LEVEL 5 / SYLLABUS

Level 5 Advanced Certificate in Travel and Tourism

Develop the operational and strategic skills to manage travel and tourism services.

Duration	Units	Assessment format
120 hours TQT	5	90 questions / 180 minutes

Who this programme is for

Experienced travel professionals, supervisors and aspiring managers.

Duration and learning approach

Total Qualification Time (TQT): 80% structured learning through classroom teaching or the online materials; 20% additional self-study, independent practical work and assessment. The final examination is included once within the 20%, not added to the published total.

These are planned learning allocations, not page-reading estimates or a claim of Guided Learning Hours for unsupervised online study. Reading progress alone is not evidence of competence. Keep a learning log with dates, minutes, activity outputs, feedback and revisions. Break long sessions into manageable study periods; breaks are not counted.

Programme information and enrolment

Delivery, evidence and assessment

Independent online route

Work through the core readings, extended teaching sessions, worked examples, visual analyses and structured activities. Reproduce the reasoning before opening guidance. Use the additional independent-work allocation for your evidence portfolio and mock exam. Record actual study time and seek support when a concept remains unclear.

ATP route

The ATP can deliver the same structured sessions in class, blending explanation, demonstration, discussion and supervised practice. Use the same outcomes, cases and evidence criteria. Classroom time replaces the corresponding online session; it is not added again. The additional 20% remains independent work and assessment.

How to use the learning materials

Begin with the unit outcomes. Study the mapped explanations and worked examples, then produce the activity evidence before opening suggested answers. Record the source, calculation or reasoning behind each decision. Revise the output after feedback. A completed reading checklist does not by itself demonstrate that an outcome has been achieved.

Mock and final examinations

Multiple-choice examination: 90 questions, 180 minutes.

Mock examinations are formative practice. Use feedback to revisit the linked units; a mock score does not award a certificate. Final examinations assess the specified knowledge and applied decisions through the configured question format. Practical outputs develop skills that multiple-choice questions alone cannot directly demonstrate. Confirm the available final assessment, supervision, submission and scheduling arrangements in the learner portal or with WTTA/your ATP.

Evidence integrity and support

Use fictional customer details for practice. Identify your sources and distinguish supplied case assumptions from real operating rules. Submit your own work, keep a record of revisions, and request reasonable learning or assessment arrangements through the published learner-support procedures. Current supplier and official requirements take priority over training examples.

WTTA learner policies and support

Unit and duration map

Unit	TQT h	Structured h	Independent + assessment h	Mock questions	Final questions
1. Tourism strategy and destination development	24	19.2	4.8	3	18
2. Travel business operations and financial planning	24	19.2	4.8	3	18
3. Leadership and service quality	24	19.2	4.8	3	18
4. Tourism marketing and distribution	24	19.2	4.8	3	18
5. Sustainable tourism and risk management	24	19.2	4.8	3	18

The final-exam allocation is included once within the independent/assessment column. The unit question counts form the assessment blueprint; they do not disclose examination questions.

International application

Activities use varied travel, destination and service contexts. Transfer the method rather than copying a fictional price or local assumption. Check geography, seasonality, traveller requirements, supplier conditions and source dates whenever the itinerary changes.

Resource access

Syllabuses are public. The linked teaching materials and practice environments require access to the corresponding programme. Keep the unit and outcome codes below in your learning log so feedback can be traced to the syllabus.

UNIT 1 / 24 HOURS

Tourism strategy and destination development

Learning outcomes

- U1.1 - Analyse destination opportunities using a critical evidence base.

- U1.2 - Compare development options against commercial and stakeholder objectives.

- U1.3 - Recommend a phased strategy with governance, indicators and decision points.

Content and scope

Diagnose concentration before prescribing growth

Choose the unit of analysis deliberately: visitor-day, overnight stay, attraction entry and transport movement describe different activity. Map the relevant intervals and locations, then ask which source observes each. Ticket counts can reveal attraction use but miss unrecorded visits; accommodation data omit day visitors. Triangulate sources without adding overlapping populations into a false total.

