



Branding Research Prince Edward Island National Park (POR-105-06)

Ecological Integrity Theme Project: *Healthy Parks for People*

Final Report

Contract Number: E60CY-030001/001/CY



Parks
Canada

Parcs
Canada

CORPORATE RESEARCH
ASSOCIATES INC



Branding Research Prince Edward Island National Park (POR# 105-06) Ecological Integrity Theme Project: *Healthy Parks for People*

Final Report

Prepared for:

Parks Canada

August 2006



www.cra.ca

1.888.414.1336

Table of Contents

	Page
Background / Introduction	1
Research Methodology	2
Context of Qualitative Research	3
Executive Summary	4
Sommaire	6
Conclusions	8
Recommendations	11
Key Findings	13
PEI National Park Impressions.....	13
As one staff member mentioned:	14
Changing Needs & Expectations.....	16
Park Strengths / Weaknesses	18
Park Performance	22
Healthy Parks for People.....	23

Appendices:

Appendix A: Recruitment Screener

Appendix B: Interview Protocols



Background / Introduction

As stated in the statement of work, Parks Canada's 2005/06 to 2009/10 Corporate Plan, as well as the Corporate Orientation and National Parks Action Plan, stresses the need to integrate visitor experiences, public education and protection of resources as the three foundation elements of the Parks Canada program. In doing so, its challenge is to understand and respond to shifting Canadian demographics and visitor attitudes in providing opportunities for visitor experience, while respecting the ecological and commemorative integrity of these special places and providing for public education. This requires a shift from emphasizing the provision of services, facilities and programs in a way that focuses on Parks Canada's goals and objectives to one where visitors' needs and expectations are central. One assumption of the Plan is that visitors are looking for authentic and diverse experiences that respond to their interests and provide a sense of personal growth and accomplishment.

Prince Edward Island National Park is the 3rd smallest national park in Canada, yet it receives the highest national park visitation outside of the mountain parks in the Canadian Rockies. Its small land base, composed of spectacular beaches, dynamic coastal dunes, wetlands, salt marshes and forest habitat, is congested with more than one million visitors annually.

PEI National Park is currently undertaking a major Ecological Integrity Project which engages a range of local, national and international interest groups and partners in the development of new options for memorable visitor experiences that contribute to the improved health of the park ecosystem and the visitor. The working title of this project (which has also been suggested by the Park as the future new brand) is "Healthy Parks for People". It is built on the premise of how contact with nature in a park context contributes to the health of human beings in a physical, emotional, psychological and/or spiritual way. The primary objectives of the Ecological Integrity Project include:

- Enhance the protection and sustainability of the National Park ecosystems;
- Promote the role and involvement of the general public, Park users and collaborators in protecting and sustaining the environment;
- Create new, high quality visitor experience options that promote and support healthy lifestyles and a healthy environment;
- Reduce visitor parking inside the National Park; and
- Increase public awareness, understanding and support for Parks Canada's role and leadership in developing sustainable tourism initiatives.

It is intended that this project will enhance ecological integrity, visitor experience and public education opportunities in Prince Edward Island National Park by ensuring that visitors enjoy experience options that involve communities in promoting healthy lifestyles for a healthy park.





In support of this initiative, PEI National Park and the Ecological Integrity Theme Project Team are interested in understanding the opinions of Park stakeholders, partners and Park employees as it relates to the current and future Park brand, as well as to the **Healthy Parks for People** brand. To achieve this goal, Parks Canada commissioned Corporate Research Associates Inc. to conduct a qualitative research study. More specifically, research objectives included:

- Explore the views and attitudes of partners, stakeholders and Parks Canada staff as they pertain to the brand (current and future) of the national park; and
- Assess the views and attitudes of partners, stakeholders and Parks Canada staff as they pertain the “Healthy Parks for People” brand.

Results of the study will direct a final brand strategy and SWOT analysis of **Healthy Parks for People** for Prince Edward Island National Park. This potential new brand will reflect the new visitor experience and culture of use within the Park as reflected in the Ecological Integrity Project Master Plan. Of note, this project represents one phase of a two-phased research initiative. The second (and simultaneous) phase includes secondary research and is reported under separate cover.

Research Methodology

To meet the above-mentioned objectives, a total of 25 in-depth, telephone interviews were conducted with partners/stakeholders and Park staff, as detailed below.

Participants	# of Interviews
Stakeholders / Partners ~ English	14
Stakeholders / Partners ~ French	5
Staff	6
Total	25

For each of the above-mentioned audiences, Parks Canada provided a list of potential participants (including names and contact numbers) and CRA subsequently recruited participants. Interviews lasted an average of 20-30 minutes and were conducted between July 26th and August 3rd. Given participants’ vested interest in the Park, it was not deemed necessary to provide incentives to interviewees.

The following report presents the results of the qualitative research study. More specifically, it includes an Executive Summary, a series of Conclusions and Recommendations derived from the analysis of findings, and a Detailed Analysis of the in-depth interviews. Appended to the report are the recruitment screeners (Appendix A) and interview protocols (Appendix B).





Context of Qualitative Research

In-depth interviews are intended as moderator-directed, informal, non-threatening discussions with participants whose characteristics, habits and attitudes are considered relevant to the topic of discussion. The primary benefits of in-depth interviews are that they allow for detailed probing with qualifying participants on behavioural habits, usage patterns, perceptions and attitudes related to the subject matter. In-depth interviews allow for flexibility in exploring other areas that may be pertinent to the investigation, and allow for more complete understanding of the segment in that the thoughts or feelings are expressed in the participants' "own language" and at their "own levels of passion."

The in-depth interview qualitative technique is used in marketing research as a means of developing insight and direction, rather than collecting quantitatively precise data or absolute measures. Due to the inherent biases in the technique, the data should not be projected to any universe of individuals.



Executive Summary

Findings of the **Branding Qualitative Research Study** show that PEI National Park is considered a key tourism icon to PEI that plays a vital role in the tourism industry on the Island, however, the Park is seen to play a disproportionately minor role in the development of sustainable tourism.

Although the Park is *not believed to have a clear positioning statement or brand*, there is agreement that its geography (beaches, cliffs, sand dunes), and to lesser extent Anne of Green Gables and Province House, best represents what is unique about the Park. Consistently, the Park's **beaches** were considered its main drawing card.

It is perceived that visitors needs have changed significantly in recent years, primarily driven by changing demographics. Visitors are now more inclined to be older and travelling as couples. Stakeholders and staff see visitors as looking for experiential-based tourism activities that allow them to interact, learn, and be engaged in activities such as walking, cycling and hiking, to name a few.

As a result, visitors' expectations of the Park are also shifting. Most notably, it is thought that visitors expect **full service** through the provision of amenities, interactive / educational programs, strong infrastructure and a strong value proposition. While most concur that having a park that contributes to the physical, emotional, psychological and /or spiritual well being of its visitors is important, these are generally considered **outcomes** of a visit to the Park rather than **motivators** to visit.

The Park's key strengths were consistently identified as its dynamic and impressive geography (beaches, cliffs, dunes), interpretive programs, and key heritage sites (Province House and Anne of Green Gables). That said, stakeholders and staff recognized a plethora of weaknesses and voiced sharp criticism of the Park for its **limited infrastructure investment, conflicting mandates**, lack of **understanding of visitors' changing needs and expectations** (coupled with a perceived lack of willingness to change to meet their needs), **lack of marketing, high cost**, and a **lack of leadership in the development of a strategic tourism strategy** for the Island.

Stakeholders and staff strongly endorse the *Healthy Parks for People* concept, but as a program or initiative, not as a positioning statement for PEI National Park. This statement speaks clearly of ensuring and sustaining an environmentally healthy park for the enjoyment of people. It was criticized, however for placing too much prominence on the Park, rather than people. Some also saw it as suggesting healthy activity in the Park, albeit to a lesser extent. Most did not feel it accurately stated that a healthy park could actually contribute to a healthy lifestyle. The French translation (*pour un parc en sante*) was considered ineffective in communicating the intended focus of the program and not reflective of the English statement's intent. The statement was criticized for its lack of





visitor reference and implied vulnerability of the Park.

