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Editor's Preface

This publication is intended as an in-depth contribution to the global discourse on World Heritage preservation, and the commodification of urban landscapes. In recent years, the phenomenon of 'over-tourism' has become a major challenge for numerous tourist destinations and a heated discussed subject in the public. However, this is just one of many issues that World Heritage sites are facing today. Broader consideration must be given to the intertwined relationships of planning, zoning policies and preservation strategies in urban spaces. These will need to address the vulnerabilities of urban spaces, the effectiveness of World Heritage management structures and the valorization of cultural heritage.

By conceptualizing management practices and examining several case studies from each continent, we hope to present proven solutions for current issues and key understandings that can foster sustainable development.

During the past decade, scientific research and the activities of international bodies and organizations have increasingly focused on cultural heritage sites – World Heritage sites in particular. With the European Year of Cultural Heritage (ECHY) in 2018, the topic became of central importance throughout Europe, and millions of people participated in events and cultural performances. However, NGOs, international organizations and public bodies have also expressed a rising number of concerns – especially as to the negative impacts triggered by the uncontrolled development of tourism conflicts, connected to urban development projects that challenge the integrity of heritage sites, or criticisms of the limited benefit for local communities. The term 'over-tourism' was rapidly taken up by the media, but a more thorough examination of the complex and complicated situation is needed, if we are to understand the hidden sets of interests and open needs of heritage sites as well as the multidimensional facets of heritage. Other factors affecting heritage sites and their users include the ongoing digitalization of societies, as well as climate change, and a wide range of social and economic challenges. During the creation of this book a whole new threat was added: the whole world was hit hard by COVID-19 – and also World Heritage sites are affected by the many restrictions and the complete standstill of international tourism. We have responded by adding a book chapter on what sustainable tourism could look like in the post-COVID-19 period.

In this book we focus on tourism, but operate with a far wider scope in order to explain and reflect the reality of heritage sites. Although several publications on tourism and on heritage management are available, not much has been written about the interrelationship of many aspects that make up the total picture. This book is unique in its broad scope in geographical as well as disciplinary terms. The contributing authors come not only from Europe and the Americas, but also from Asia and Africa, with professional backgrounds ranging from scientists to heritage managers, from architects to tourism promoters, from urban planners to concerned members of civil society. The unifying element is cultural heritage and urban development, un-
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understood as a complex system that is determined by the several layers outlined in the 2020 Historic Urban Landscape Convention and by the strong role of local communities following the 2005 Faro Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society.

Here we offer a platform for interdisciplinary discourse, focusing on the junction of scientific theories and practical experiences. The outcome is a colourful mix of theoretical considerations, practical insights and reflections on a wide range of topics, drawing on case studies, applied research and in-depth understanding of the complexity of the issues involved. We hope to offer wider perspectives, so that the book can serve as a bridge between these various disciplines, stimulating dialogue among the spheres of heritage, sustainable tourism and spatial planning.

The point of departure for this publication was the OWHC (Organization of World Heritage Cities) regional conference held in Amsterdam, November 2018. Under the heading ‘Heritage and Tourism: Local Communities and Visitors – Sharing Responsibilities’, the coordination team from the Regional OWHC Secretariat based in Regensburg (Monika Göttler and Matthias Ripp) invited members and several experts for exchange of experiences in managing the World Heritage City of Amsterdam, in order to gain deeper insights into the practical management measures taken. The OWHC is a global network of urban heritage sites. It was founded in 1993 following a UNESCO recommendation that there be exchange and learning between World Heritage Cities. The objectives of the OWHC are as follows:

- to promote implementation of the World Heritage Convention
- to encourage co-operation and the exchange of information and expertise on matters of conservation and management of urban heritage
- to develop a sense of solidarity among OWHC member cities

(See: https://www.ovpm.org/all-about-owhc/introduction-and-mission/)

The OWHC has a potential membership base of more than 300 cities – municipalities that have a site inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List. In practice, this means that the OWHC represents a combined urban population of over 164 million people. The organization has its administrative General Secretariat in Québec, Canada, and is supported by eight Regional Secretariats on five continents. The Northwest Europe and North America Regional Secretariat has 23 active members from 13 countries and is headquartered in Regensburg, Germany.

It was at the 14th OWHC World Congress held in Gyeongju, South Korea, that members chose ‘Tourism and Heritage’ as a theme for 2018/19. The Amsterdam conference reflected this theme, with 46 participants from 15 World Heritage sites contributing substantially to the conference working programme.