Separate additional value from relocated activity

Define the counterfactual: what is likely to happen without the project. A new centre may capture spending that existing businesses would otherwise receive, so total sales at the centre are not automatically additional. Distinguish visitors newly attracted to the destination from those changing their route within it. State the evidence supporting the estimate and test a plausible range.

Sequence investment using reversible commitments

Identify the assumptions whose failure would invalidate the project: usable demand, partner capacity, access permissions or an operating funding stream. Place the earliest useful test before the largest irreversible expenditure. A temporary service can sometimes test behaviour more directly than another opinion survey. Define what it will reveal and what it cannot reveal about a permanent facility.

Design a destination review that changes decisions

Write the expected chain from resources to activity, output, behaviour and outcome. A shuttle may create departures, enable access, alter visitor distribution and affect local spending. Each link can fail independently. Select a few measures that reveal the uncertain links, with an owner and review date. Avoid requiring a large dataset that partners cannot collect consistently.

A staged destination portfolio with explicit public value

Build a critical destination evidence base, compare a portfolio of development choices and recommend an adaptive sequence with measurable public and commercial outcomes. Explain additionality, distribution, spatial and seasonal concentration, and the value of a reversible pilot. Define who can decide, which evidence will trigger the next stage, and how adverse effects could cause a project to be revised or stopped.

Unit 1 delivery and evidence

Structured learning: 19.2 hours. Independent tasks: 4.2 hours. Share of the single final examination: 0.6 hours.

Diagnose concentration before prescribing growth - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U1.1

Explain: Diagnose concentration before prescribing growth (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between total visitor volume and the distribution of pressure. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the spatial-and-seasonal evidence brief (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read OECD 2026 executive summary on balanced outcomes and destination management; inspect one country example relevant to visitor distribution. Identify a national indicator that would need local evidence before supporting a neighbourhood investment.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Analyse growth from 80,000 to 110,000 visitor-days with peak share falling from 55% to 44%. Explain both distribution and absolute pressure, then identify one missing local measure. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how aggregate growth can conceal local concentration and unequal benefit would behave in a different international destination.

Separate additional value from relocated activity - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U1.1, U1.2

Explain: Separate additional value from relocated activity (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between gross visitor spending and additional retained benefit. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the additionality and distribution appraisal (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read OECD 2026 discussion of social benefits and balanced destination outcomes. List one beneficiary and one potentially displaced group that a gross-spending total would conceal.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Compare displacement assumptions of 40,000 and 100,000 CU on the same 200,000 gross spending, with retention of 50%. Explain what evidence would narrow the range. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how gross activity overstates value when displacement and leakage are ignored would behave in a different international destination.

Sequence investment using reversible commitments - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U1.2, U1.3

Explain: Sequence investment using reversible commitments (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a learning milestone and a calendar announcement.

Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the investment stage-gate plan (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read the UNESCO toolkit sections on strategy, governance and managing visitor behaviour. Identify a dependency that should be resolved before a public launch commitment.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Design three stages for a shuttle requiring 240,000 CU capital, where a six-week leased pilot costs 18,000 CU. Set evidence gates for demand, reliability and resident effects, including one reason to stop. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how small reversible tests can reduce exposure to assumptions that would overturn a large commitment would behave in a different international destination.

Design a destination review that changes decisions - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U1.3

Explain: Design a destination review that changes decisions (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a delivered project output and a sustained destination outcome. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the adaptive destination review (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read OECD 2026 key policy priorities concerning data, governance and destination outcomes. Write one output, one behavioural indicator and one outcome for the same intervention.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Create a six-measure review for the shuttle covering delivery, use, distribution, local benefit, resident response and operating cost. Explain the decision triggered if reliable departures produce little redistribution. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how leading implementation evidence and outcome measures together support timely adaptation would behave in a different international destination.

Evidence task

Prepare a staged strategy for a fictional destination with visitor growth, concentrated pressure and uneven local benefit.

- Critical evidence brief with populations, gaps and a concentration chart.

- Options appraisal including additionality, distribution and essential conditions.

- Three-stage strategy with governance, outcome chain and review triggers.

Review criteria

- Aggregate data are not used to make unsupported local causal claims.

- Commercial and stakeholder effects are compared transparently.

- The strategy preserves learning and identifies evidence that can stop or change a commitment.

