN) coverage in ports’ protocols is LOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARISK - Risk nodes (RN)</th>
<th>Included in revised protocols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trolleys and luggage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check-in area</td>
<td>Check-in / Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luggage handling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auto Check-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection and control</td>
<td>Scanner / Trays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control / Customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure terminal</td>
<td>Vending machines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catering services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waiting area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoking area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAC region

Low

Medium

High
User’s Perceptions

73%
Of users perceive ports as unsafe spaces.

It is necessary to establish specific measures for risk nodes with lower coverage.*

*The survey to users about airports and ports spaces was developed together since these spaces share travelers’ itinerary and therefore, risk nodes...
Strategies to improve coverage and user’s perceptions on safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsector</th>
<th>RN Coverage</th>
<th>Main perception</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCOMMODATION</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Unsafe space</td>
<td><strong>Reinforce Risk Nodes’ (RN) coverage with specific measures and improve communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTAURANTS</td>
<td>Medium-high</td>
<td>Safe space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>Medium-low</td>
<td>Unsafe space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEACHES</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Unsafe space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRPORTS</td>
<td>Medium-low</td>
<td>Unsafe space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTS</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unsafe space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Variables related to Implementation, Communication and Control (VICC)
The diagnosis is complemented with the analysis of the implementation, communication and control measures that are carried out in the protocols through:

- Revision of the contents of protocols
- Interviews to key stakeholders

The results of the diagnosis are key to create an efficient management framework of protocols.
### Implementation

#### Coverage in Revised Protocols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Restaurants</th>
<th>Local transportation</th>
<th>Beaches</th>
<th>Airports</th>
<th>Ports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Red" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Gray" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Red" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Gray" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination with Other Private Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Red" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Gray" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Red" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Gray" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination with Authorities (Health, Safety, Etc.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Gray" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Gray" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management of Risk Variability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Gray" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Gray" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Low*, *Medium*, *High*, *N/A*

*N/A*: no protocols from countries outside LAC were included in the sample.

The variables with lowest coverage are the management of risk variability and the coordination between private agents.

Users perceive differences and a lack of coordination in the implementation (between different organizations / destinations) because of the heterogeneity of measures, which generates distrust.

#### Required actions:

- To include the risk variability approach, since risk is not static (modulating factors, vaccines, incidence) and provide instruments for its analysis (risk management models or committees).
- To reinforce the coordination between private agents at the destination.
- To harmonize the implementation of protocols.
In relation to factors that modulate the risk of contagion and affect its variability, these are referred to with different levels of detail, and therefore in some cases measures to reduce the risk are insufficient:

**Safety distance:** covered in protocols, although contemplating disparate distances, sometimes insufficient to prevent contagion.

**Ventilation:** it is necessary to prioritize natural aeration as much as possible and stipulate guidelines to reduce the likelihood of aerosol formation in indoor spaces (through filtration systems, CO2 measurement, avoiding air recirculation, etc.)

**Exposure time:** it is covered indirectly in the protocols, although it is necessary to consider that a longer exposure time generates mayor probability of contagion.

**Use of mask:** the use of mask is contemplated in the protocols, although it does not specify the type of mask recommended.

**Relative humidity:** this factor is not directly covered by the protocols, although in some cases the temperature is mentioned, which directly affects the percentage of relative humidity.
Low level of coverage of the communication variables in the protocols.

Users feel confusion and distrust when receiving disparate information from various sources.

Required actions:

- Efficiently manage varied and variable information, channels and coordination with all agents; update information and make it accessible and understandable to the user (for example, with "single window", apps, updated webs with consolidated information).

- Structure and systematize communication to support the adoption and management of protocols, as well as to involve all key agents, (for instance, through risk management committees or regular meetings).

---

**DIAGNOSIS OF BIOSAFETY PROTOCOLS IN THE TOURISM SECTOR**

**COMMUNICATION**

within the organization and at the destination

---

### COVERAGE IN REVISED PROTOCOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Restaurants</th>
<th>Local transportation</th>
<th>Beaches</th>
<th>Airports</th>
<th>Ports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNAL COMMUNICATION OF MEASURES (TO STAFF AND USERS)</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAC</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION (TO THE DESTINATION, OTHER PRIVATE AND PUBLIC AGENTS AND RESIDENTS)</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="High" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="High" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAC</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="High" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Low, Medium, High, N/A*

*N/A: no protocols from countries outside LAC were included in the sample.*
### CONTROL

#### DIAGNOSIS OF BIOSAFETY PROTOCOLS IN THE TOURISM SECTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Restaurants</th>
<th>Local transportation</th>
<th>Beaches</th>
<th>Airports</th>
<th>Ports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**<strong>INTERNAL SUPERVISION OF COMPLIANCE WITH MEASURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**<strong>PROTOCOLS UPDATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**<strong>HEALTH CONTROL OF STAFF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**<strong>CONTINGENCY PLANS (MANAGEMENT OF POSITIVE OR SYMPTOMATIC USER CASES)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**<strong>CONTINGENCY PLANS (MANAGEMENT OF POSITIVE OR SYMPTOMATIC STAFF CASES)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N/A: no protocols from countries outside LAC were included in the sample.