This present publication is a follow-up to the Amsterdam conference. An open call elicited an astonishing response: 25 out of 43 proposals were selected for peer-review and later inclusion in this publication.
With tourism in cities on the rise, cultural heritage is becoming a civic focal point for local residents and temporary visitors as well. The increased numbers of users of an urban space result in qualitative changes in the relationship to heritage. Cultural tourism has long been viewed as positive, not least because visitors provide funding that help to conserve the heritage site. However, negative consequences often arise when visitor numbers soar in already crowded city centres. Recognizing this problem, UNESCO launched the World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme in 2011. This programme embodies a new approach, based on dialogue and stakeholder cooperation where planning for tourism and heritage management is integrated at the destination level. This provides an international framework for cooperation and coordinates achievements across sectors in order to safeguard heritage and achieve sustainable economic development. (See: https://whc.unesco.org/en/tourism/)

It is our hope that this publication will enhance the basis of knowledge and skills required for effective management of World Heritage sites. We understand ‘heritage’ as both a system and process. This system is complex, consisting of a great range of elements and processes. Fully understanding the complexity of heritage, tourism and urban planning requires a holistic, interdisciplinary approach. It is essential to overcome sectoral boundaries, to get the full picture of the current situation of heritage sites around the globe. Such an approach is in line with recent trends as well as the findings of the 2016 Habitat III Conference in Quito, the EU Urban Agenda on the international level, and the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, which is increasingly put into practice in heritage sites around the world.

Kurt Luger & Matthias Ripp
Salzburg/Regensburg, December 2020
A. Contextualizing Heritage and Site Management
A. Contextualizing Heritage and Site Management
The Broad Scope of World Heritage Management

World Heritage Cities (WHCs) can be understood as systems that are part of a greater whole representing complex and constantly transforming modern societies. These systems and subsystems are where the heritage sector dynamically interrelates with transportation, tourism, the wide field of culture with its own intercultural dimensions, migration, and the economy – either locally, nationally or even globally. Altogether they are guided by some invisible hand within a yielding infrastructure.

The 21st century presents many challenges that have become undercurrents in society and, more specifically, WHCs. Even though heritage has proven to be a steadfast resource for urban development (CHCfE 2015), serious fixes exist due to changes in demographics, social fabric, migration flows, and in wealth and lifestyles – all compounded by continued global warming and climate change. These factors significantly influence urban development in terms of housing demand, traffic density, tourism, not to mention issues concerning sustainable urban management (Deutscher Staedtetag 2019, 4).

It follows that WHCs set an example and take the opportunity to implement the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). As part of the initiative “Education for Sustainable Development (ESD)” UNESCO and other UN organizations have prioritized the educational role of the SDGs (Turner 2017; Lutz/Koch 2017). WHCs are big players in the implementation of the ESD program. Their prestigious designations as UNESCO World Heritage Sites (WHSs) provide exceptional opportunities to facilitate sustainable development. Consequently, WHSs are obligated to implement the SDGs and their respective educational program. So far only a few WHCs have accepted this important task in the development of appropriate activities (Deutscher Staedtetag 2019).

Preserving heritage, both tangible or intangible, is undoubtedly the main objective of managing WHSs. At the same time it is difficult to accomplish this task because there are so many other challenges to contend with, such as urban mobility and development, the transformative digitization of society, environmental degradation, pressures from investors and the commercial building industry, not to mention financial constraints. Also, mediating the different objectives and conditions has become increasingly difficult in numerous WHCs, such as Liverpool (Rodwell...
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2015), Vienna and Salzburg (Luger 2018) to name just a few. This is partially due to the often held views that urban heritage is rigid, unaccommodating to change and inert. However, heritage can significantly shape urban landscapes and gently facilitate change without compromising historic ensembles.

The resilience of urban landscapes can be enhanced through [reflective] design and construction, the use of suitable building materials and the adaption of planning parameters if and when urban heritage becomes a reference point (Ripp/Lukat 2017). Urban heritage can stimulate strong impulses for the economy, particularly within the conservation and building industry (CHCfE 2015). WHSs, and heritage sites in general, can be seen as a locational factor for businesses; as a result they have a positive effect on the economic development of a city, and are themselves resources for economic activity (Deutscher Stadetetag 2019, 7).