Mapped learning resources

Diagnose a destination before proposing growth

Evaluate options with stakeholders and explicit trade-offs

Convert strategy into a phased development programme

Unit 1 workshop and knowledge check

Deep study · A destination strategy that survives a difficult trade-off

Case laboratory · A destination strategy that survives a difficult trade-off

Use strategic tools to test a business choice

Design a partnership that can make and enforce decisions

Unit 1 learning map

Diagnose concentration before prescribing growth

Separate additional value from relocated activity

Sequence investment using reversible commitments

Design a destination review that changes decisions

Unit 1 independent evidence brief

OECD: Tourism Trends and Policies 2024

GSTC: Destination Standard and suggested indicators

UNIT 2 / 24 HOURS

Travel business operations and financial planning

Learning outcomes

- U2.1 - Evaluate a travel business model using capacity, contribution and break-even analysis.

- U2.2 - Build a forecast that distinguishes profitability, cash timing and uncertainty.

- U2.3 - Recommend an operating plan through scenario comparison and explicit decision thresholds.

Content and scope

Rank products by their use of the scarce resource

Identify the actual constraint before calculating a ranking. It may be specialist time, guide availability, confirmed rail capacity or a customer-support window. A resource that appears scarce in annual totals may not bind in the period being planned. Quantify usable capacity after required checking and support rather than treating every paid hour as sellable production.

Stress-test contribution and the operating break-even point

Calculate unit contribution before fixed costs and identify the relevant operating range. Fixed commitments may step up when another guide, office or system tier is required. A model that assumes unchanged fixed cost beyond that step understates exposure. For a mixed portfolio, use an explicitly assumed mix and recognise that a different mix changes the weighted contribution.

Model commitment exposure before cash is at risk

Map each contract-related teaching assumption by date: reservation, deposit, release, balance and service. Distinguish a payment already made from a liability committed but payable later. Both can constrain the decision. A forecast that records only bank movements may understate future unavoidable outflow, while one that records every reservation as fully committed may overstate it.

Choose operating triggers from coherent scenarios

Construct a small number of coherent scenarios rather than changing every cell arbitrarily. A demand fall may coincide with lower cash receipts and higher support cost; a transport disruption may reduce capacity while increasing rebooking work. Explain the mechanism linking assumptions. Do not assign probabilities unless there is an appropriate basis, and do not present an average of scenarios as the outcome most likely to occur.

An operating portfolio that respects both constraints and cash

Evaluate a multi-product travel model using contribution per constrained resource, break-even exposure, dated cash requirements and downside scenarios. Explain why the product with the highest contribution per sale may not best use the bottleneck. Recommend an operating mix, funding condition and decision thresholds, distinguishing an economically attractive plan from one the organisation can safely deliver and finance.

Unit 2 delivery and evidence

Structured learning: 19.2 hours. Independent tasks: 4.2 hours. Share of the single final examination: 0.6 hours.

Rank products by their use of the scarce resource - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U2.1

Explain: Rank products by their use of the scarce resource (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between contribution per booking and contribution per bottleneck hour. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the constraint-based product mix (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read Manage your finances, segment analysis and cost-benefit analysis. Explain why segment revenue alone cannot identify the best use of a constrained specialist.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Use A contribution 150 CU for three hours and B contribution 110 CU for two hours. Capacity is thirty hours, maximum B demand ten bookings and A demand ample. Find the whole-booking mix and unused capacity. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how the binding resource changes which additional sale contributes most to the feasible portfolio would behave in a different international destination.

Stress-test contribution and the operating break-even point - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U2.1, U2.2

Explain: Stress-test contribution and the operating break-even point (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a base-case break-even point and a robust operating margin. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the contribution sensitivity table (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read financial cost-benefit analysis and compare fixed commitments with recurring costs. Identify an operating step cost that a simple linear model might omit.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Test a 5% discount from 400 CU with variable cost 260 and fixed commitment 14,000. Calculate original and revised break-even and volume needed to preserve the contribution from 120 original-price bookings. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how small changes in unit contribution can materially change required volume near break-even would behave in a different international destination.