The greatest criticism of *Healthy Parks for People* as a positioning statement for the Park was its ineffectiveness in clearly differentiating PEI National Park as unique from any other park. There was general consensus that any positioning statement or brand must appropriately distinguish the Park from any others. *Healthy Parks for People* simply does not do that.

Finally, when asked what was needed to create a Park that embodies *Healthy Parks for People*, the development of experiential-based tourism products and a ‘people strategy’ (that effectively redirects high traffic volume) was consistently identified, as was a more open and active commitment on the Park’s behalf to the development of a sustainable tourism strategy for the Island.



Sommaire

Les résultats de l'**Étude qualitative sur la stratégie de marque** indiquent que le Parc national du Canada de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard est considéré comme un important produit touristique vedette de l'Î.-P.-É. qui joue un rôle essentiel dans l'industrie touristique de la province. Par contre, comparativement à son importance, on estime que le parc joue un rôle trop peu important sur le plan du développement du tourisme durable.

Bien qu'on considère que le parc *n'a pas une image de marque ou un énoncé de positionnement clair*, on s'entend pour dire que sa géographie (plages, falaises et dunes de sable) et, à un niveau moins important, les attractions Anne aux pignons verts et Province House, sont les éléments qui représentent le mieux l'unicité du parc. Les **plages** du parc sont systématiquement considérées comme son attraction vedette.

On pense que les besoins des visiteurs ont changé de façon marquée au cours des dernières années, surtout en raison de l'évolution démographique. Les visiteurs ont désormais tendance à être plus âgés et à voyager en couple. Selon les intervenants et le personnel, les visiteurs cherchent des activités touristiques expérientielles qui permettent l'interaction, l'apprentissage et la participation active, comme la marche, le vélo et la randonnée pédestre, pour n'en nommer que quelques-unes.

Par conséquent, les attentes des visiteurs du parc changent elles aussi. En particulier, on croit que les visiteurs s'attendent à un **service complet** regroupant commodités, programmes éducatifs et interactifs, infrastructure robuste et proposition de valeur solide. Bien que la majorité convienne de l'importance d'avoir un parc qui contribue au bien-être physique, affectif, psychologique ou spirituel de ses visiteurs, on considère généralement qu'il s'agit des **résultats** d'une visite au parc plutôt que des facteurs qui la **motivent**.

Comme principales forces du parc, on signale systématiquement sa géographie dynamique et impressionnante (plages, falaises et dunes), ses programmes d'interprétation et ses importants sites patrimoniaux (Province house et Anne aux pignons verts). Cela étant dit, les intervenants et le personnel signalent une myriade de faiblesses qui valent de vives critiques au parc : **faible investissement dans les infrastructures, mandats contradictoires, manque de compréhension des besoins et des attentes en évolution des visiteurs** (jumelé à ce qu'on perçoit comme un manque de volonté à changer pour répondre à ces besoins), **manque de marketing, coûts élevés** et **manque de leadership en ce qui concerne l'élaboration d'une stratégie touristique** pour l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard.

Les intervenants et le personnel appuient vigoureusement le concept de **Healthy Parks for People**, mais comme programme ou initiative et non pas comme énoncé de positionnement pour le Parc national du Canada de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard. Le concept évoque clairement l'idée d'assurer la santé écologique du parc, maintenant et pour toujours, afin que les visiteurs puissent en bénéficier. On critique toutefois le concept en ce sens où il insiste trop





sur le parc et trop peu sur les visiteurs. Chez certains, le concept évoque des activités saines dans le parc, mais à un niveau moins important. La majorité considère que le concept ne communique pas clairement l'idée qu'un parc sain pourrait contribuer à un mode de vie sain. On considère que la traduction française (***Pour un parc en santé***) communique mal l'objectif du programme et qu'elle ne reflète par l'intention de la version anglaise de l'énoncé. En outre, on critique le fait qu'elle ne mentionne pas le visiteur et qu'elle sous-entend que le parc est vulnérable.

Selon les principales critiques, le concept de ***Healthy Parks for People*** en tant qu'énoncé de positionnement pour le parc est inefficace lorsqu'il s'agit de distinguer clairement le Parc national du Canada de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard des autres parcs et de faire valoir son unicité. Le consensus est clair : tout énoncé de positionnement ou toute image de marque doit bien distinguer ce parc-ci des autres parcs. Le concept de ***Healthy Parks for People*** n'est tout simplement pas à la hauteur de la tâche.

Finalement, interrogés sur les éléments requis pour créer un parc qui reflète le concept de ***Healthy Parks for People***, les répondants mentionnent systématiquement le développement de produits touristiques expérientiels et d'une « stratégie axée sur les personnes » (qui redirige efficacement le flux de visiteurs), ainsi qu'une volonté davantage ouverte et concrète de la part du parc à élaborer une stratégie de tourisme durable pour l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard.



Conclusions

The following conclusions are derived from the detailed findings of the study.

- ***PEI National Park is held in high regard and is most recognized for its beaches. The Park is not considered to have a clear positioning statement.***

Partners / stakeholders hold Prince Edward Island National Park in very high regard, and consistently describe it as a key tourism icon for the Province, and one of its most important assets. The Park's geographic characteristics (beaches, sand dunes, cliffs), as well as key historic sites (Province House, Anne of Green Gables) are well recognized as its unique characteristics or differentiators, and **beaches** are considered the greatest motivator for Park visitation.

That said, participants were consistently unable to identify the current positioning statement of PEI National Park and most questioned if, in fact, a positioning statement actually exists.

- ***The Park's physical attributes are considered exceptional strengths, although the Park is plagued by a variety of obvious weaknesses.***

When asked to describe the Park's strengths and weaknesses, participants readily identified a variety of strengths including its distinctive beaches (notably their white sands and warm waters), and other key physical products of the Park (impressive scenery, sand dunes, red cliffs). The Park performance in sustaining the ecological health of the Park was also considered a key strength, as was its educational programs.

Despite very positive impressions of the Park, staff and stakeholders voiced harsh criticism of the Park and identified multiple weaknesses. These primarily included its conflicting mandates (*preserving the Park versus meeting visitors' needs*), deficient marketing activities, lack of infrastructure investment, limited product development, poor value proposition (based on the price of admission) and an inability or unwillingness to meet visitors' changing needs and expectations. In addition, the Park was criticized for its perceived lack of cooperation with other tourism stakeholders in developing sustainable tourism opportunities for the Island.





■ ***Visitors' needs and expectations are perceived to have changed dramatically in recent years.***

Vacationers needs are perceived to have changed significantly in recent years. Visitors have not only become older, more affluent, technologically savvy and well travelled, but as baby boomers have aged, they have also become more inclined to travel as couples. Travelers are also more health conscious and active than in the past. They are looking for active, experiential tourism products, where they can interact and participate in key activities, while learning about their destination.

With increased time commitments at home, busy schedules and a strong urban representation, visitors are also looking for opportunities to relax, appreciate their surroundings and witness an experience unique from others. Camping habits are also perceived to have changed with campers now looking to enjoy the many conveniences of home while 'roughing it'.

Changing visitor characteristics have resulted in an apparent change in visitor expectations of the PEI National Park, with visitors expecting more **full service** products, including full amenities, and a stronger value proposition through activity-based and experiential offerings.

■ ***There is mixed opinion of the Park's performance in delivering experiences to travelers.***

Given the perceived weaknesses of the Park, it is not surprising that stakeholders / staff have mixed opinion of the Park's performance in actually delivering experiences to its visitors. While the Park receives accolades in its preservation work in ensuring an environmentally safe and pristine environment, most felt it falls short of meeting visitors changing needs and expectations. In particular, the Park received low performance marks for its limited investment in infrastructure, product / service development, perceived lack of interest in growing the number of visitors and "over pricey" admission fees. As well, the Park was harshly criticized for its inability to (or lack of interest in) taking a leading role in developing a sustainable tourism strategy for the Island.