The World Heritage designation alone has a positive connotation and is a source of pride that enhances the cultural identity of [local] residents. Rebanks Consulting and Trends Business Research conducted a comprehensive study of hundreds of WHSs and identified numerous positive socio-economic effects. The different forms of value created by cultural heritage were also recognized within the project Culture Heritage Counts for Europe in which a holistic four domain approach was used (Rebanks/Trend Business 2010). It became apparent that a World Heritage designation along with the preservation of a WHS proved advantageous to a location by establishing it as a tourist destination and by benefitting the businesses associated with tourism.
2 Theorizing Heritage & Tourism – Setting the Agenda

During the last decade heritage has caught the interest of more and more tourists; this to some extent is thanks to the UNESCO initiatives of promoting WHSs as instruments for intercultural understanding and education. Cultural heritage and cultural memory are “shining stars” in the rapidly growing field of cultural tourism. Today, every third tour contains a cultural component. Cultural and natural treasures form the raw material for high-quality tourism [services] and products. Without these treasures tourism as an industry would stagnate in the world (UNWTO 2018). When tourists visit a historic site, they enter a space that is subject to another time. It connects them to past events that can be located, interpreted and remembered through examination at a symbolic level. The historic site thereby provides a social framework that brings together collective memory and history, generational memory and memory that in a sense configures identity. In the case of World Heritage the tourism product incorporates elements of national or regional character, making WHSs universally recognized as national flag carriers, symbols of national identity and major tourist attractions for a country.

The cultural artefacts of earlier times and generations – such as buildings, monuments and memorials, events, rites, works of art and ways of life – convey cultural memory. They not only keep cultural memory alive but also maintain it beyond the present and into the future (Groebner 2018). The touristification of places of remembrance like UNESCO WHSs are, according to Assmann (2014), a new form of cultural memory that makes cultural attractions globally accessible – tourism even takes on a mediatory role. Accordingly, what is remembered as World Heritage and which cultural phenomena from past epochs become cultural memory depends on how society is currently shaped, how the media maintains the memory and how tourism products are marketed. Heritage thereby undergoes revaluation, finds new anchorages, and when necessary is re-contextualized. In these ways heritage becomes attuned to new realities that allow for the present to be connected [to the past] and experienced [in the here and now]. More importantly, heritage can be recast again and again – a process that ensures its survival (Luger/Wöhler 2008).

The significance of this process becomes apparent especially in historic old towns where there are conflicts of interest. The quasi-sacralization of a treasured historic substance protected as a heritage of mankind is of sorts a declared temporal state of emergency. When a structural ensemble is [protectively] frozen in space and time, tension-laden disputes can heat up between conservationists and renovators; here, too, the marketing of local history and culture for tourism plays a significant role. Historic urban landscapes are often considered an antithesis to the modern city, which adapts and subordinates itself to vehicular and pedestrian traffic. However, historic old towns may actually invite a future-oriented view of sustainable development and coexistence, albeit, in some ways, they oppose the
dictates of unleashed mobility as well as the considerations for economic utilitarianism and profit. They form anomalies [within the urban landscape] that allow for contemplation and amusement in the widest sense, or they become multi-purpose, walkable living spaces that shorten the distance between work and leisure. It follows that the preservation of a historic old town also finds its raison d’etre in social thought, whose significance extends far beyond the attractiveness of the design of an authentic façade or the motivation of preserving a historic site for a touristic experience (Luger/Ferch 2014).

In this sense cultural tourism is a powerful medium, since it serves the demands of a postmodern society and acts as an attractive instrument of memorial design (Richards 2018).

Conflicting Objectives – Cultural Heritage and Tourist Marketing

Since 1972, when the World Heritage Convention was adopted, over 1000 examples of humanity’s heritage from 161 countries have been inscribed onto the UNESCO World Heritage List. The criteria for inscription address the uniqueness, the historic authenticity and the integrity of an individual property. A property may represent a masterpiece of human creative power or present a significant intersecting point of human values in relation to the development of architecture, technology, urban design and/or landscaping within a cultural period. A property may be unique if not an extraordinary testimony of a cultural tradition of an existing or
lost culture. It may also be an excellent example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble and/or landscape of one or more significant periods in human history. Whatever the case, these indicators are also the “raw material” for touristic products. They all characterize the [inscribed] “instances of human brilliance” in their exceptionalism, beauty, exclusivity and uniqueness – attractive qualities that tourism draws from and depends on in order to flourish commercially.