Model commitment exposure before cash is at risk - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U2.2, U2.3

Explain: Model commitment exposure before cash is at risk (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between cash received, refundable funds and committed expenditure. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the commitment and cash exposure map (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read Manage your finances, available cash, accounts receivable and accounts payable. Distinguish a future unavoidable payment from a payment already visible in the bank account.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Create an exposure map for 12,000 CU deposits, 4,000 already non-refundable supplier payment and 9,000 becoming unavoidable in three days. Compare stopping now with proceeding when later customer balances may be 8,000 or 3,000. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how irreversible supplier commitments can create exposure before accounting profit or final receipts are known would behave in a different international destination.

Choose operating triggers from coherent scenarios - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U2.3

Explain: Choose operating triggers from coherent scenarios (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between an uncertain forecast and an actionable contingency. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the scenario-trigger operating recommendation (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read financial planning and cost-benefit analysis; focus on decision assumptions rather than accounting labels. Write a trigger that can be observed before an irreversible supplier commitment.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Compare fixed commitment 12,000 with contribution 120 at 130 or 80 bookings against flexible commitment 8,000 with contribution 100 at the same volumes. Recommend a choice and a bookings trigger before commitment. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how coherent downside assumptions expose decisions hidden by a single average forecast would behave in a different international destination.

Evidence task

Recommend a feasible operating portfolio for a fictional multi-product travel business facing a scarce specialist and uncertain departure demand.

- Constraint-based mix and sensitivity table with whole-booking checks.

- Dated cash and commitment-exposure map.

- Scenario recommendation with decision triggers, funding conditions and rejected alternative.

Review criteria

- Contribution is related to the actual constraint and demand limits.

- Profitability, recoverability and cash timing are not conflated.

- Scenarios are coherent and actions occur before the last useful decision point.

Mapped learning resources

Connect the business model to capacity and contribution

Build a forecast that exposes cash pressure

Use scenarios to choose an operating commitment

Unit 2 workshop and knowledge check

Deep study · Cash, contribution and a seasonal operating commitment

Case laboratory · Cash, contribution and a seasonal operating commitment

Manage working capital through the booking cycle

Use capacity and booking pace to make revenue decisions

Unit 2 learning map

Rank products by their use of the scarce resource

Stress-test contribution and the operating break-even point

Model commitment exposure before cash is at risk

Choose operating triggers from coherent scenarios

Unit 2 independent evidence brief

U.S. Small Business Administration: Break-even point

UNIT 3 / 24 HOURS

Leadership and service quality

Learning outcomes

- U3.1 - Evaluate leadership choices against task, team and service conditions.

- U3.2 - Design a quality system with meaningful measures and review routines.

- U3.3 - Lead a service improvement with staff development and evidence of sustained change.

Content and scope

Match decision rights to task uncertainty

Classify decisions by reversibility, consequence and information location. A frontline colleague may have the best information about a customer's immediate need, while a central manager sees capacity across departures. Place authority where the relevant information and competence exist, but define limits for commitments that affect other teams. Requiring approval for every minor action can create a bottleneck without improving control.

Design measures that resist gaming and misleading aggregation

Identify the behaviour encouraged by each target. Closing cases quickly may encourage premature closure; low complaint counts may discourage recording. Pair the measure with evidence of resolution or completeness and inspect exceptions. This is not an assumption that employees are dishonest; systems can make an undesirable shortcut appear to be the expected way to meet conflicting demands.

Test quality controls through the actual customer journey

Design a walkthrough that follows one case across roles, systems and suppliers. At each important point, identify the risk, control, evidence and action on failure. A checker may verify names accurately but work too late to correct a supplier record without cost. Timing is therefore part of control effectiveness, not a separate administrative detail.

Lead adoption and verify sustained improvement

Identify what each role must do differently and what might prevent it. A new form may require information another team does not yet provide. Explain the purpose, demonstrate the task and give practice with realistic exceptions. Involve staff in testing usability without implying that essential customer protections are optional. The leader's responsibility includes resolving conflicting targets and providing time for learning.

Leadership, quality assurance and learning that survive expansion

Design a leadership and service-quality approach for a growing distributed operation. Distinguish routine and judgement-intensive work, establish meaningful measures and tests of control operation, and plan a change that staff can adopt without losing service cover. Evaluate whether the improvement is sustained across case types and shifts, and identify evidence that would require the leadership approach or process design to change.

