Chapter 1
The Context: COVID-19, Global Development Agendas and Tourism

Abstract  This chapter provides the context in which the book “Counting the Cost of COVID-19 on Global Tourism Industry” is written, including highlights for what follows in the rest of the book. The COVID-19 pandemic came when the world was in the midst of entertaining major global development agendas that had implications on the global tourism value chains. Among such major global development agendas, one could list the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its aligned 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Paris Agreement, the Sendai Framework and Habitat III’s New Urban Agenda. The pandemic also steered geopolitical and global economic tensions as key players, including individuals and countries, demanded answers as to what led to such a wild and unstoppable spread of the coronavirus. Accusations of maladministration within the World Health Organization (WHO) and connivance with China emerged. Many countries battled to “flatten” the runaway COVID-19 and economic curves. Many countries and territories went on lockdown, with millions infected and hundreds of thousands dead by the time this book was going into production. Global economic stimulus packages were urgently instituted, and the tourism sector was among the top beneficiaries of such packages. The chapter also presents sections on the importance of the tourism sector to the global economy and how past pandemics affected the sector. It further highlights the overall methodological framework used for data generation and analysis.
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1.1  Introduction

On 31 December 2019, the world woke up to the WHO announcement that China had notified it of pneumonia cases of an unknown cause in Wuhan City, Hubei Province of China (WHO 2020a). Within 3 days from the notification to 3 January
2020, there were 44 case-patients with so-called pneumonia. The source of the infection was identified as the seafood market in Wuhan, with the disease referred to initially as the novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV). As time passed, the 2019-nCoV was renamed COVID-19, with the cause being the SARS-2 coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) (Backer et al. 2020). The WHO declared the COVID-19 a global pandemic on 11 March 2020, sending huge shock waves across the global community (WHO 2020b). COVID-19 was also known to spread from human to human through droplets and contact, making it a deadly infectious disease (Peng et al. 2020). From the knowledge gathered at the time, COVID-19 was fortunately sensitive to disinfection measures, although it could survive for hours on surfaces in the environment. The main known symptoms were fever, cough and dyspnea. Other symptoms from clinical cases included shortness of breath and chest tightness and/or pain (Deng and Peng 2020). Coughing was also reported for the first case of COVID-19 in Nepal (Bastola et al. 2020) whom on admission to hospital in Kathmandu, the temperature was 37.2 °C, with throat congestion. However, there were no other symptoms. Most of those at high risk of dying included people with hypertension, diabetes, coronary heart disease, cerebral infarction and chronic bronchitis (Deng and Peng 2020).

The Global Preparedness Monitoring Board (GPMB) highlights that while diseases, epidemics and pandemics have been integral parts of human livelihoods, “a combination of global trends, including insecurity and extreme weather” had heightened the risk of outbreaks (GPMB 2019: 6). Disease outbreaks were noted to be on the rise during the past several decades. To this end, one could not discount the possibilities of a spectre of a global health emergency looming large in the future. In almost a prophetic message, the GPMB presented a shock scenario. In its view, “If it is true to say, ‘what’s past is prologue’, then there is a genuine threat of a rapidly moving, highly lethal pandemic of a respiratory pathogen killing 50–80 million people and wiping out nearly 5% of the world’s economy” (Ibid.). Hence, experiencing a pandemic of this magnitude would be catastrophic. Not only will it create instability and insecurity, but the world will also not be ready for such a situation. The GPMB (2019) then raises several key points that the world should familiarise itself with in order to deal with future pandemics (Box 1.1).

Global pandemics impact severely on least resourced communities, of which most are in Africa. However, with the spectre of COVID-19, no country was left standing as the pandemic moved across jurisdictions with great and uncontrollable speed. Among the countries that were at the coal face in the early days were China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Italy and Spain, with the USA, Brazil, Australia and South Africa becoming epicentres in their continents. As of 28 April 2020, there were 3.08 million confirmed cases globally, 213,824 deaths registered (Johns Hopkins University 2020) and the count was rising. The figures were becoming common knowledge! What a traumatised world it became, right through communities, organisations and ultimately families and individuals.

The GPMB (2019) further highlighted the vulnerability of many developing nations that threatened the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Developing nations lacked access to basic food (SDG 2), basic health services (SDG 3), quality education (SDG 4) as well as clean water and sanitation.
All these aspects aggravate the spread of infectious pathogens. Other disease amplifiers that added to ever-increasing populations included strains on the environment, climate change and dense urban settlements. Furthermore, air travel had exponentially grown, which increased the risk of both imported and locally transmitted infections from pandemics such as the 2003 SARS pandemic (Breda 2004) and COVID-19, which is the focus of this book. Everyone everywhere would be at risk, including both national and global economies.

