

Royal Caribbean Group: What comes after Mahahual?

Internal ID: S&F-STR-484

Topic: Operations Strategy, Corporate Strategy, Platform Strategy

Industry: Hotels, Resorts & Cruise Lines

Source: Strategy & Finance

Publication date: 5 October 2026

License: Not specified

Student case | Information cutoff: August 4, 2026

In late July 2026, Royal Caribbean Group was still telling investors it expected its private-destination portfolio to expand from three locations to eight by 2028. But its most prominent planned Mexican destination had encountered a regulatory impasse. The environmental review for the submitted Perfect Day Mexico development at Mahahual had ended after the company withdrew that application in May. A separate request to modify port infrastructure at Costa Maya was not authorized.

The distinction mattered. Royal Caribbean had acquired the Port of Costa Maya and adjacent land in July 2025. That transaction did not itself authorize the separately proposed destination or the requested port modification. Nor did the end of those proceedings establish that the company had abandoned Mexico or its broader destination strategy. The company said it would re-engage stakeholders, but by August 4 it had not publicly identified a revised design, another site, a new permit or a timetable. [C2-C3, C5-C6]

The strategic proposition

Royal Caribbean presents destinations as part of the guest experience and itinerary proposition. The company's 2025 annual report described Costa Maya as a future "Perfect Day Mexico" destination, expected in 2027. That was a pre-review plan, not a current schedule after the May proceedings. The same filing explains that ship deployment decisions are generally made 18 to 32 months ahead, so destination decisions can affect future itineraries well before an opening. [C6]

The company's second-quarter 2026 results were strong across the group: revenue was \$4.832 billion, up 6% year over year; capacity grew 4.9%; load factor was 110%; and net yields rose 1.9% as reported. Gross-margin yield declined 5.6%. Onboard and other revenue increased 11%, reflecting both higher onboard spending per passenger and capacity growth. Management attributed its stronger-than-expected net yields largely to close-in demand. These figures describe the company as a whole; they do not isolate the return, demand contribution or local effects of any destination. [C1, C5]

Management also described its destination portfolio as expanding from three to eight by 2028. A January 2026 capital-expenditure outlook had said a significant portion of expected non-new-ship spending related to announced private destinations, including Perfect Day Mexico. That statement preceded the May withdrawal. It is not a project-specific budget, a remaining commitment, or evidence that those funds remained assigned after the filing ended. [C1, C7]

What happened in May

On May 20, Royal Caribbean filed a response after Mexico's environment secretary publicly indicated that the initial environmental-permit application for Perfect Day Mexico would be denied. The company said it respected the authorities and planned to re-engage stakeholders to pursue responsible investment, environmental infrastructure, local jobs and community programs. Those were company statements about intent and prospective benefits; the filing does not establish that the benefits had been delivered or that a new project had been selected. [C2]

The environmental authority's May 21 notice clarified the procedural record. The applicant withdrew the main Perfect Day environmental-review application on May 19, and the authority closed that proceeding. The notice described potential concerns identified during review, including mangrove effects, water supply and saline intrusion, aquifer balance, mitigation measures and impacts on protected ecosystems and species. The withdrawal means the submitted project did not receive approval through that process; it was not a merits ruling approving a different design or deciding whether another site could work. [C3]

Two other proceedings were separate. A "Beach Club Perfect Day Mexico" environmental application was dismissed on May 13 after the authority concluded that the applicant's response did not sufficiently address requested information. Separately, the authority did not authorize a May 20 modification request concerning Costa Maya port infrastructure. The port, the destination environmental review and the port-modification request should not be treated as one permit or one decision. The company retained its acquired port asset, but ownership alone did not establish authorization for the proposed changes or a substitute attraction. [C3, C6]

A local and guest-value question

The business case for a private destination is not only about ship capacity. A controlled destination may give the cruise line more influence over the guest experience and retain more spending within the company's offering. But the same concentration can intensify exposure to local water, ecosystem, infrastructure, access and benefit-sharing questions. A cruise-destination review synthesizing 98 empirical studies finds economic benefits alongside environmental and social costs and emphasizes stakeholder governance and shared resources. It does not provide a project forecast for Mahahual. [A1]

A comparison of residents' views in two Mediterranean cruise ports found positive perceptions on some social, cultural and economic dimensions alongside environmental concerns. Only the publisher abstract was available; it cannot establish what Mahahual residents think or predict the effects of a new resort. [A2]

A survey/GPS study of 487 Valencia cruise visitors found that expenditure patterns varied with spatial movement, visit choice and cruise category; the measured expenditure excluded tour-price and transport. A separate one-ship survey study reports that spending behavior moderated behavioral actions and varied by gender and travel frequency. These studies suggest questions about itinerary, time ashore and guest outcomes, but neither predicts private-destination demand or returns for Royal Caribbean. [A3-A4]

Your assignment

You are advising a hypothetical Royal Caribbean strategy committee on the next planning cycle. The committee has not disclosed an actual internal vote, competing approved budgets or a preferred option. Recommend which path deserves the next stage of work and specify what evidence should be required before the company makes an irreversible commitment.

1. **Redesign or relocate:** Continue toward a Mexico destination with a materially different design or location, subject to permitting, environmental and community gates.
2. **Defer destination development:** Preserve the Costa Maya port option and use existing local offerings while deferring a new destination build. Determine what must be true for port ownership to create value without assuming the previously proposed port works are approved.
3. **Prioritize other experiences:** Direct the next planning effort toward other private destinations or shipboard experiences, while retaining the option to revisit Mexico if evidence and approvals support it.

For your recommendation, distinguish (a) the acquired port, (b) the withdrawn destination application and (c) the unapproved port modification. Identify the strongest argument against your preferred path. State which operating, environmental, community and itinerary evidence should change the decision. Do not infer that the May action ended Royal Caribbean's broader destination strategy.

Sources and conventions

Company and regulator source details, versions, exact locators and access depth are listed as C1-C7 in the accompanying research dossier's source register. Academic evidence and its limits are documented as A1-A4 there. Cited operating metrics are reported companywide measures; management explanations and prospective benefits are attributed. Proposed paths and gates are teaching constructs, not disclosed company plans. No information after August 4, 2026 is included.