- ***Healthy Parks for People is strongly supported as an initiative, but is not considered appropriate as a positioning statement for PEI National Park.***

The notion of having healthy parks for people is considered an important and worthy initiative. Most believe *healthy parks for people* suggests sustainability, and ensuring parks are available for people to access. To a lesser extent, some also felt that the statement implies visitor activity at a park.

Although the concept of having healthy parks for people was endorsed, it was not considered an appropriate positioning statement or brand for PEI National Park. In particular, the statement was considered to give prominence to the importance of a healthy park, suggesting that ensuring the Park's sustainability through limited accessibility was more important than its visitors needs. More importantly, it was felt that a national park's positioning statement must clearly differentiate it from any other parks, profiling unique characteristics and attributes. This statement was considered generic in nature, and did nothing to uniquely portray PEI National Park. Similarly, the French translation, *pour un parc en santé*, was considered ineffective in differentiating the PEI National Park and in translating the intent of the English version.



Recommendations

The following recommendations are presented for Parks Canada's consideration.

1. **Parks Canada should move forward with the implementation of *Healthy Parks for People* ~ but as a program only, with some modifications to its name.**

Partners and staff support and appreciate the implied direction of the *Healthy Parks for People* program, recognizing the importance of developing interactive, memorable learning experiences for visitors, while at the same time ensuring the sustainability and longevity of the Park. That said, while the program was perceived as having great merit and worth, there was general agreement that it does not suffice as a positioning statement for the Park.

The name "*Healthy Parks for People*" was seen as lacking uniqueness and clarity. In particular, a good number of stakeholders and staff felt the title gave unbalanced prominence on the Park's health, with minimal focus on the visitor. In French, the statement *pour un parc en santé* was considered ineffective and problematic, particularly because of the use of "pour", the lack of mention of people and an implied vulnerability of the Park. Altogether, this suggests that a slight adaptation to the English statement should be considered that more appropriately reflects a causal relationship between the Park and its visitors (e.g. *Healthy Parks, Healthy People*), and that French translation of any such program must be revisited.

2. **Any positioning statement or brand for Prince Edward National Park must accurately reflect unique attributes of the Park, clearly differentiating it from other parks and destinations.**

Beaches, the Island's scenic beauty, majestic geography and its unique product offerings (Greenwich, Anne of Green Gables, Province House) were all considered current key differentiators of PEI National Park, with beaches being recognized as the Park's greatest drawing card. When contemplating the appropriateness of *Healthy Parks for People* as a positioning statement for the Park, participants felt strongly that any positioning statement must more accurately reflect the unique selling proposition (USP) of the Park, while at the same time, enticing travelers to visit.

Equally important, it is perceived that the success of any positioning statement or brand of PEI National Park will depend on a heightened marketing and promotional focus of the Park.





3. **Parks Canada should take a lead role in developing a sustainable tourism strategy for the Island.**

The Park was criticized for its perceived lack of transparency and apparent inability to work well with other tourism stakeholders to enhance visitor experiences and develop a sustainable tourism strategy for the Island. Indeed, most perceive the Park as having conflicting mandates (namely preservation ~keep the visitors away and enhancing the visitor experience and product offerings ~ attract visitors). The disproportionate importance of the Park to the Island's tourism industry, coupled with the declining state of the tourism industry, lends an increased sense of urgency to more clearly understanding and effectively linking these two Park mandates.

Most importantly, perhaps, given that the Park is perceived to be *the* key tourism icon of PEI, stakeholders / partners felt strongly that the Park should play a leading role in ensuring development of a sustainable tourism strategy. To many, this requires rethinking how things are currently done in the Park, including relaxing some historic rules, redirecting traffic flow and enhancing product and service delivery that more accurately reflect visitors' changing needs. As part of any sustainable tourism strategy it is perceived imperative that the Park enhance its infrastructure, product development and increase activity opportunities. Finally, results suggest a more thorough understanding of visitors' needs and expectations is warranted to direct future efforts.



Key Findings

The following presents detailed findings of the one-on-one interviews with partners / stakeholders and Park staff.

PEI National Park Impressions

PEI National Park is held in high regard and is most recognized for its beaches. The Park is not considered to have a clear positioning statement.

General Impressions

Partners / stakeholders hold the Prince Edward Island National Park in high regard, consistently describing it as a “gem”, a key tourism icon for the Province, and one of PEI’s most important assets (both as a natural resource and attraction). The Park was readily identified as a high use park that protects a valuable resource in a very fragile area.

“It’s a crucial part of our tourism industry and a primary icon for PEI.”

That said, top of mind mentions or descriptions of the Park consistently focused on its beaches.

“First and foremost, it’s about big beaches. Many would just refer to it as Cavendish.”

“They are Canada’s best beach national park. They want to fight it, but that is what they are. The beach is the icon of the Park.”

“Warm sand, windy, rough pavement and piping plovers.”

Staff’s impressions of the Park were generally consistent with those of partners / stakeholders, although reflecting a more heightened awareness of the Park’s diversity.

“The Park is a representation of the dynamic coastal processes. It is a key draw for tourists and an anchor for the tourism industry, while continuing to support its mandate.”

“It is a Park that is under a lot of pressure both from an environmental aspect (long, narrow coastline, erosion) and from landholders (its boundaries are becoming smaller every year).”

“It’s a memorable place where you can participate in a number of activities.”



Current Positioning Statement

When asked what they consider to be the current positioning statement of PEI National Park, most partners / stakeholders voiced uncertainty and questioned if, in fact, a positioning statement actually exists.

“No idea.”

“There is no positioning statement today that I’m aware of. What makes the Park unique is its white sandy beaches, red cliffs and dunes at Greenwich, but they don’t clearly position the Park in any way.”

“I really can’t say what the positioning statement is. I guess I don’t know as much as I thought I did about the Park.”

Others questioned what a ‘positioning statement’ meant, and asked if it was simply descriptions of the Park’s unique attributes and how people perceive the Park. Partners / stakeholders cited a variety of ‘position statements’ ranging from preservation to beaches.

“It’s the premiere north shore beach.”

“Beach, beach, beach, beach.”

“A national park that is connected to nature and well maintained.”

“Would that be the mandate of the Park? To preserve and maintain a precious resource.”

Similarly, there was no consensus among staff members as to what the current positioning statement of the Park might be.

“Forest and beaches ~ A link between the coastal environment and the wooded environment.”

“One of the only protected areas where people can experience the dynamic coastal line we have through its cliffs, beaches and habitat.”

“I’m not sure that there is one.”

As one staff member mentioned:

“There hasn’t been a conscious effort to position National Parks in general, or the PEI National Park.”



Key Differentiators

When asked what differentiated PEI National Park from other national parks, participants identified a variety of unique attributes, as outlined in the table below. Highlighted attributes were considered most memorable or unique to the Park. Of note, beaches were consistently mentioned as the most unique attribute of the Park.

“La beauté du parc en général avec les dunes. Contrairement à d’autres, on va.. Les plages sont extraordinaires. C’est ça qui le rend unique.”

~Differentiators~
• Beaches
• Sand Dunes
• Cliffs
• Forest and beaches
• Small size (on Island)
• Greenwich
• Province House
• Long, narrow park
• Home of Anne of Green Gables
• North Shore Highway (visible access to sea)

Reasons for Visiting

When asked why visitors choose to visit PEI National Park, participants consistently mentioned **beaches** as the top of mind motivator.

“They can’t get away from that. In PEI, the beaches are the main drawing card.”

A variety of other reasons for visiting the National Park were also mentioned, although to a lesser extent. Most related to either a specific activity (e.g. Anne of Green Gables, Province House) or a desire to get closer to nature (to see the cliffs, dunes, ocean, wildlife). Of note, no one mentioned the Park’s interpretive programs as a primary reason for visiting the Park.