1.2 Importance of Tourism to Economies and COVID-19 Impacts

There is no doubt that tourism makes a significant contribution to the global economy. The United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) presented positive figures regarding global tourism growth in 2018. There were 1.4 billion international tourist arrivals (up 5% from the same time in 2017), with $1.7 trillion (up 4% from the same period 2017) (UNWTO 2019). This growth was attributed to the emerging middle class, new business models, technology advancement, low-cost travel and the ease of visa facilitation. From the tourism receipts highlighted, it is clear that the tourism sector is a significant player in global economies, creating jobs and wealth as well as changing lives for the better. The tourism sector, therefore, has been assisting in transforming, especially poorer communities. However,

Box 1.1: Pointers for Future Pandemic Preparedness

- Leaders at all levels hold the key. It is their responsibility to prioritise preparedness with a whole-of-society approach that ensures all are involved, and all are protected.
- For too long, we have allowed a cycle of panic and neglect when it comes to pandemics: we ramp up efforts when there is a serious threat and then quickly forget about them when the threat subsides. It is well past the time to act.
- Heads of government must commit and invest in preparedness.
- All countries must build strong systems.
- Countries, donors and multilateral institutions must be prepared for the worst.
- Financing institutions must link preparedness with financial risk planning.
- Development assistance funders must create incentives and increase funding for preparedness.
- The United Nations must strengthen coordination mechanisms.

Source: authors, based on GPMB (2019: 6–10)
given the quick growth, the UNWTO noted that there was also an increasing demand for the sector to be more responsible by ensuring effective destination management and reduce negative impacts associated with the sector such as greenhouse (GHG) emissions. The year 2018 was the ninth consecutive year of growth in the tourism sector, and this was a remarkable achievement! With COVID-19 in the mix, predictions from the UNWTO were that international arrivals could drop by between 20% and 30% compared to 2019 (Gössling et al. 2020). The growth in terms of arrivals and receipts for selected continents is reflected in Table 1.1.

Given the widespread negative impacts of COVID-19 on all sectors of the economy, the tourism sector was not spared and became one of the worst affected sectors (Nicola et al. 2020). Global travel restrictions accompanied by stay-at-home orders caused disturbances in the global economy, possibly surpassing damages witnessed during World War II (Gössling et al. 2020). An estimated 90% of the global population was impacted by restrictions on mass gatherings, and this disrupted the tourism and hospitality sector. For example, in the US hotel industry revenue per available room fell by 11.6% for the week ending 7 March 2020 (Nicola et al. 2020). In China, hotel occupancy rates fell by 89% as of 31 January 2020. This resulted in workers having reduced working hours, being put on temporary layoffs and, in extreme cases, being dismissed.

Countries with a heavy dependence on outbound tourists from China including Australia, Fiji, Palau, Samoa, Vanuatu, Thailand, the Philippines, Singapore, Malaysia and Vietnam were on the receiving end of the detrimental effects (ADB 2020; ATIC 2020). The cruise ship business also came under the spotlight with cancellations and port closures (Webeck 2020). Many passengers and crew members got trapped in cruise ships for weeks as they could not disembark. The aviation industry was also badly hit by cancellations and airport closures (Nicola et al. 2020). The cancellations were made abruptly with limited time for a soft landing by the sector. To make matters worse, the travel bans and airport closures were prolonged beyond 2 months in most instances. The sporting sector was not spared either (Stone 2020; Comrades Marathon 2020). There were cancellations and postponements of the Japan Olympics 2020, to golf, tennis, football, athletics, basketball, marathons, rugby, cricket, cycling, boxing, Formula one Grand Prix and ice-skating fixtures and tournaments (PGA Tour 2020; AELTC 2020). Some of the events were moved indefinitely, with other fixed for 2021.

### Table 1.1 International tourist arrivals and tourism receipts 2018

| Continent/destinations | Arrivals Millions | Growth | Receipts USD billion | Growth |
|------------------------|------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|
| Africa                 | 67               | 7%     | 38                   | 2%     |
| America                | 216              | 2%     | 334                  | 0%     |
| Asia and the Pacific   | 348              | 7%     | 435                  | 7%     |
| Europe                 | 710              | 5%     | 570                  | 5%     |
| Middle East            | 60               | 5%     | 73                   | 4%     |

Source: authors, data from UNWTO (2019: 3)
1.3 COVID-19’s Landing on Global Development Agendas

Although COVID-19 made a direct landing on SDG 3 (health and wellbeing), the turbulence was intensive and vast, generally resulting in immediate negative impacts on all major global development agendas. Among such major global and regional development agendas were listed the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the aligned 17 SDGs (United Nations 2015), the Paris Agreement, (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change – UNFCCC 2015), the Sendai Framework (United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015) and the Habitat III’s New Urban Agenda (United Nations Habitat 2016). Given that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, COVID-19 and tourism, as well as the Paris Agreement, are discussed later in the book, this section will only highlight some of the take-homes regarding the remaining two global development agendas.

The impacts of COVID-19 on the progress to attain the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is overall negative (United Nations 2020), with resources being redirected towards fighting the pandemic across the world (Gössling et al. 2020). However, there were some positive in terms of reduced carbon emissions that cause global warming, leading to climate change (Quéré et al. 2020).