Unit 3 delivery and evidence

Structured learning: 19.2 hours. Independent tasks: 4.2 hours. Share of the single final examination: 0.6 hours.

Match decision rights to task uncertainty - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U3.1

Explain: Match decision rights to task uncertainty (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between delegating an output and abandoning oversight. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the decision-rights architecture (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read Performance management, task, contextual and adaptive performance. Explain how an authority boundary can support adaptive performance without removing accountability.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Design decision rights for routine schedule changes, a large supplier-cost exception and an uncertain accessibility request. State who decides, what evidence is needed and when a case must stop for support. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how clear authority boundaries allow useful local judgement without unsupported high-consequence decisions would behave in a different international destination.

Design measures that resist gaming and misleading aggregation - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U3.2

Explain: Design measures that resist gaming and misleading aggregation (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a convenient proxy and the outcome it is intended to represent. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the balanced measurement specification (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read NIST Results and measurement commentary, focusing on meaningful segmentation and organisational outcomes. Describe one misleading aggregate and the additional breakdown needed to interpret it.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Recalculate the four group rates and aggregate rates, then propose a fairer dashboard. Add a measure that would detect premature case closure. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how a narrow target can reward behaviour that undermines the intended service outcome would behave in a different international destination.

Test quality controls through the actual customer journey - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U3.2, U3.3

Explain: Test quality controls through the actual customer journey (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between control design and operating effectiveness.

Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the end-to-end control test (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read NIST Operations, work processes and operational effectiveness. Create a control test that checks purpose and timing, not only presence of a form.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Design a test of a customer-notification control with thirty cases, twenty-seven recorded notifications and six of those sent after the promised update window. State both measures and an investigation plan. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how a control can be documented but fail through timing, scope or lack of authority would behave in a different international destination.

Lead adoption and verify sustained improvement - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U3.1, U3.3

Explain: Lead adoption and verify sustained improvement (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between initial compliance and sustained independent use. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the sustained-change evaluation (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read Implementing workforce planning, support for managers and review and learning. Link one implementation barrier to a leadership action and a later effectiveness check.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Prepare a four-week adoption plan with role training, a support route, removal of obsolete templates and two later review points. Explain how you would test whether a peak-period decline reflects capacity or misunderstanding. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how adoption, competence and operating support jointly determine whether a change survives normal pressures would behave in a different international destination.

Evidence task

Design a leadership and quality system for a fictional distributed travel operation implementing a new process.

- Decision-rights architecture with escalation and competence evidence.

- Balanced dashboard and segmented case interpretation.

- End-to-end control test and sustained-change plan.

Review criteria

- Leadership choices fit uncertainty, capability and customer consequences.

- Quality measures and controls test relevant outcomes rather than superficial completion.

- Change includes resources, practice, retesting and evidence from later operating conditions.

Mapped learning resources

Choose leadership behaviour for the situation

Design quality measures that support sound decisions

Lead change with adoption and sustained review

Unit 3 workshop and knowledge check

Deep study · Leading service change without distorting performance

Case laboratory · Leading service change without distorting performance

Plan workforce capability through a service change

Design controls around the failures that matter

Unit 3 learning map

Match decision rights to task uncertainty

Design measures that resist gaming and misleading aggregation

Test quality controls through the actual customer journey

Lead adoption and verify sustained improvement

Unit 3 independent evidence brief

ISO: Quality management principles

CIPD: Performance management - an introduction

CIPD: Coaching and mentoring

UNIT 4 / 24 HOURS

Tourism marketing and distribution

Learning outcomes

- U4.1 - Develop a researched positioning and integrated tourism marketing strategy.

- U4.2 - Evaluate channel choices using incremental contribution and commercial dependence.

- U4.3 - Interpret campaign experiments and recommend evidence-based budget changes.

Content and scope

Test positioning against the customer's real alternatives

Map the customer's decision criteria using specific recent choices. Price, planning effort, flexibility and specialist interpretation may matter differently at different stages. Ask what the traveller sacrificed to obtain the chosen benefit. This reveals trade-offs that a general satisfaction survey may miss. Do not assume that the features easiest for the business to advertise are the ones that influence commitment.