Nonetheless, there still exists an inherent potential for conflict. Cultural heritage is a fragile, non-renewable resource. Only by protecting it can its exceptional character be preserved for future generations. Even though both tangible and intangible treasures are threatened, it is the tangible – essentially buildings or cultural landscapes – that are given consideration first. Most endangered is the cultural heritage in developing societies (Timothy/Nyaupane 2009). There are manifold reasons for this: tourism, for one, can cause significant disturbance to the cultural fabric – especially uncontrolled tourism development.

Fundamentally, this conflict in objectives has its source in the guiding principle that heritage is to be systematically preserved and transmitted from one generation to the next. World Heritage aims for the largest possible reference group (i.e. all of humanity) and is oriented towards the common good. Tourism, however, is systematically guided by the principle of consumption, and the use of landscapes and resources, and is profit-oriented. This fits in with the postmodern concepts of mobile leisure, individual gratification and experience-oriented monopolization of the world (Luger 2008).
In reality, the solution to this fundamental conflict of aims and principles can generally be found in quality-oriented cultural tourism. Firstly, a profound contextual examination of the World Heritage in question is needed that establishes a "meaningful experience" (Prentice 2003); and secondly, a tourism policy based on sustainability and the preservation of the given heritage must be put into practice.

**Profane Pilgrimage**

Whatever the case may be, tourism providers are challenged to walk a tightrope between the requirements of educational mediation and desirable amusement, wherein the [visitor’s] experience depends on how well service and communication are synthesized, and the degree to which it is augmented by new information technologies (Egger 2015).

The World Heritage tourist learns, studies and consumes essential aspects of a culture and the embodiments of national identity. Yet tangible cultural heritage is conceptually more complicated to understand and requires a knowledge basis. It reveals bygone societies and the history of humanity. The timeless of a World Heritage encounter makes it possible for visitors to feel as if they are part of a larger story, a bigger picture. Wöhler (2008) even speaks of a “sacramental experience.” Something transcendent is revealed. Accordingly, how one shows proper respect for specific places, memorials, and natural monuments, etc., comes into question, especially when these objects of respect become almost sacred through their up-valuation to World Heritage in a profane society. The history of the human spirit and the manifestations of its virtuosity are thereby deemed highest cultural value, in a sense *sacralized* – this is in contrast to the largely desacralized cosmos of the western world. More importantly this valourization can be shared by all of humanity. Wöhler rightly refers to this as a canonization of spaces. This is how cultural memory is formed: from a diversity of cultural artefacts, certain artefacts are designated memorable. A place, a region, a site is given a permanent code and in this manner its time-transcending significance is enshrined.

Experiencing that which is deemed important also creates its uniqueness. In a sense one becomes attuned to the extraordinary and universal value of World Heritage. Therein also lies a large-scale tourist potential given the great yearning for emotionality and a holistic experience, not to mention the desire to feel one with the world. World Heritage tourists are, in a sense, on a “profane pilgrimage.” Experiencing sacralized World Heritage places with one’s own senses is reason enough for a tourist to travel thousands of kilometres and climb hundreds of steps. WHSs provide a learning platform where the cultural tourist can share a cultural value-system. One can understand then that the communication goals of the World Heritage Convention will only have been successfully reached when the past is conveyed into the present and is contextually re-invigorated and filled with new meaning.
3 Coping with Success – the Burden of Over-tourism

WHSs are most vulnerable to mass tourism given that their Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) is used as a powerful marketing tool. Annually, WHSs are visited by millions of tourists who are largely oriented towards culture and heritage. The economic impact is huge; then again, this dynamic can have a negative effect on a site. Because of this inherent contradiction that tourism holds, the UNESCO World Heritage Centre in Paris has given it greater consideration within heritage management. In 2011, a new UNESCO World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Program was developed to address the reality of many WHSs struggling to deal with mass tourism.