The Sendai Framework (2015–2030) provides a generic and global platform for dealing with disaster risk reduction (DRR) and management. Central to the Sendai Framework is the DRR cycle that focuses on prevention, response and recovery, as well as the concept of building resilience and building back better (United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015) after disasters such as COVID-19. The Sendai Framework further identifies biological hazards such as pandemics among the key challenges of the twenty-first century. Bringing the reader’s attention to the evaluation of the Sendai Framework for the first 3 years of implementation, Bakatsaki and Zampetakis (2020) observed that countries needed to adopt comprehensive and holistic approaches, including sharing responsibilities among key stakeholders and building community resilience (Adekola et al. 2020). The most appropriate leadership style under such disasters should be persuasive as opposed to the directive. These insights remain useful in the case under scrutiny, as the management of the COVID-19 pandemic demanded flexibility and quick decision-making that embraced all stakeholders. Ratner et al. (2020: 1) add elements such as the need to remain “flexible in dynamic situations and embracing discomfort to think bigger about context-specific solutions to collectively build back our systems”. The authors also identify the need to accept realities that could not be changed and to look back and learn from disaster situations. Given the scenario being documented in this book, there are incidences where lives were lost, with some businesses folding. These situations could not be changed, but they remained relevant as learning points for the future. Parajuli (2020) presented the concept of disaster science education for effective DRR in developing countries. Such disaster science education would assist in shifting public awareness through local level basic science behind a disaster to minimise exposure, improve preparedness, response and recovery. These efforts were becoming clear across the world as governments channelled COVID-19
disaster science education prioritising washing hands, coughing and sneezing etiquette, self-isolation and social distancing.

The impacts of COVID-19 could also be linked to the New Urban Agenda (United Nations Habitat 2016), that is, in turn, linked to the SDGs and the Paris Agreement. For example, metropolitan transportation systems were brought into the spotlight (Okraszewska et al. 2019) as public transport was rendered useless by lockdowns. However, as the stay-at-home restrictions were relaxed, passenger limitations by public vehicles were also implemented. With high population densities and massive expansion drives in megacities such as Wuhan and Paris (Acuto 2020) that have 11 million-plus dwellers, pandemics such as COVID-19 always present a huge and rapid infection risk. The authors go on to indicate that approximately 43 such high-rise-dense megacities are expected by 2050, with more than 60% of the global population living in them. From the experiences of COVID-19, there was an increased demand for clean water supply and sanitation facilities (SDG 6), access to energy (SDG 7), reliable food supply systems (SDG 2) and other amenities and infrastructure (SDG 9). Apart from being densely populated, megacities host many informal settlements and slums (SDG 11) (Kaika 2017), an element that would present additional complexity to administering the spread of pandemics such as COVID-19. Megacities and other urban spaces are also hosting to most refugees and half of all internally displaced populations (Earle 2016). The municipal officials and other key players were also battling with reductions in carbon emissions, calling for greener building, low carbon transportation systems and settlement densification (Nerini et al. 2019). All this was done in response to the call to reduce carbon emissions as per the Paris Agreement on climate change (UNFCCC 2015) and SDG 13 (United Nations 2015). Hence, it is a cocktail of interventions that COVID-19 brought within the framework on major global development agendas to 2030 and beyond. Drawing from Kaika (2017: 89), however:

>T]he new call for ‘safe, resilient, sustainable and inclusive cities’ as enshrined in SDG 11 remains path dependent on old methodological tools (e.g. indicators), techno-managerial solutions (e.g. smart cities), and institutional frameworks of an ecological modernisation paradigm that did not work.

Given the widespread of COVID-19, containment became one of the key intervention measures to “flatten” the curves (McCloskey et al. 2020). The authors noted that historically, major gatherings including pilgrimage and religion, sports, music concert and cinemas remain sources of runaway infections. Most of these events took place in urban areas. Although some major events were held in the past during periods when the WHO had declared public health emergencies such as the Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympics and the 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa during the H1N1 influenza pandemic and the 2015 Africa Cup of Nations Football tournament in Equatorial Guinea during the outbreak of Ebola virus (Ibid.), in hindsight, the outbreaks were nowhere near that of COVID-19. Hence, to curb the spread of COVID-19, drastic measures of containment, including mass cancellations and postponements of events involving major gatherings, had to be taken. In addition, mass COVID-19 testing was carried out, and isolations were implemented (Lau
et al. 2020), while maintaining essential health services; this was necessary to reduce further loss of lives (Loayza and Pennings 2020). The next section presents an overview of past pandemics and how these impacted on tourism.