**The internal supervision** of measures, the **updating of protocols** as well as the **contingency plans** in some sectors are the **weaknesses** of the control variables.

Users perceive that there is no **appropriate control** (e.g. on-site control measures, user feedback), and a lack of coordination

### Required actions:

- **Updating** the protocols is necessary to achieve effectiveness and validity of measures throughout the pandemic.
- Establish **suitable control mechanisms** for measures in the organization (for instance, checklists, records or internal documentation) and at the destination (for instance, observatories, on-site inspections, self-declarations, or monitoring groups) to **regain users’ confidence**.
- **Deploy control/performance indicators**
Key factors for interviewed experts

Beyond the specific processes of implementation, communication and control, there are transversal factors that impact on the performance (efficiency and effectiveness) of the protocols that should be considered in any future update of biosafety measures in the tourism sector.

Regulatory framework and degree of compulsory nature:

Learned lessons in this crisis will reinforce the management structures of both destinations and tourist organizations, laying the bases for future sanitary crises.

The public-private co-implementation favours:

• Greater adoption, dissemination and continuity of measures
• Greater control of measures
• Union and creation of associations in a highly atomized sector (sector strengthening)
• Greater commitment of involved agents

However, we find:

• Development and implementation of disparate protocols.
• Different level of representativeness and participation of key agents (for example, low representation of workers, which is reflected in protocols).

It is necessary to promote public-private co-implementation (e.g. crisis committees in destinations and tourist organizations) and establish mechanisms for their formalization and operation when required.
## Strategies to improve implementation, communication and control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>User’s Perceptions</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>Heterogeneity on implementation</td>
<td>Distrust</td>
<td>Harmonization of implementation and formalization mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispersion in measures</td>
<td>Distrust</td>
<td>Revision of communication at the destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>Low coverage in protocols</td>
<td>Confusion</td>
<td>Inclusion of communication measures in protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td>Lack of control (no measures or indicators)</td>
<td>Lack of control</td>
<td>Establishment of cost-effective control mechanisms: public-private coordination, self-control, digital channels, and performance indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of definition of contingency plans</td>
<td>Improvisation and chaos</td>
<td>Definition and specification of contingency plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UPDATE PROTOCOLS AND REINFORCE VICC**
1. Update current biosafety protocols considering learned lessons and new researches (VARISK)

- Include risk variability approach: mechanisms to evaluate the risk of contagion according to modulating factors.
- Harmonize biosafety measures and their level of granularity in each Risk Node (RN), to facilitate their implementation and inspire confidence to the user.
- Include measures for key Risk Nodes (RN) and not currently included in the analyzed protocols.
- Include internal management and self-control measures for tourism organizations and destinations.

2. Define measures for the management of protocols’ implementation, communication and control (VICC)

Establish permanent structures based on learned lessons to face future sanitary crises

- Consider a collaborative approach and participation of all key agents of the destination’s value chain.
- **Determine and communicate** the degree of obligation to comply with the established protocols.
- **Update information** (RN coverage according to new science discoveries).
- Establish coordinated and agile communication channels and structures between key agents of the tourist value chain (public-public, private-public, private-private).
- Define and implement systematic and cost-effective control mechanisms that guarantee compliance with measures.
**3. CHALLENGES**

Promote compliance with protocols by fostering their convergence with the current legal framework (occupational health, food hygiene, safety, etc.) as a basis for the construction of a management framework.

- **Facilitate harmonization and self-control measures**, improving the perception of the user and regaining market confidence.

- **Identify touchpoints with legal framework** to design biosafety measures and their management structure. The use of the existing regulatory framework accelerates the design and implementation of measures and, in turn, values and reinforces the legal framework, contributing to the professionalization of the sector and the consolidation of management structures for future health crises.
• Development of recommendations to be considered in any biosafety tourism protocol in LAC.

• Identify the content that should be revised and updated according to challenges pointed out in the diagnosis.

• Define processes for the implementation, communication and control of protocols that ensure their harmonization, effectiveness and validity.

RETRIEVE THE CONFIDENCE OF USERS, REACTIVATE TOURISM ACTIVITY AND LAY OUT THE BASIS FOR FUTURE CRISES.