A number of stakeholders questioned if the Park truly understands why visitors choose to come to PEI National Park and what their expectations might be.

“I don’t think they really understand why visitors come here or what they are looking for. They assume they (the Park) know the answers and that it matches what they offer.”



Without exception, participants agreed that national parks play an important role in contributing to the physical, mental and spiritual health of their visitors, primarily because of its natural and relaxing environment. That said, most partners considered this to be a secondary benefit, rather than a primary motivator for visiting the Park.

“I don’t think visitors go there for those reasons, but they get it when they are there. It’s a secondary benefit.”

Changing Needs & Expectations

Visitors’ needs and expectations are perceived to have changed dramatically in recent years.

Participants readily acknowledged that visitors’ needs have changed significantly in recent years. Visitors have become older, more affluent, and are well travelled. As baby boomers have aged, they have become more inclined to travel as couples (rather than with a young family), or with other couples.

Visitors are also more health conscious and active than in the past. They are looking for active, experiential tourism products, where they can interact and participate in key activities while learning about their destination.

Of specific relevance to beaches, vacationers’ health conscious behaviours have resulted in them being more aware of the danger of spending extended time in the sun. Subsequently, visitors are more inclined to spend less time on the beach, seek shelter from the sun or at minimum, use sunscreen.

With increased time commitments at home, busy schedules and a strong urban representation, visitors are also looking for opportunities to relax, appreciate their surroundings and witness an experience unique from others. While camping continues to be popular, visitors appear more inclined to enjoy a different type of camping, driven by an increased propensity to own RVs or enjoy many conveniences of home while ‘roughing it’.

A number of stakeholders also mentioned that with growing immigration to Canada, the needs of new Canadian visitors would be dramatically different than ‘traditional’ Canadians. In particular, these visitors will be interested in increased educational opportunities, both in relation to historical sites, natural wildlife and geography.

Finally, urban travelers are technologically savvy, well educated and look forward to increasing their knowledge and learning something new during their vacation. They also look for a destination that offers a safe surrounding.



Expectations of the Park

With changing visitor characteristics comes the expectation of changing visitor expectations of the PEI National Park. Both partners / stakeholders and staff agreed that visitors today expect more **full service**, including full amenities (showers, dressing rooms, canteens) at beaches.

“Amenities now have to be there. They need more than just the beach.”

Similarly, visitors are expecting campsites that allow adequate space for RVs, electrical outlets, water availability and full shower and washroom facilities.

“Private campgrounds do a much better job at meeting today’s campers’ needs. The Park is still offering the camping product they did 20 years ago. They fail to recognize that needs have changed. There may be some that still want that (old) product, but they are a minority.”

Stakeholders also identified activities that allow one to experience the local environment through interactive learning initiatives as important to these more active visitors . This group wants to be able to touch, see, smell and feel the experience and learn by doing.

As well, with an aging population, the Park must be cognisant of seniors’ special needs, including additional places for seniors to sit (on walks), bigger print in materials, more washrooms, and an ability to accommodate disabilities.

When asked what presents the Park’s greatest opportunity in terms of visitor growth, participants offered a variety of responses, including:

- Marketing / Promotion;
- Look at better ways to move people in an out;
- Bring people to the experience;
- Improve visitors’ experience;
- Be more welcoming to visitors;
- New development of trails;
- More bike trails;
- Improved infrastructure; and
- New development with the old Rainbow Valley land.

A good number of stakeholders questioned how interested the Park actually is in growing visitor numbers. While there was agreement that growth is essential to the economic stability of the Island, even staff questioned if that was actually the intent. Some felt the Park must develop a central location for learning activities that would act as an attraction itself. At such a location, visitors would have the opportunity to interact in key activities that create learning opportunities and help demonstrate the importance of the Park’s environmental sustainability.



Park Strengths / Weaknesses

The Park's physical attributes are considered exceptional strengths, although plagued by a variety of obvious weaknesses.

To better understand current perceptions of the PEI National Park, partners / stakeholders and Park staff were asked what they consider to be the key strengths and weaknesses of the Park.

Strengths

Beaches

Without exception, and across interviewee types, the Park's **beaches** were recognized as its greatest strength. Its beaches were considered memorable, distinctive from any others in Canada, and exceptional in terms of their warm water, white sand and long, expansive geography. Similarly, the physical products of the Park (impressive scenery, sand dunes, red cliffs) were named consistently as key strengths.

Ecological Preservation

The Park was also recognized as doing a good job at **sustaining the ecological health** of the Park. Partners and staff alike indicate efforts such as dune protection have gone a long way in ensuring the longevity of the Park.

“The Park is a wonderful natural beauty. How wonderful it is to have this protected asset!”

Programs

The Parks **educational programs** were also considered to be a key strength of the Park, although participants readily identified that the programs are neither well known nor promoted to visitors.

Weaknesses

Despite very positive impressions of the Park and its various product offerings, and a blatant sense of pride, staff and stakeholders voiced harsh criticism of the Park in a variety of areas, as outlined below.



Conflicting Mandates

Participants consistently mentioned that the Park has conflicting mandates that are counterproductive to both the Park's and the Island's economic sustainability. On one hand, the National Park is viewed as having a mandate to preserve, protect and maintain the natural elements of the Park, and that restricting access is required to meet this mandate. In an apparent contradiction, the Park is also perceived as having a mandate to increase interaction and experiential offerings to visitors. Some felt that there is currently not an appropriate balance between the two.

“Their mandate is all across the board; there must be a much more concerted effort on educating people as to why sustainability is important. If you are forcing people to comply, you need to tell them why.”

“They deliver experiences only that are conducive to their preservation mandate. They devote all kinds of resources to make the product more inaccessible. Improving or building infrastructure that meets visitors' needs doesn't seem to be high on their priority list.”

A good number of stakeholders and some staff felt the Park's mandate must be more flexible to ensure experiences more closely align with visitors' needs and expectations. Numerous examples of better aligning service delivery with visitor needs were offered, including: raking the beach (to remove excessive jellyfish); creating a people strategy for the beach; offering interactive, engaging activities in an accessible, developing a central location (understanding the structure of a dune, less educating / preaching, more engaging, etc.), and improving / enhancing camping facilities (water, electricity access, internet access, increasing camp site size to allow RVs, improved amenities such as showers, washrooms).

“The commitment to their mandate is not parallel to the needs of the tourism sector, although their changing mandate seems to be more reflective of those needs.”

“They are trying to evolve their mandate into the visitor experience, but we just don't see it.”

“They should walk the talk. They have the whole new visitor experience mandate, but they need to extend that to true visitor experience, not just what is conducive to their mandate. Help visitors experience the beach in a way that suggests that the Park welcomes them with open arms.”

It is interesting to note that there was mixed opinion amongst staff as to whether the Park was looking to increase, shift or decrease the number of visitors to the Park. Some felt increasing visitors would be counterproductive to the protection mandate of the Park, although they agreed all stakeholders would probably like to see that happen. A few others felt the Park was focussed on shifting existing visitor numbers to other less frequented areas



of the Park. As mentioned earlier, partners were unsure of the Park's intentions, and were cynical of the perceived lack of transparency on such an important matter. A good number of stakeholders were of the impression that the Park is not interested in increasing visitation.

Infrastructure Investment

Participants also considered the Park's lack of investment in infrastructure to be a key weakness of the Park. In particular, the Park was criticized for the "horrid" state of its roads, outdated campsites, and lack of product development. Many partners felt the Park has actually lowered expectations of its repeat visitors through its apparent lack of investment in maintaining or enhancing existing infrastructure.

"There have been no infrastructure changes in years. They are closing services and decreasing services to the public rather than increasing them."

"Take a look at the campgrounds. If they would actually consider having them graded, bringing them up to the standards that visitors expect! The sites need to be more upscale. They are missing the boat – but of course that is assuming that they want more visitors."

Similarly, some criticized the Park's inability or lack of interest in ensuring a 'wow' factor or impressive appearance of the Park.