1.4 Overview of Past Pandemics and Impacts on Tourism

Following the outbreak of the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) pandemic in 2003, the WHO issued international travel advice to avoid high-risk areas in China (Breda 2004). This was the first pandemic of the twenty-first century (Wilder-Smith 2006). Between March and June 2003, the WHO issued 11 travel advisory notices, with the China National Tourism Administration issuing its own emergency circular making it a top priority to control the spread of SARS by travellers (Breda 2004). The SARS, therefore, remains a good case study on how pandemics can affect tourism. To this end, Beijing International Airport had to install infrared temperature scanners for both inbound and outbound passengers. This measure was not helpful as the WHO issued further travel advisory notices for Beijing and Shanxi Province on 23 April 2003. Although Canada (a country that recorded the highest SARS cases outside Asia) had a travel advisory notice issued by the WHO, this only lasted for a week. The travel advisory of 23 April was followed by two additional recommendations to China, targeting Tianjin, Inner Mongolia and Hebei Province, negatively impacting both out- and inbound tourism.

Tourism became a victim of SARS induced panic (SIP). Several high-profile sporting events were cancelled (Breda 2004), and these included the Women’s Ice Hockey World Championship, the Cathay Pacific Squash Open, which were to be held in Hong Kong, and the San Fernando Yacht Race from Hong Kong to the Philippines, and the World Track Cycling Championship was moved by the International Cycling Union from Shenzhen in the Guangdong Province to Germany, and FIFA decided to move the fourth Women’s World Cup to the USA. International arrivals globally fell by 1.2% to 694 million in 2003 (Wilder-Smith 2006). The figures were higher in East Asia as arrivals dropped 41% between the first and 21st of April 2003 compared to the same period in 2002. The most affected destinations were China, Hong Kong, Vietnam and Singapore. There was a drop of 12 million arrivals over the months of the SARS outbreak in Asia and the Pacific, comprising a 9% drop compared to 2002. Beijing hotel occupancy fell by 10% (Ibid.). The broad impacts of SIP from SARS on the Hong Kong tourism industry are shown in Box 1.2.

McKercher (2003) ended his paper by asking whether the SIP was warranted, and the author responded to the contrary. This made sense then because there had been breakthroughs in containing SARS, with initial modelled projections to have 80% of Hong Kong infected, which turned out to have been prevented. Only 0.02% of the population had been infected after 2 months, and with the number of new cases between 15 and 30 a day, it would have taken 931 years to infect the entire population. However, with the rapidly spreading and much more contagious COVID-19, taking precautionary measures remained the most viable option. As the
book was being finalised, Africa remained at the knife-edge as many still believed it was a matter of time. McKercher (2003: 2) ended his story with other observations that were being discouraged and/or promoted to combat the spread of COVID-19. In his view “those of us who live in Hong Kong continue to go to work, continue to shop and continue to lead normal lives. We practice safe SARS by adopting such unusual measures as washing our hands regularly, cleaning our houses, refraining from spitting and seeing doctors if we feel unwell. And yes, we do wear face masks in public”. On the question, whether it was safe to travel, the author indicated “Yes”, but urged precaution. He also blamed the media for presenting news that sells, some highlighting death to visitors to Asia.

Cooper (2005), focused on the impact of SARS on the Japanese tourism sector, and they discovered that SARS brought instability into the sector. Wilder-Smith (2006) also established an intricate interlinkage between SARS and travel. In their view, while travellers become vectors of SARS, finally travel and tourism becomes the victim. Since SARS anxiety killed travel, governments from both affected and non-affected areas were encouraged to strike a quick and right balance in risk communication. However, this intervention usually came late in many instances when the damage would have already been done.

Box 1.2: Impact of SIP on the Hong Kong Tourism Sector
(i) Hotel occupancy across the board was less than 20% with most five-star hotels reporting single-digit occupancies.
(ii) At least six hotels went on sale, with some predicting many more were going into receivership before the end of the (northern) summer.
(iii) More than 40% of all flights in and out of Hong Kong were cancelled with Cathay Pacific alone cancelling 45% of its flights and issuing an unprecedented profit warning.
(iv) Outbound tourism went down by almost 80%.
(v) Inbound tourism went down by almost 80%.
(vi) The loss of the Easter weekend and China 1 May Golden Week period (a total of 2 weeks) cost Hong Kong tourism approximately US$250 million.
(vii) The Hong Kong Restaurant Association warned that up to 5000 restaurants were likely to close.
(viii) The Travel Industry Council warned that 300 travel agents could be forced out of business.
(ix) At least 50,000 jobs were at risk, and many companies had to send their staff home on unpaid leave due to a lack of business.
(x) Economists predicted that Hong Kong would have 0.5% economic growth that year, down from 3% growth forecasted a few months earlier.

Source: authors, based on McKercher (2003: 1)
1.5 The Politics Surrounding COVID-19

Dealing with China in terms of statistics and full disclosure has been problematic in the past. During the novel influenza A (H1N9) outbreak in 2013, the government was accused of hiding information (The Lancet Editorial 2013). While China notified the WHO on 31 March 2013, the first case had been identified on 19 February 2013. This was not the first time China had been accused of concealing information. In 2003 during the SARS outbreak, the country notified the WHO of the pandemic on 11 February 2003, yet the first case had been discovered months earlier on 16 November 2002 (Chan-Yeung and Xu 2003). However, to build back global support, the government fired both the national health minister and the Beijing mayor for poorly handling the situation and China pledging to fully cooperate with the WHO. Since China is a global powerhouse with huge trade linkages with every country on earth, it would have been difficult to immediately close borders to China, and even the USA could not manage it (Stacey and Richards 2020). Yet the COVID-19 pandemic continued spreading like wildfire.