Measure channel value when attribution overlaps

Start from a deduplicated completed-booking population. A customer can click a search ad, read content and book through a partner. Summing each platform's claimed conversions can exceed actual customers. Different attribution rules distribute credit differently because they answer different reporting questions. Retain the rule and observation window when comparing reports instead of treating every dashboard total as directly additive.

Interpret an experiment beyond the uplift headline

Define the eligible population, allocation, exposure and outcome before launch. Random assignment can reduce systematic differences, but poor delivery or contamination between groups can still weaken interpretation. Analyse according to the planned comparison and record exclusions. Removing inconvenient customers after seeing results can introduce a bias that the initial randomisation was designed to avoid.

Allocate a learning budget under capacity limits

Distinguish average from marginal return. The first reachable audience may be highly responsive, while additional spending reaches less suitable people or repeats the same message. Do not multiply a small pilot's conversion rate indefinitely. Divide proposed spending into tranches with explicit evidence requirements, then compare the next tranche with other uses of the budget.

Positioning, channel economics and causal budget decisions

Develop an integrated strategy whose positioning is supported by customer evidence and operational capability. Compare the incremental economics and dependence of selected channels, distinguish attribution from causal effect and evaluate experiment results against the cost of a wrong decision. Recommend a budget allocation with capacity limits, uncertainty and review conditions rather than maximising clicks or reported conversions independently.

Unit 4 delivery and evidence

Structured learning: 19.2 hours. Independent tasks: 4.2 hours. Share of the single final examination: 0.6 hours.

Test positioning against the customer's real alternatives - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U4.1

Explain: Test positioning against the customer's real alternatives (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a distinctive claim and a relevant credible difference. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the positioning evidence map (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read market research and competitive analysis, focusing on alternatives, customer needs and competitive advantage. Identify one substitute outside the normal competitor category and explain its relevance.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Create a two-dimension positioning map for three fictional alternatives, state the evidence behind each placement and draft one promise with two operational proofs. Include a reason to reject the position. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how a differentiated promise creates value only if customers recognise it and the operation can deliver it would behave in a different international destination.

Measure channel value when attribution overlaps - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U4.2

Explain: Measure channel value when attribution overlaps (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between assigned conversion credit and additional completed demand. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the incremental channel-value model (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read Marketing and sales, sales methods and measuring return on investment. Explain why a last-touch report cannot establish the absence-of-channel counterfactual.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Model a partner producing 100 bookings at 45 CU contribution with a 600 CU setup cost. Test displacement of 20 or 50 direct bookings that would contribute 60 CU each. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how overlapping attribution can count the same completed customer more than once would behave in a different international destination.

Interpret an experiment beyond the uplift headline - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U4.3

Explain: Interpret an experiment beyond the uplift headline (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between relative uplift, percentage-point difference and commercial value. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the experiment interpretation brief (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read Marketing and sales, measuring return on investment; distinguish that commercial calculation from the separate experimental design. Identify one implementation failure that could weaken an otherwise well-planned comparison.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Evaluate groups of 800 with 56 and 40 completed bookings, 75 CU contribution per additional booking and 1,400 CU campaign cost. Explain why a positive uplift need not justify scale. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how absolute effect, uncertainty and contribution determine whether an observed uplift justifies spending would behave in a different international destination.

Allocate a learning budget under capacity limits - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U4.1, U4.2, U4.3

Explain: Allocate a learning budget under capacity limits (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between average historical return and the return on the next unit of spend. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the capacity-aware marketing portfolio (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read Marketing and sales, budget and measuring return on investment. State the condition under which a previously successful campaign should be paused despite remaining budget.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Allocate 1,500 CU across three 500 CU tranches expected to add 10, 6 and 3 completed bookings at 100 CU contribution each. Capacity allows fourteen additional bookings. State a feasible staged decision. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how a campaign with attractive unit economics can lose value when it exceeds fulfilment capacity or stops being incremental would behave in a different international destination.

Evidence task

Prepare an integrated positioning and marketing investment recommendation for a fictional specialist travel business.

- Positioning evidence map with operational proof and a rejected alternative.

- Deduplicated channel model including displacement and dependence.

- Experiment interpretation and staged budget under a delivery constraint.