"You just have to look at the horrible type of fences they put up to realize that they don't care how bad it looks to visitors. They are more concerned with the protection than the experience the visitor will have."

Over-Governance

Participants also felt the Park was over-policed. While all agreed that rules are required to ensure sustainability of the resource, a good number questioned if the Park had gone too far in some areas. Not allowing dogs on beaches, no raking of the beach, an inability to offer umbrellas / concessions on the beach (through private enterprise), and lack of availability of alcohol on the beach were cited as examples of the Park's inflexible nature in meeting visitors' changing needs.

"They don't want to clean up the many jelly fish (in the sand or water) because it's touching a 'natural state'. That is certainly leaving an impression for visitors, and not a positive one! I think that's a good example of taking something too far."

Cost / Value Proposition

The perceived high cost of entry to the beach area of the National Park was considered a key weakness. While most partners criticized the Park's lack of communication of what the entry fee is used for, they were most critical of the lack of tangible evidence of any investment in the Park in recent years, despite increasing fees.



“You can’t see where they’ve spent that money. The infrastructure is in really bad shape. What value have they gotten for their dollar – especially those repeat visitors?”

Some questioned if a more appropriate cost structure would be one that actually reflects the length their visit to the Park.

“The cost is the same regardless of how long you visit the beach – that is ridiculous. The high cost encourages someone to park on the road and walk over the dunes, especially when they just wanted to take a walk.”

Ineffective Product Development

Although the Park’s recent product development efforts (increased interpretive programs, Greenwich) were recognized and appreciated, partners were critical of the limited new product development and the Park’s inability to be innovative in meeting the changing needs of visitors. In particular, it was felt that visitors did not want to be “talked to” as much as they wanted to be actively engaged in an experience or activity.

Similarly, there was strong criticism of the Park’s inability to engage local partners or members of the community in Park initiatives.

“Instead of embracing the local community and engaging them in some type of reconstruction or product development, they keep it all to themselves. I think they do that for job security. Let the community help to make the Park all it can be!”

Marketing

Finally, the Park’s lack of marketing initiatives was harshly criticized. PEI National Park was considered to undertake minimal to no marketing or promotional efforts to encourage visitors to come to PEI and the Park (reflective of its conflicting mandate), and was considered uncooperative in ensuring tourism operators / stakeholders had ready access to information on the Park. Similarly, the Park was considered ineffective in promoting its programs to visitors and it was felt most visitors accidentally became aware of the Park’s programs.

“They have a product that is second to none in the world ~ if they wanted to market it. It is a shame that national parks don’t market their beaches anymore.”

“There is no proactive promotion of programs. They don’t even so much as give visitors a list of the activities or programs when they pay admission. Instead, they just rely on them to find out about them by chance, or if they happen to visit the Information Centre.”



Park Performance

There is mixed opinion of the Park's performance in delivering experiences to travelers.

Stakeholders and staff alike concurred that the Park performs exceptionally well in meeting its mandate in relation to both **preservation of the natural resource** and in providing **protected access** to an amazing and memorable natural shore environment. Indeed, the Park was well recognized for its 'policing' of restricted areas by limiting visitor traffic in more fragile areas.

When considering visitors' experiences, staff and partners consistently mentioned that the Park performs particularly well in meeting visitors' expectations through its end product, namely providing **outstanding white beaches**, and **spectacular scenery** (beautiful sandy dunes and impressive red cliffs).

Participants were also complimentary of the Park's delivery of **interpretative programs**, as well as its delivery of programs at Anne of Green Gables and Province House.

That said, despite extremely positive perceptions of the Park's experiences, participants openly criticized the Park for its lack of commitment to **enhancing the Park's infrastructure, marketing initiatives** and in **meeting visitors' changing needs**. The Park's performance in addressing its weaknesses (as previously discussed) was considered less than ideal, and demonstrative of a lack of innovation.

The Park was also criticized for its lack of effective involvement in developing sustainable tourism initiatives in PEI. Staff and stakeholders alike were unable to identify what role the Park currently plays in such an initiative. Some, in fact, described the Park as being non-participatory at meetings that address sustainable tourism.

"I don't believe there is a sustainable tourism strategy in place. But PEI National Park should be leading it. Look at what is going on in Gros Morne. In Newfoundland, Parks Canada has played an instrumental role in developing a strategy. In PEI, they talk the talk but don't walk the walk."

"Hopefully we can find common ground between the Park's mandate and the economic development mandate of the Island."



Healthy Parks for People

Healthy Parks for People is strongly supported as an initiative, but is not considered appropriate as a positioning statement for PEI National Park.

Participants were told that PEI National Park is currently undertaking a major Ecological Project. This three-year initiative engages a range of local, national and international interest groups and partners in the development of new options for memorable visitor experiences that contribute to the improved health of both the Park ecosystem and the visitor. The working title of the project is ***Healthy Parks for People***.

Although staff were generally aware of the ***Healthy Parks for People*** project, awareness was mixed among stakeholders / partners. Not surprising, those who are actively involved in committees or organizations that meet regularly with the Park were most likely to be aware of the initiative.

Top of Mind Associations / Impressions

Regardless of awareness levels, participants were asked what comes to mind when they hear the words ***Healthy Parks for People***. Most concurred that, first and foremost, the statement suggests that the Park is being maintained and protected in a healthy environment. To others, it implied that a healthy park is a good park and that people can use the park facilities as a place to be active. It suggests respect for the environment and nature, as well as for healthy lifestyles, and that while parks are there for the enjoyment of people, they need to be respected.

“It suggests a bit of a sanctuary. I don’t see lots of people there.”

A good number of participants criticized the statement for being park centric. More specifically, they felt the statement positioned people as secondary and did not necessarily imply that healthy parks would have any impact on people.

“It represents the fence mentality. We are going to put a fence around this so it is healthy.”

“It is missing something when you hear it. If the project is supposed to be about making people healthier, I don’t make the link. I am not sure it will translate into being beneficial for the people it’s referring to.”

Interestingly, a number of staff suggested that more appropriate alternatives would be ***Healthy Parks, Healthy People*** (suggesting a causal relationship between the two) or ***Healthy Parks for Healthy People***. The latter, however, was recognized as potentially problematic in that it could be seen as implying that the parks are only for healthy people.





Appropriateness for PEI National Park

When asked if the statement is appropriate in positioning PEI, participants voice divergent opinions. Some felt the statement would be appropriate if and when the Park provides new experiences for its visitors. These participants also felt it would help to reinforce the mandate of the Park.

“They are going in the right direction. It is what Parks Canada is all about and it better meets the needs of the changing visitors.”

Most however, felt the statement was too vague and lacked any point of differentiation for the Park. In particular, a good number of partners felt that branding and positioning has to plant an idea as to why people should visit. It has to bring together landscape, culture, and local attributes that are iconic in a way that clearly separates the Park from others.

“I would be more inclined to use it as an initiative, not as a positioning statement for PEI. Take a better look at the value proposition. The word beach is more important than the word park for PEI National Park. Even seaside would be much more relevant.”

Most felt that the statement was not considered appropriate as a positioning statement for the PEI National Park, primarily because it was too generic in nature and does not differentiate the Park from any others.

“That is not a positioning statement. It sounds like a program. Is it something that is used by all national parks? If so, fine. But it can’t be thought of as a positioning statement for PEI National Park – it’s not. PEI National Park’s position statement should reflect the USP of the PEI Park. You could have an overall national park brand, but each park should have a unique position statement that clearly articulates what makes them unique.”

Of note, during the interviews only two participants mentioned, unaided, the Island’s current positioning statement (‘Gentle Island’). In particular, one commented that *Healthy Parks for People*, or parks in general, supported the natural environment and relaxation implied by such a positioning. The other felt that ‘Gentle Island’ was contrary to visitors’ changing needs and expectations, primarily because visitors were looking for more active, and interactive vacations. This stakeholder felt strongly that this was not something the Park should assimilate or work towards.