As the COVID-19 pressure grew globally, and particularly in the USA, President Donald Trump on 7 April 2020 announced a move to withhold WHO funding of up to $400 million (Mahase 2020). The President accused the WHO head of incompetence and being biased towards China. The backlash against China seemed to be gaining traction as on 8 April 2020, and Japan announced that $2.2 billion from its stimulus package would be used to incentivise its companies to move out of China back into Japan and also to go elsewhere (Reynolds and Urabe 2020). However, as a typical Chinese show of soft power, interwoven with diplomacy, the comeback fight was on (Knight 2020). As the country was initially accused of covering up on the COVID-19 outbreak, and only notifying the WHO after hundreds had already been infected, the country was rebranding its response as a symbol of good leadership. Several cargo planes were sent all over the world, including the USA, Africa and Europe dropping donated and purchased medical equipment including ventilators, surgical gloves, masks and other protective clothing. As Knight (2020) observed, the Irish Ambassador to China posted a clip thanking Chinese officials who had helped arrange shipment of COVID-19 fighting equipment worth $30 million. China was the first country to reopen closed factories following COVID-19, producing tonnes and tonnes of medical supplies for the world (Bittmann et al. 2020). Assisting the Chinese government’s soft power were its mega corporates such as Alibaba that also sent medical supplies and COVID-19 test kits across continents and the USA (Knight 2020).

The US Secretary of State, Mr. Mike Pompeo accused Cuba of “profiting from COVID-19” by exporting doctors to countries such as South Africa and Qatar. The 200 Cuban doctors to South Africa were priced at approximately $24.3 million (BBC 2020a, b). Like China, Cuba uses its medical assistance as a source of soft diplomatic power. However, the Cuban doctors were not welcome in countries such as Brazil, Ecuador and Bolivia (News24 Team 2020). Although the USA claims could have been valid, the USA has for a long time been accusing Cuba of human rights violations.
The COVID-19 political battles spilled over to trade war proxies between China and Australia. Following the passing of a motion to institute an independent international inquiry into the COVID-19 outbreak sponsored by Australia, China immediately instituted an 80% anti-dumping tariff on Australian barley imports (Hurst 2020). This action, if finalised would threaten about $A500 million worth of trade decline annually in the Australian economy for a period of 5 years. China had been investigating a barley anti-dumping complaint since 2018 on the grounds that Australian farmers were being subsidised (Australian Associated Press 2020). To complicate matters, China agreed to a WHO-led investigation into the pandemic outbreak and further pledged $2 billion in aid for 2 years to assist other countries to fight COVID-19 (Shih et al. 2020). Speculation over the pledge grew, with allegations that the pledge was to divert attention from China that needed to give even more towards COVID-19 fight. To this end, China could have succeeded in its push-back as the draft resolution from the 73rd World Health Assembly of the WHO that took place 18–19 May 2020 (supported by over 100 countries) did not mention China or Wuhan (Ibid.).

Devakumar et al. (2020) bring another interesting dimension of racism and discrimination to COVID-19 responses. The authors believe that pandemics create an environment of fear, where racism and xenophobia thrive. To this end, COVID-19 revealed social and political fault lines in communities, with those marginalised usually at the receiving end. There was also increased discrimination against the Chinese people, including violence and blocked entry to certain establishments. COVID-19 policy responses were also found to have been disproportionately affecting people of colour and migrants. Individuals from marginalised communities were seen to have limited healthcare access, at times work in precarious jobs and stay in crowded residential areas and residences. To this end, policy responses such as self-isolation remain inappropriate, presenting the communities with a high risk of infection (Ibid.). Drawing from Latin America, Blofield et al. (2020) brought more evidence of class struggles to COVID-19 responses. The authors highlighted that social distancing measures directly affected the livelihoods of those involved in informal workers who are mainly from lower social classes.

Political leadership in Latin America also came under pressure. Some presidents were “emerging as strong, unifying leaders, while other flounder, in a continent where historically trust in formal institutions, is low” (Blofield et al. 2020: 1). However, Oliver (2020) cautioned, indicating that COVID-19 was not presenting opportunities for premature post mortems on responses and political point-scoring. The author referred to how some national leaders were at odds with the WHO guidance and at times with South East Asian countries that had managed to “flatten” the COVID-19 curve. The reaction came in direct response to the way in which the UK had responded, which was in the author’s view, a few weeks late. From South Africa emerged an issue concerning the geography of poverty (Manderson and Levine 2020), where some residential areas in Western Cape remained marginalised and some in the wealthy suburbs clamouring to go ahead with their dog and daily walks.