Review criteria

- Positioning follows customer decisions and credible capability.

- Channel value distinguishes attribution from incremental completed contribution.

- Budget choices account for uncertainty, marginal response and fulfilment limits.

Mapped learning resources

Turn research into a defensible positioning choice

Optimise a channel portfolio without ignoring dependence

Evaluate campaigns with incrementality and uncertainty

Unit 4 workshop and knowledge check

Deep study · Distribution strategy and the difference between attribution and impact

Case laboratory · Distribution strategy and the difference between attribution and impact

Research the purchase decision before choosing a message

Allocate a channel budget under capacity constraints

Unit 4 learning map

Test positioning against the customer’s real alternatives

Measure channel value when attribution overlaps

Interpret an experiment beyond the uplift headline

Allocate a learning budget under capacity limits

Unit 4 independent evidence brief

U.S. Small Business Administration: Marketing and sales

UNIT 5 / 24 HOURS

Sustainable tourism and risk management

Learning outcomes

- U5.1 - Evaluate environmental, community and commercial effects using appropriate indicators.

- U5.2 - Integrate risk scenarios and critical dependencies into management decisions.

- U5.3 - Prepare and test a proportionate continuity and recovery plan.

Content and scope

Build a resource account with a defensible boundary

Define what is included: lodge operations, outsourced laundry, staff accommodation or transport may sit in different records. Changing that boundary between periods can create an apparent improvement without a real reduction. Keep a boundary note and, where feasible, restate comparable periods. Separate measured values from estimates and explain missing meter readings rather than replacing them with convenient averages silently.

Evaluate who receives value and who carries the burden

Define local for the decision and explain the evidence. A supplier registered nearby may import most inputs, while a community enterprise may retain a greater share through local labour. Trace enough of the purchase to support the claim rather than assuming all invoiced spending remains nearby. Do not imply that every external purchase is avoidable or undesirable.

Stress-test shared dependencies and residual exposure

Map the resources supporting each critical activity: power, communications, access, staff, supplier stock and cash. Then trace where primary and backup arrangements converge. Two communication providers may use the same local power source; two transport firms may use the same bridge. The graph reveals common-cause failures that a supplier list hides.

Rehearse recovery as a controlled sequence

Identify the minimum service, the target restoration sequence and the information needed for each step. Some activities depend on earlier recovery: a booking system may need reconciled supplier status before automated messages resume. Define decision authority and a record of assumptions during the incident. A concise current log is more useful than an elaborate plan that cannot be accessed without the failed system.

An accountable sustainability and continuity decision

Integrate resource and community indicators, critical-dependency scenarios and a tested continuity plan. Compare absolute, intensity and distribution effects, evaluate claims and investment trade-offs, and identify shared failure modes that could defeat backup arrangements. Recommend an operating decision with stakeholder feedback, a recovery sequence, measurable tolerances and a review of what remains unprotected.

Unit 5 delivery and evidence

Structured learning: 19.2 hours. Independent tasks: 4.2 hours. Share of the single final examination: 0.6 hours.

Build a resource account with a defensible boundary - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U5.1

Explain: Build a resource account with a defensible boundary (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between absolute resource use, intensity and a boundary change. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the resource and activity account (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read GSTC Destination Standard environmental management sections; focus on measurement, resource management and boundaries. Identify a relevant resource indicator and explain what it does not measure.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Compare 180,000 kWh for 3,000 guest-nights with 198,000 kWh for 3,600. Calculate intensity and total changes, then introduce outsourced laundry omitted only in the later period. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how activity growth and boundary changes can reverse the meaning of an efficiency claim would behave in a different international destination.

Evaluate who receives value and who carries the burden - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U5.1

Explain: Evaluate who receives value and who carries the burden (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between a larger total benefit and a fairer or stronger distribution. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the distribution and claims assessment (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read GSTC socioeconomic and cultural sections; consider community engagement and local economic benefit. Identify one distribution question that a total procurement figure cannot answer.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Prepare a balanced claim for local purchasing of 90,000 from 300,000 CU, rising to 108,000 from 400,000. Include one stakeholder question and one supplier-development action. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how aggregate benefit can conceal a declining share or an uneven distribution of costs would behave in a different international destination.