Pour un parc en santé

Quebec partners / stakeholders were asked their impressions of the French translation of the *Healthy Parks for People* positioning statement, ‘*pour un parc en santé*’. These participants were also critical of the statement and questioned its appropriateness for PEI National Park. To most, it implied that the Park doesn’t want people around.

“Non, il n’y a pas tellement de parc. Celui-la n’est pas tellement connu, pas aussi connu que le parc de la Baie de Fundy. On le fait découvrir aux gens.”

“Ça vient pas me chercher. Il me semble que j’associe la santé avec la santé humaine plus qu’avec un parc. L’image que ça me donne c’est de quelque chose de très stérile. Pour garder [le parc] en santé on éloigne la dimension humaine parce que c’est ce qui le rend en mauvaise santé.”

Others questioned whether the French translation actually reflected the intent of the English statement and felt the translated statement implied some level of vulnerability.

“J’aime bien ça ‘Healthy Parks for People’. C’est très évocateur. C’est très démocrate. ‘Un parc en santé pour le peuple’ serait la traduction. On évoque la démocratie. ‘Healthy’ en anglais automatiquement c’est un mot qu’on utilise pour les êtres humains. C’est un peu comme mettre la vie dans quelque chose qui n’est pas vivant, un jeu de mot pour parler d’un site abstrait. Le parc est en santé et il fait des choses pour des gens en santé.”

“Je crois que les mots sont bien choisis mais la connotation n’est pas la même. Pour un parc en santé ici. [Il faudrait] quelque chose de [plus] dynamisant. ‘Healthy’ pour moi c’est plus dynamique.”

“‘Healthy’ sonne beaucoup plus comme ‘en forme’ qu’en santé. Quelqu’un qui est en santé n’est pas nécessairement en forme. Ce n’est pas parce qu’un parc est en santé qu’il est dynamique et vivant. Une personne en santé ne mange pas nécessairement bien ni ne fait de l’activité.”

“C’est plus ‘punché’ en anglais. Ça assume [qu’il y a] des visiteurs. Il y a une petite nuance. Les gens du bel âge ne s’associeront pas à un parc comme ça (selon le slogan français). Ça [Pour un parc en santé] ne connote pas un parc aménagé.”

“Pour un parc en santé; pour une forêt en santé, ça nous détache un peu. C’est très vague. Ça ne veut pas dire que les gens vont se promener dedans.”

Creating a Healthy Park for People

Participants strongly endorsed having a *Healthy Parks for People* program. They generally



agreed that having healthy parks for people is important to visitors. In particular, it was felt that visitors want to know, and expect, that parks are well maintained and carefully managed. This was considered increasingly important given society's heightened focus on the environment and healthy lifestyles. A few, however, questioned just how important it may be and felt the Park is incorrect in giving it prominence over the actual visit experience.

"I think there is a limited number that really care. They really care more about their experience."

When asked what is needed to create and sustain a **Healthy Park for People** in PEI, participants felt each of the previously mentioned weaknesses must be addressed. In addition, a number of suggestions were made, including:

- A desire to attract more visitors; an interest in telling people that the Park is open and has the facilities to live up to the statement.

"I don't have a feeling that they really want more people. If they do, it seems it is only if people don't touch anything."

"They are walking away from the beach mandate. Don't forget your reason for being there. The beach is your differentiator and there should be an increased focus on the beach."

- Consultation / better involvement of partners; it was strongly felt that consultation with key partners and stakeholders is key before decisions are made.

"That is the greatest component in making it work. The people they have engaged need to be truly part of the process. They can't be presented with a full plan. That is not consultation. They need to be part of the plan's development."

"What is missing from the Parks Canada culture is the lack of understanding from a business perspective. They do not yet have an appreciation for believing that much of the support for parks can come from people who engage with the Park. They need to facilitate ways for that engagement. They need to create deliberative projects where they can help local people become involved, consistent with their mandate.... Ask themselves 'how can we involve them (owners operators, schools, visitors, residents) so they can understand and appreciate and contribute to the Park?' They need practical applications to real projects."

- Develop a more thorough understand of visitors' needs.

"You need to see what people are looking for. Do a lot of research on what people are really looking for – not just what you think they are looking for."



Appendix A: Recruitment Screener

Parks Canada
~FINAL Invitation – Key Stakeholder / Partner Interviews~

Name: _____
Company: _____
Telephone: _____
Email: _____

Goal of 20-25 completed interviews; *Minimum of four interviews will be conducted in French.

Hello, may I speak to _____.

My name is _____ and I am calling on behalf of Corporate Research Associates. I am calling as a follow-up to a recent **e-mail / telephone call** sent to you from Elizabeth MacDonald of Parks Canada, concerning a key stakeholder and partner **consultation**. Do you recall receiving the **e-mail or call**?

(If yes: as you may recall:...)

(If no – May I send you a copy of the letter? (collect email address and re-forward letter))

Parks Canada is interested in the interests, attitudes and opinions of key stakeholders and partners with respect to the current and future brand of **Prince Edward Island National Park**, as well as to the **Healthy Parks for People** brand. Corporate Research Associates will be conducting individual interviews with a cross-section of key stakeholders / partners. Interviews will take approximately 20-25 minutes and will be conducted by phone, at a time that best meets your schedule. **Would you be available to take part in this important study?**

When would be a convenient date and time to complete the interview?

Date: _____

Time: _____

Confirm phone # for interview: _____

Thank you for your participation. I would like to email you a reminder of the interview with 24hours of the scheduled interview time. May I have your email address? _____

If you are required to change the interview time, please don't hesitate to contact me directly at xxx-xxxx.

**Parks Canada
~FINAL Invitation – STAFF~**

Name: _____
Company: _____
Telephone: _____
Email: _____

Goal of 3-6 completed interviews

Hello, may I speak to _____.

My name is _____ and I am calling on behalf of Corporate Research Associates. I am calling as a follow-up to a recent email sent to you from Elizabeth MacDonald of Parks Canada, concerning a **re-positioning** research study being undertaken with staff. Do you recall receiving the email?

(If yes: as you may recall:...)

(If no – May I send you a copy of the email? (collect email address and re-forward email))

Parks Canada is interested in the interests, attitudes and opinions of staff with respect to the current and future **positioning of Prince Edward Island National Park**, as well as to the **Healthy Parks for People** brand. Corporate Research Associates will be conducting individual interviews with a number of selected staff. Interviews will take approximately 20 minutes and will be conducted by phone, at a time that best meets your schedule. **Would you be available to take part in this important study?**

When would be a convenient date and time to complete the interview?

Date: _____

Time: _____

Confirm phone # for interview: _____

Thank you for your participation. I would like to email you a reminder of the interview with 24hours of the scheduled interview time. May I have your email address? _____

If you are required to change the interview time, please don't hesitate to contact me directly at xxxxxx.

Parcs Canada

~ FINALE d'invitation – Entrevues avec les principaux intervenants / partenaires ~

Nom : _____

Compagnie : _____

Téléphone : _____

Courriel : _____

***Au moins quatre entrevues seront menées en français.**

Bonjour, pourrais-je parler à _____, s'il vous plaît?

Je m'appelle _____ et je vous appelle au nom de Corporate Research Associates. Je fais un suivi du **courriel/de l'appel téléphonique** que vous avez reçu dernièrement de Elizabeth MacDonald, de Parcs Canada, concernant la **consultation** d'un intervenant clé ou d'un partenaire. Vous souvenez-vous d'avoir reçu un **courriel ou un appel**?

(Si oui, vous vous souviendrez que...)

(Si non – Puis-je vous envoyer une copie de la lettre? (Prenez l'adresse courriel et renvoyez la lettre.)