The African continent has, for a long time, been placed in the spotlight to check compliance with global pandemics such as COVID-19. However, this work revealed several African countries took leadership in certain areas. For example, Nigeria was
among the first countries to realise the risk associated with COVID-19 and started planning in early January 2020 (Zumla et al. 2020). In a comprehensive federal effort, the National Coronavirus Preparedness Group was established by the Centre for Disease Control on 7 January 2020. This was just after a week when China first reported the COVID-19 cases to the WHO. Furthermore, within a month, the country had established testing capacity with three functional laboratories. The Centre for Disease Control also put up a national team that met daily to assess the pending coronavirus risk.

The Tanzania and Madagascar presidents also joined the COVID-19 controversies. President John Magufuli fired the national COVID-19 laboratory testing head after undercover samples for a goat, sheep and papaw allocated human names and ages tested positive (Aljazeera 2020). Apart from firing the national COVID-19 testing laboratory head, the President went on to request the military to test the genuineness of the donated COVID-19 tests kits he suspected were faulty. President Magufuli also gave orders for the Madagascar COVID Organics treatment to be bought and used in Tanzania. The COVID Organics is some herbal remedy made out of *Artemisia* plant widely grown in Madagascar and prepared by the Malagasy Institute for Applied Research. Artemisia is also traditionally used to cure ailments that include malaria and the Madagascar President Andry Rajoelina indicated that other countries that took delivery of donated COVID Organics included Comoros, Guinea-Bissau and Equatorial Guinea (Medical Brief 2020). However, the WHO first dismissed the COVID Organics saying it was not a cure for COVID-19, only to make an about-turn indicating its recognised benefits of traditional and alternative medicines for possible COVID-19 treatment (ANA Reporter 2020). The WHO indicated that the COVID Organics should be tested for efficacy and side effects.

While these events were unfolding, New Zealand became the first country to claim it had managed to stop community transmissions of COVID-19, effectively eliminating the coronavirus (BBC 2020a, b). The announcement came on 27 April 2020. The claim came after the country reported single-digit new cases for several days. However, the Prime Minister, Jacinda Ardern and her officials warned against complacency as the claim did not imply a total freeze in COVID-19 cases. The announcement came soon after the national lockdown was ended with some non-essential business, education and healthcare resuming on Tuesday 28 April 2020. The country had less than 1500 COVID-19 cases and 19 deaths (Ibid.). The success story from New Zealand and other countries is the subject of Chap. 4. The next section focuses on the economic stimulus packages put in place in response to COVID-19.

### 1.6 Economic Stimulus Packages in Response to COVID-19

This section profiles the emerging global economic stimulus packages in response to COVID-19. The section will not go into detail regarding the tourism specific economic stimulus packages as these are the subject of a whole chapter in the book. Hence, it is only a quick overview and an overview into what transpired until the point the book went into publication.
According to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD 2020: 2), in a televised address of 23 February 2020, the President of China, Mr. Xi Jinping highlighted that it was “unavoidable that the novel coronavirus epidemic will have a considerable impact on the economy and society”. This view was supported by the Japanese Finance Minister, Taro Aso during the Riyadh G20 meetings in Saudi Arabia on 24 February 2020. Mr. Taro Aso further indicated that COVID-19 was a public health crisis that posed a serious risk to the macro-economy, and this would be aggravated by drastically reduced production lines, cut-off supply chains, as well as restricting people’s movement (Ibid.). PwC (2020) also noted work that was done by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which concluded that a one percentage point drop in Chinese growth translates into a 0.2 percentage point drop in South Africa’s growth. The observations made herein were fulfilled as the global economy needed multiple economic bailouts following the COVID-19 pandemic.

Nicola et al. (2020) identified three economic sectors whose industries were severely affected, namely, those from primary, secondary and tertiary sectors. The primary sectors include agriculture as well as petroleum, oil and gas. The plummeting global demand for foods and beverages, particularly from the hotels and restaurants, resulted in a 20% drop in commodity prices. Brent crude demand went down drastically, hitting a low of around $16 per barrel in April 2020. From the secondary sectors, the manufacturing industry was not spared, with businesses in the UK factoring in decline in revenue until the third quarter if things remained as they were. As for the tertiary sector, education systems were negatively affected, ranging from partial to complete closures of facilities that included schools and universities, with figures of those affected running into billions. The finance sector was another of the tertiary industries affected. Indices of major stock exchanges such as the S&P 500, Dow Jones Industrial Average, Nasdaq, Shanghai Composite, Johannesburg Stock Exchange, UK FUTSE 100, Euro Stoxx 50, Germany’s DAX, Japan’s Nikkei, Hong Kong’s Hang Seng and South Korea’s KOSPI all went down drastically following the announcement of COVID-19 as a global pandemic on 11 March 2020 (Ibid.). The central banks had to intervene with drastic repo rate cuts, and the situation as of 30 April 2020 is shown in Fig. 1.1.