Stress-test shared dependencies and residual exposure - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U5.2

Explain: Stress-test shared dependencies and residual exposure (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between supplier diversity and dependency independence. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the common-cause scenario map (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read UNDRR guidance on critical activities, risks and business continuity strategies. Draw one shared dependency and an alternative that is genuinely independent for the stated scenario.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Map a lodge with grid power, a generator requiring daily fuel delivery and two internet providers using the same local power cabinet. Build a twenty-four-hour access-and-power disruption scenario. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how shared infrastructure can make multiple backups fail together would behave in a different international destination.

Rehearse recovery as a controlled sequence - 288 minutes

Outcomes: U5.3

Explain: Rehearse recovery as a controlled sequence (67 min): Study the linked prerequisite lessons and the new teaching explanation. Construct a concept map and annotate the distinction between system restoration and complete service recovery. Produce three cause-and-effect statements before using the case data.

Reconstruct the continuity exercise and recovery sequence (44 min): Reconstruct the supplied records in a spreadsheet or ruled workbook without copying the answer. Show formulas, units and boundary checks. Build two justified variants, compare the resulting decisions and explain any non-linear or whole-unit constraint.

Focused primary-source comparison (44 min): Read UNDRR guidance on exercises, review and maintenance of the continuity plan. Specify one exercise observation that would require changing the plan rather than only retraining staff.

Apply and defend the decision (89 min): Design an exercise with a four-hour outage, demand nine per hour, workaround four and restored capacity fourteen. Calculate recovery and specify checks before automated customer messages resume. Build the complete management output, including source records, calculations, assumptions, an operating instruction and an evidence-based alternative. Adapt the case to a second international destination, state what changes and prepare a five-minute explanation or equivalent written briefing. Retain both versions for comparison.

Review, correct and transfer (44 min): Use the guidance to audit each calculation and decision. In class exchange evidence with a peer; online perform a written opposing-case review. Revise the output, record the reasons for each material correction, and explain how restored technical capacity can leave a backlog and inconsistent records that prolong customer disruption would behave in a different international destination.

Evidence task

Produce an integrated sustainability and resilience decision for a fictional lodge and excursion business facing growth and a shared-infrastructure disruption.

- Comparable resource account and balanced procurement claim.

- Stakeholder distribution assessment and dependency map.

- Continuity exercise, recovery calculation and corrective-action review.

Review criteria

- Claims distinguish absolute, intensity, boundary and distribution effects.

- Risk scenarios expose shared dependencies and residual exposure.

- Recovery is executable and includes reconciliation, people and follow-up.

Mapped learning resources

Measure sustainability without hiding the trade-offs

Integrate risk scenarios with strategic choices

Plan continuity, rehearse decisions and recover responsibly

Unit 5 workshop and knowledge check

Deep study · Sustainability, continuity and the credibility of a public claim

Case laboratory · Sustainability, continuity and the credibility of a public claim

Prioritise recovery through a business-impact analysis

Buy responsibly using whole-life cost and supplier evidence

Unit 5 learning map

Build a resource account with a defensible boundary

Evaluate who receives value and who carries the burden

Stress-test shared dependencies and residual exposure

Rehearse recovery as a controlled sequence

Unit 5 independent evidence brief

GSTC: Destination Standard and suggested indicators

UNDRR: Strengthening disaster resilience of SMEs through business continuity planning

Learning log and review

Use one entry per learning block. Classroom and online versions of the same structured session are alternatives, not additional hours. Record actual time and discuss substantial differences from the plan with WTTA or your ATP.

Record	What to include
Date and unit	Unit number and outcome code(s)
Learning route	Online material-led session or ATP classroom session
Time	Start/end or actual minutes; exclude breaks
Activity evidence	Calculation, decision note, source review, presentation or practical output
Review	What was correct, what changed after guidance, and unresolved questions
Next action	Specific revision, further practice or request for support

Before final assessment

- Check that every outcome has at least one evidence item in your portfolio.

- Revisit errors from the course-specific mock; explain why alternatives were unsuitable.

- Check your enrolment, examination availability and scheduled arrangements in the learner portal.

- Confirm any agreed accessibility arrangements before the assessment date.