Parcs Canada cherche à connaître l'intérêt, l'attitude et l'opinion des principaux intervenants et des partenaires concernant la commercialisation actuelle et future des produits que constituent le **parc national de l'île-du-Prince-Édouard**, et l'initiative ***Des parcs en santé pour des gens en santé***. Corporate Research Associates va mener des entrevues individuelles auprès d'un échantillon d'intervenants clés et de partenaires. Chaque entrevue durera de 20 à 25 minutes environ et sera menée au téléphone, à la date et à l'heure qui vous conviendront le mieux. ***Seriez-vous disposé(e) à participer à cette importante étude?***

Quel jour et quelle heure vous conviendraient le mieux pour participer à cette entrevue?

Date : _____

Heure : _____

Confirmez le numéro de téléphone pour l'entrevue : _____

Je vous remercie de bien vouloir participer à l'étude. J'aimerais vous envoyer un rappel 24 heures avant la date et l'heure de l'entrevue. Puis-je avoir votre adresse courriel? _____

Si vous devez changer la date ou l'heure de l'entrevue, n'hésitez pas à communiquer directement avec moi au xxx-xxxx.

Appendix B: Interview Protocols

PARKS CANADA

Final Interview Protocol ~ Partners / Stakeholders

Introduction

*I would like to begin by thanking you for taking the time to help us with our market research study. Our discussion should take about 20-25 minutes. The objective of our discussion today is to discuss your current opinions with respect to the current and future positioning of **Prince Edward Island National Park**, as well as to the **Healthy Parks for People** positioning statement.*

I'd like to audio tape our discussion today, so I don't have to write a lot of notes while we are having our discussion. I will be the only person who will listen to the tape, and it will only be used to help me write my report on the findings from this market research study. As soon as I am finished with my report, the tape will be destroyed. Everything you say today is anonymous and confidential. Your comments will be combined with the comments from other people that I interview, as part of a detailed study report.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

PEI NATIONAL PARK - impressions

To begin, I am interested in learning a little more about your impressions of the PEI National Park, as a key partner / stakeholder with the Park.

- How would you describe Prince Edward Island National Park?
- Currently, what do you consider to be the unique positioning statement of Prince Edward Island National Park?
- How well does Parks Canada perform in delivering experiences to travelers? How competitive are they?
- Do you feel national parks play an important role in contributing to the physical, mental and spiritual health of they visitors? Why / why not?
 - Should they play this role?
- Based on your experience, why do you believe visitors come to PEI NATIONAL PARK?
 - What do they look for or expect from the Park?
 - How do you think visitors to PEI National Park describe their experience?
- Have visitors' **needs** changed in recent years? If so, how?
- What about their **expectations** of PEI NATIONAL PARK - how have they changed?
 - What, if anything, **sets PEI NATIONAL PARK apart** from other National Parks?
 - Anything else?
- What, if anything, would you consider to be PEI NATIONAL PARK's **strengths**?
 - What do you consider to be its **greatest** (most memorable) attributes?
 - And what do you consider to be the Park's **weaknesses**?
- How confident do you feel about the future of the Park? Why?
- Has your confidence level changed in the past five years? If so, what's caused that change?

Currently, Prince Edward Island National Park has more than one million visitors each year.

- What impact has visitor usage patterns had on the Park?
- Looking forward, what should the Park be doing and offering to visitors to ensure their needs are being met, while at that same time, sustaining the ecological health of the park for future generations?
- What, if anything, presents the Park's greatest opportunities in terms of visitor growth?



- What, if anything, **threatens** visitor growth? Anything else?
- Based on your knowledge of PEI National Park, its experiences, services and facilities, what other opportunities are there to enhance the overall experience for visitors?
 - What could be done to make visitors' experiences more memorable or rewarding?
 - What might result in visitors to becoming **more connected** to the Park?
- Currently, what role does Parks Canada play in developing sustainable tourism initiatives in PEI?
 - What else could it do?

Healthy Parks for People

As you may or may not be aware Prince Edward Island National Park is currently undertaking a major Ecological Integrity Project. This three-year initiative engages a range of local, national and international interest groups and partners in the development of new options for memorable visitor experiences that contribute to the improved health of the park ecosystem and the visitor. The working title of the project is **Healthy Parks for People**.

- Prior to our discussion today, had you heard of this positioning statement?
- What comes to mind when you hear the words **Healthy Parks for People**?
- What does it suggest to you? Anything else?
- Do you think this statement is appropriate in positioning PEI NATIONAL PARK?
 - If yes, why? /If no, why not?
- Do you think having **healthy parks for people** is important to visitors? Why / why not?
- How important is it to you, as a Park stakeholder/partner, to have an ecologically healthy, protected park that also provides high-quality experiences for people? Why/Why not?

For Quebec Interviewees only:

'Pour un parc en sante' is the equivalent of Healthy Parks for People in English, which was initially developed by national parks in Australia.

- Do you feel 'Pour un parc en sante' is the best way to communicate this concept in French? Is that the best adaptation of Healthy Parks for People?
 - If not, what wording would be more appropriate?
- From the perspective of the Quebec tourism market, do you think the concept of marketing national parks as places that facilitate physical, mental and spiritual healthy is appropriate or would be successful with the French market?
 - If so, what words and phrases should be used in marketing positioning statements and campaigns targeting the Quebec market?

The goal of the Healthy Parks for People project is to ensure that visitors enjoy experience options that involve communities in promoting healthy lifestyles for a healthy park, while ensuring that the long-term ecological health of the Park is improved and maintained. Today's tourism market includes more people looking for physically active vacation experiences and opportunities to learn in the outdoors.

- What is needed to create and sustain a **healthy park for people** in PEI?
- Who would be involved?
- Any other comments or suggestions?

Closing

That concludes my questions. On behalf of Parks Canada, thank you for your participation.



PARKS CANADA

FINAL Interview Protocol ~Staff

Introduction

*I would like to begin by thanking you for taking the time to help us with our market research study. Our discussion should take about 20-25 minutes. The objective of our discussion today is to discuss your current opinions with respect to the current and future positioning of **Prince Edward Island National Park**, as well as to the **Healthy Parks for People** positioning statement.*

I'd like to audio tape our discussion today, so I don't have to write a lot of notes while we are having our discussion. I will be the only person who will listen to the tape, and it will only be used to help me write my report on the findings from this market research study. As soon as I am finished with my report, the tape will be destroyed. Everything you say today is anonymous and confidential. Your comments will be combined with the comments from other people that I interview, as part of a detailed study report.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

PEI NATIONAL PARK - impressions

To begin, I am interested in learning a little more about your impressions of the PEI National Park, as a staff member of the Park.

- How would you describe Prince Edward Island National Park?
- Currently, what do you consider to be the unique positioning statement of Prince Edward Island National Park?
- What are the Park's goals as they pertain to visitors, marketing and product development?
 - Probe if not mentioned: Is the Park interested in...:
 - Increasing / shifting / decreasing visitation?
 - Attracting new / different markets?
 - Developing new products and services?
- Based on your experience, why do you believe visitors choose to visit PEI NATIONAL PARK?
 - What do they look for or expect from the Park?
- Have visitors' **needs** changed in recent years? If so, how?
- What about their **expectations** of PEI NATIONAL PARK - how have they changed?
 - How do you think visitors to PEI National Park describe their experience?
- Do you feel national parks play an important role in contributing to the physical, mental and spiritual health of their visitors? Why / why not?
 - Should they play this role?
- What, if anything, would you consider to be PEI NATIONAL PARK's **strengths**?
 - What do you consider to be its **greatest** (most memorable) attributes?
 - And what do you consider to be the Park's **weaknesses**?
- What would make PEI NATIONAL PARK more attractive to visitors?
 - (*If more than one mention*), what do you consider **most** important?
 - What do you consider to be the key opportunities for the Park to enhance the overall visitor experience?



- What might result in visitors to becoming *more connected* to the Park?
- What should be the long-term vision for the park in terms of visitor experience and ecological health?

Healthy Parks for People

As you are aware, the Park is currently undertaking a major Ecological Integrity and Visitor Experience Project. The working title of the project is **Healthy Parks for People**.