A comparison of emerging economic stimulus packages for 2008/2009 and 2020 in logarithmic format for selected countries is shown in Fig. 1.2. What is clear is that the 2008/09 global financial meltdown economic stimulus packages were a fraction of what was required for COVID-19’s 2020 economic stimulus packages. For example, South Africa’s 2008/2009 economic stimulus packages stood at $3.7 billion compared to $25 billion in 2020. This is an increase of close to sevenfold. For the European Union, the 2008/2009 figure was $255 billion compared to $2.108 trillion for 2020. Similarly, the USA had a stimulus package of $787 billion in 2008/2009 compared to $2 trillion in 2020. The same picture emerged in many countries sampled. Hence, there is no doubt that judging by the amounts of stimulus packages countries were implementing, the COVID-19 impacts were far more severe compared to the impacts of the 2008/2009 global financial crisis. In many instances, countries had to top up their stimulus packages for the third time as the gravity of the COVID-19 pandemic impacted their economies.
Kickbusch et al. (2020) portrayed three linked platforms on which COVID-19 had severe negative impacts, namely, health and wellbeing, social welfare and global economy. Regional and national lockdowns in many other places led to a decrease across all economic sectors and caused large numbers of job losses (Nicola et al. 2020). The World Bank announced immediate support of $12 billion to enable countries to respond to the pandemic, and the IMF announced it was relaxing structural adjustment measures to permit countries and territories to invest in fighting COVID-19 (Kickbusch et al. 2020). The US President Donald Trump announced
payroll tax cuts, which usually brought approximately $960 billion to the Federal budget. Loayza and Pennings (2020: 1) warned that the human and economic costs were “likely to be larger for developing countries, which generally have lower health care capacity, larger informal sectors, shallower financial markets, less fiscal space, and poorer governance”. As such, the short-term interventions had to focus on avoiding mass layoffs and bankruptcy to stimulate the economy, which was an impossibility under supply-restricting containment measures. Economic stimulus packages were likely to work in the medium- to long-term horizons, with macroeconomic policy focusing on recovery measures involving monetary and fiscal stimulus. Such policies could also not be applied in a blanket manner, as these had to be country-specific.

1.7 Methodology: Theories and Methods Utilised

Given the magnitude and nature of the book, a multi-, inter- and transdisciplinary approach was preferred in documenting the cost of COVID-19 on the global tourism industry. This approach led to a mixed methods application in generating and analysing data. Some of the theories from which insights were drawn included the grounded theory and the actor–network theory (ANT). The grounded theory is a popular research methodology with a traceable and distinct history that has resulted in an array of other qualitative approaches emerging (Rieger 2019). Such qualitative approaches are distinguishable under three schools of thoughts, namely, the classic Glaserian grounded theory, Straussian grounded theory and constructivist grounded theory. The methodology emerged from sociology and was developed by Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss in the USA in the 1960s (Peiter et al. 2020).

The characteristics of the grounded theory include the elucidation of a process; starting with inductive logic; simultaneous data collection, analysis and theory construction; constant and continuous comparisons; memo writing; and theoretical sampling (Rieger 2019). Although not all these perspectives were applied in this work, several aspects were embraced as was deemed appropriate. From analysing data, a large number of modern-day document and critical discourse analysis components borrow from the grounded theory. Matters such as data coding, category building and formulation of themes resulting in incoherent narratives are borrowed from grounded theory (Tie et al. 2019). Given this set-up, grounded theory has found resonance across many disciplines applying purposive sampling, including tourism studies and general environmental studies. The fundamentals have also been embedded in modern qualitative data analysis software packages such as NVivo and ATLAS.ti.

The ANT has also found application across disciplines and brings additional lenses for tracing and documenting narratives emerging from the interaction of non-human (actants) and humans (actors) within networks (Laasch et al. 2020). The interaction takes place as premised from a quasi-object such as COVID-19 on which certain narratives are built, dismantled and reconstructed. With time, actors recruited
to such a narrative may contest perspectives, resulting in some withdrawing from the networks, new actors recruited and so on presenting contested policy domains. As a new phenomenon, narratives and discourses surrounding COVID-19 would naturally bring disagreements and contestations, some as sharp as direct opposites. Technologies including mobile phones, social media and others remain active ingredients in the ANT (Sage et al. 2019).

Organisations such as the United Nations, WHO, World Bank, UNWTO, International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), The International Air Transport Association (IATA), EUROCONTROL, the IMF, Airports Council International, the Civil Air Navigation Services Organization, stock exchanges and the International Air Cargo Association become active and crucial in the context of ANT. In addition, everyday influential countries such as China, India, the USA, South Africa, Nigeria, Japan, the European Union, Brazil, Germany, England, Australia and Canada remain in the spotlight and so do their leaders. Top and known philanthropists, such as Bill and Melinda Gates, as well as global multinational corporates such as Alibaba, Facebook, Boeing, Airbus and Nestlé, also grace the discourses, shaping global direction both at national and global levels (Nhamo 2006, 2010). However, it was also important to trace actors and their networks in the context of COVID-19, an aspect that brought together groups of countries according to how they responded to the pandemic. A group of countries that battled to contain the pandemic such as Italy, Spain and the USA emerged. Another group of countries that seemingly did well to manage the pandemic also emerged, and in this group were countries and territories such as Hong Kong, China, Taiwan, Korea, Australia, Canada, South Africa, Rwanda, New Zealand and Germany. There was yet another group of countries that were leading in vaccines and treatment research, which included countries such as Senegal, the USA, China, England, Germany and Australia. In the context of this book, more groups of countries emerged such as the USA, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand and Australia who had strong tourism stimulus packages. These groups are only a few examples of many more that the researchers could identify.

In addition to grounded theory and ANT, the (global) tourism value chain framework, as informed by Michael Porter’s value chain model (Porter 1985), and the generic global value chain framework (Antràs 2020) were also utilised. The global tourism value chain framework brought additional methodological underpinnings which guided the researchers in orientating the chapters. Chapters were identified along the global tourism value chain framework to include COVID-19 impacts on the following sectors: air travel, cruise ships, airports networks, restaurants, hotels, sports as well as pilgrimage and religion. Support and cross-cutting chapters were also identified, including the tourism stocks and those dealing with the tourism economic stimulus packages.

With these theoretical framings, several methods that were applicable were identified to generate and analyse the data sets. Figure 1.3 shows the overall methodological orientation as it was applied in the book. Further details on how the methods were applied, including secondary data sources from the World Development Indicators (WDI) database, Johns Hopkins University, the IMF and the UNWTO
portals, are embedded in each of the book’s chapters. The authors also made use of announcements, a method that is embedded in events studies (Kumar and Srivastava 2017). The authors recommended that there was a need to carefully select the nature of events that could be subjected to events studies. To this end, the chapters dealing with hotel stocks and shares benefited most, although elements of the methodology were also applied in other chapters as was deemed appropriate. The events studies method has its roots in finance, particularly the analysis of stocks and foreign exchange (Hayward 2018). However, over time the methodology has been applied in other disciplines (Giorgino et al. 2017).

Given that some chapters are location-specific, the geographical information system (GIS) applications were also used. In addition, other generic Microsoft data analysis packages such as Excel were utilised. The GIS remains a suitable tool for tourism studies (Martínez-Hernández and Yubero 2019). Several spatial maps were developed to locate countries and related tourism events that were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Of late, the GIS application has found application in the mapping and spatial analysis of SDGs (Cheikh and Rebai 2019). Reference to the SDGs is made in some chapters as the authors deemed appropriate. Document and critical discourse analysis (D&CDA) (Mendes et al. 2020), as well as meta-analysis, were other methods used in analysing data (Asatani et al. 2020). The D&CDA has been successfully applied to research climate change (Shi et al. 2020; Islam and Kieu 2020) and REDD+ regimes (Mbatu 2020), both of which have direct linkages to the tourism value chains. Both D&CDA and meta-analysis methods were also applied in studying sports tourism (Jiménez-García et al. 2020) and the understanding of environmental perception in tourism (Shi and Sun 2020).

The use of several methods to generate and analyse data further assisted with both methodological and data triangulation (Taswell et al. 2019; Zhang et al. 2019) as some sources of data needed double authentication. There was just too much information generated within very short periods. In addition, there were also updates from the literature, another source of data heavily utilised in the book. In a way, it
was like the book was being written live. The next and last section in this chapter presents the book and chapter outlines.

### 1.8 Book and Chapter Outlines

This book was written in five parts. Part I presents the introduction and background and is made up of a single chapter dedicated to the context of COVID-19, global development agendas and the contribution of tourism to global economies (this chapter). Part II presents the conceptual framework for COVID-19 and tourism. This part comprises two chapters, namely, Chap. 2, that deliberates on the global tourism value chains, the SDGs and COVID-19, and Chap. 3, which documents the preparedness and responses to COVID-19 from selected countries.

Part III is composed of nine chapters and looks at the impact of COVID-19 on (global) tourism value chains. Chapter 4 discusses COVID-19 and its implications for the aviation sector, while the impact of COVID-19 on the global network of airports is the subject matter in Chap. 5. Chapter 6 elucidates the cost of COVID-19 on the global cruise ship industry, with Chap. 7 deliberating on the car rentals, and Chap. 8 focuses on hotel industry and COVID-19 impacts. Chapter 9 profiles restaurants and COVID-19 impacts, with a focus on sustainability and recovery pathways. Chapter 10 presents the impacts of COVID-19 on the global sporting industry and related tourism, while Chap. 11 does the same with a focus on pilgrimage and religious tourism. Chapter 12 looks at COVID-19 and the entertainment industry, while COVID-19 and the stock market with a focus on tourism-related share prices is the focus of Chap. 13.

Part IV is made up of two chapters and is dedicated to philanthropy and tourism economic stimulus packages. Chapter 14 tracks corporate, philanthropic and public donations to dislodge COVID-19, while the tourism economic stimulus packages as a response to COVID-19 is the focus on Chap. 15. Part V, which is made up of another single chapter, draws the book’s conclusions and policy recommendations (Chap. 16).
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