- What comes to mind when you hear the words *Healthy Parks for People*?
- What does it suggest to you? Anything else?
- Do you think having *healthy parks for people* is important to visitors? Why / why not?
- Have you heard any reaction thus far from staff, visitors, partners or stakeholders to the position statement Healthy Parks for People? If so, what have you heard?
- Are you aware of any formal or informal market-testing, focus-testing or evaluation having been conducted (*prior to this project*), of Healthy Parks for People as a position statement for PEI National Park?

The use of the positioning statement Healthy Parks for Healthy People and Healthy Parks for People are being increasingly used by parks around the world.

- What **benefits**, if any, might there be to PEI National Park using the same positioning statement as other national, provincial and municipal parks around the world?
 - And what **challenges** might that present?

For staff member from Australia only:

- How was the brand developed/ implemented / evaluated in Australia?
- How did staff react to it?
 - What about visitors?
- Any other comments or suggestions?

Closing

That concludes my questions. On behalf of Parks Canada, thank you for your participation.



PARCS CANADA

Protocole d'entrevue définitif ~ Partenaires et intervenants

Introduction

*J'aimerais d'abord vous remercier d'avoir accepté de prendre le temps de participer à notre étude de marché. Notre entretien devrait durer une vingtaine de minutes. Nous discuterons de vos opinions sur le positionnement actuel et futur du **Parc national du Canada de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard** et sur l'énoncé de positionnement des **Healthy Parks for People**.*

J'aimerais faire un enregistrement sonore de notre entretien afin de ne pas avoir à prendre trop de notes pendant que nous parlons. Je serai la seule personne à écouter l'enregistrement et je ne l'utiliserai que pour rédiger mon rapport sur les résultats de cette étude de marché. Dès que j'aurai terminé mon rapport, je détruirai la bande sonore. Tout ce que vous me dites aujourd'hui sera fait dans l'anonymat et la confidentialité. Vos commentaires seront combinés à ceux des autres personnes que j'interroge, dans le cadre d'un rapport d'étude détaillé.

Avez-vous des questions avant de commencer?

Impressions du PARC NATIONAL DU CANADA DE L'Î.-P.-É.

En votre qualité de partenaire ou d'intervenant clé du Parc national du Canada de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard, j'aimerais d'abord en connaître un peu plus sur vos impressions du parc.

- Comment décririez-vous le Parc national du Canada de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard?
- Selon vous, quel est l'énoncé de positionnement unique du Parc national du Canada de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard à l'heure actuelle?
- Dans quelle mesure les expériences offertes par Parcs Canada plaisent-elles aux visiteurs? Dans quelle mesure Parcs Canada est-il compétitif?
- Selon vous, les parcs nationaux contribuent-ils de façon marquée à la santé physique, mentale et spirituelle des visiteurs? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
 - Devraient-ils jouer ce rôle?
- À la lumière de votre expérience, pourquoi diriez-vous que les gens visitent le PARC NATIONAL DU CANADA DE L'ÎLE-DU-PRINCE-ÉDOUARD?
 - Quelles sont leurs attentes face au parc?
 - Selon vous, comment les visiteurs du Parc national du Canada de l'Î.-P.-É. décrivent-ils leur séjour?
- Est-ce que les **besoins** des visiteurs ont changé au cours des dernières années? Si oui, de quelle façon?
- Et qu'en est-il de leurs **attentes** face au PARC NATIONAL DU CANADA DE L'Î.-P.-É. – de quelle façon ont-elles changé?
 - Qu'est-ce qui **distingue** le PARC NATIONAL DU CANADA DE L'Î.-P.-É. des autres parcs nationaux?
 - Y a-t-il autre chose?
- Selon vous, quelles sont les **forces** du PARC NATIONAL DU CANADA DE L'Î.-P.-É.?
 - À votre avis, quels sont ses **plus grands** attributs (les plus mémorables)?
 - Et selon vous, quelles sont les **faiblesses** du parc?
- À quel point avez-vous confiance en l'avenir du parc? Pourquoi?
- Votre degré de confiance a-t-il changé au cours des cinq dernières années? Si oui, à quoi attribuez-vous ce changement?



À l'heure actuelle, le Parc national du Canada de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard accueille plus d'un million de visiteurs par année.

- Quel a été l'impact des comportements des visiteurs sur le parc?
- Dans une perspective d'avenir, qu'est-ce que le parc devrait faire et devrait-il offrir aux visiteurs afin de s'assurer de répondre à leurs besoins tout en maintenant la santé écologique du parc pour les générations futures?
- Quelles sont les plus grandes opportunités offertes au parc en ce qui concerne l'augmentation du nombre de visiteurs?
 - Qu'est-ce qui **menace** l'augmentation du nombre de visiteurs? Y a-t-il autre chose?
- À la lumière de votre connaissance du Parc National du Canada de l'Î.-P.-É., des séjours qu'il offre, de ses services et de ses installations, de quelles autres opportunités pourrait-il profiter pour améliorer le séjour global offert aux visiteurs?
 - Que pourrait-on faire pour créer des séjours encore plus mémorables ou enrichissants?
 - Que pourrait-on faire pour que les visiteurs se sentent **davantage partie prenante** du parc?
- À l'heure actuelle, que fait Parcs Canada pour créer des initiatives de tourisme durable à l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard?
 - Quelles autres démarches pourrait-il entreprendre?

Healthy Parks for People

Comme vous le savez peut-être, le Parc national du Canada de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard travaille présentement à un important projet d'intégrité écologique. Dans le cadre de cette initiative triennale, plusieurs groupes d'intérêts et partenaires locaux, nationaux et internationaux participent à l'élaboration de nouvelles possibilités de séjours mémorables qui contribuent à améliorer la santé du visiteur et de l'écosystème du parc. Ce projet a pour titre **Healthy Parks for People**.

- Avant notre entretien d'aujourd'hui, aviez-vous entendu parler de cet énoncé de positionnement?
- À quoi pensez-vous lorsque vous entendez l'expression **Healthy Parks for People**?
- Qu'est-ce que ça évoque pour vous? Y a-t-il autre chose?
- À votre avis, s'agit-il d'un bon énoncé pour positionner le PARC NATIONAL DU CANADA DE l'Î.-P.-É.?
 - Si oui, pourquoi? / si non, pourquoi pas?
- Pensez-vous qu'il est important pour les visiteurs d'avoir des **Healthy Parks for People**? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?
- À quel point est-ce important pour vous, en tant qu'intervenant ou partenaire, d'avoir un parc écologiquement sain et protégé qui offre également des séjours de qualité supérieure aux visiteurs? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?

Section réservée aux entrevues avec les répondants québécois

Pour un parc en santé est l'équivalent français de *Healthy Parks for People*, concept initialement développé par les parcs nationaux d'Australie.

- Selon vous, est-ce que « Pour un parc en santé » est la meilleure expression pour communiquer ce concept en français? Est-ce la meilleure adaptation française de l'expression *Healthy Parks for People*?
 - Si non, quelle formulation proposeriez-vous?



- Du point de vue du marché touristique québécois, pensez-vous que le concept de promotion des parcs nationaux en tant qu'endroits favorables à la santé physique, mentale et spirituelle serait bien reçu par les francophones?
 - Si oui, quels mots ou phrases devrait-on utiliser dans les campagnes et les énoncés de positionnement destinés au marché québécois?

Le projet « Pour un parc en santé » a pour but d'assurer que les possibilités de séjour offertes aux visiteurs découlent de la participation de la collectivité à la promotion de modes de vie sains pour un parc sain, tout en assurant que la santé écologique du parc est améliorée et maintenue à long terme. Le marché touristique contemporain compte plus de gens à la recherche de vacances axées sur l'activité physique et d'occasions d'apprentissage en plein air.

- De quoi avons-nous besoin pour créer et maintenir un « parc en santé » à l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard?
- Qui seraient les intervenants?
- Avez-vous d'autres commentaires ou suggestions?

Conclusion

Voilà, c'est terminé. Au nom de Parcs Canada, je vous remercie de votre participation.