During the last decade this topic has made headlines and public disputes in this matter have drawn attention in the media:


“Quebec City residents join global backlash against over-tourism” (https://www.ctvnews.ca/lifestyle/quebec-city-residents-join-global-backlash-against-overtourism-1.4437859?cache=yes%FclipId%3D104069%Fot%3DAjaxLayout%FautoPlay%3Dtrue%FclipId%3D373266%FautoPlay%3Dtrue%3FclipId%3D68597%FautoPlay%3Dtrue%3FautoPlay%3Dtrue%3FautoPlay-3Dtrue)


“Has tourism killed Dubrovnik?” (https://www.telegraph.co.uk/travel/destinations/europe/croatia/dubrovnik/articles/dubrovnik-overtourism-2019/)
The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), which acts as an advisory body to the World Heritage Centre, has also expressed concern about the issue of mass tourism at some sites. At the 19th General Assembly in New Delhi/India this topic was brought up in connection with the Florence Declaration on Cultural Heritage Conservation and Sustainable Tourism for Development. A whole set of measures was agreed upon, including one specifically, the “Regulation to counter over-tourism in historic towns and cities and iconic World Heritage sites” (19GA Agenda item 6–4 Resolutions on other heritage issues; Resolution 19GA 2017/20).

Regulation ultimately has to answer two crucial questions: firstly, how many tourists can a WHS “carry” without harming the quality of the experience or the site itself; and secondly, how many visitors are required for there to be an economic benefit to the stakeholders of a WHS?

In this instance, sustainability might have to be interpreted as finding a long lasting balance between heritage conservation and commercial use within the tourism industry. Although no two WHSs are alike, they all do share the challenge of reconciling the opposing views concerning visitation and conservation. These views can differ greatly depending on the degree to which a WHS is threatened and able to accommodate visitor numbers. This comes down to understanding the carrying capacity of a site.

Defining tangible resource limits (crowding, carrying capacity) is necessary to prevent the overuse and destruction of heritage assets. A hosting population will only have a welcoming attitude towards tourists if limits are kept. This will not only benefit the life of the host but also the experience of the visitor in a touristic place. Yet recent tourist developments and openings of new tourist markets have led to excessive visitor numbers in some places. Residents are suffering from the consequences of these temporary and seasonal tourism peaks. For instance, the reduced access to amenities has brought about permanent changes in their lifestyles and their general well-being. These frustrations can be transferred on to visitors who then leave with a negative experience.

The issues around “over-tourism” are complex; they are heavily laden with emotions because of the harm caused to landscapes, the enormous burden placed on both locals and infrastructure and the pollution generated either physically or visually. McKinsey (2017) identifies five major problems linked to tourist overcrowding: 1.) alienated local residents; 2.) a degraded tourist experience; 3.) an overloaded infrastructure; 4.) damage to nature; 5.) and threats to culture and heritage. Most probably, over-tourism is a side effect of the unprecedented affluence and hyper-mobility of modern day societies. Whereas global travel supply chains may prosper – as in the case of the international cruise ship industry that daily delivers thousands of passengers to ports near historic cities and heritage sites – locals in some places have tourism-phobia because they have to bear the brunt of tourism growth in terms of the rising costs of housing and in real estate speculation. AirBnBs, for example, have been legitimately accused of reducing
housing affordability and displacing residents. Small-sized WHCs suffer the most from these phenomena as cultural tourism naturally focuses on “destinations of desire” like Venice, Dubrovnik, Florence, Bruges, Visby, Amsterdam, Salzburg, Hallstatt and Český Krumlov, to name only a few.

The visual signs of overcrowding due to uncontrolled tourism can be traffic jams, pedestrian congestion in narrow city lanes and an overall suboptimal experience of an, otherwise, high quality tourism product. Managing visitor numbers through strict limits on accessibility to city centres for cars and motor coaches may mitigate the problem. Ever since unbounded individual mobility created a rapidly expanding market for the tourism industry, city administrators and destination managers have quickly learned there are definite limits to this growth. Prioritizing the welfare of local residents over the needs of the global tourism supply chain is vital. Utmost consideration must be given to ensuring visitor numbers do not exceed a destination’s carrying capacity. The tourism industry, too, must realize its responsibility in ensuring product development is balanced between optimal experiences for tourist and commensurate benefits for locals. Similarly, tourists must do their part in making travel choices that are sensitive to the places they visit and the inhabitants who live in and around them. It is apparent that tourism is part of a wider destination management system – in line with the Historic Urban Landscape Approach – that takes into consideration transport and mobility, the preservation of spaces, the local economy and housing, among other aspects of daily life. Needless to say, tourism, when carefully planned and managed, can certainly facilitate the goals of the World Heritage Convention in preserving cultural and natural heritage, maintaining intercultural respect and expressing appreciation.

4 Balancing – A Mitigation Strategy for Problems

Within the framework of the Barcelona Declaration of Tourism and Cultural Heritage (2019) – an outcome of the European Year of Cultural Heritage 2018 – the term “balance” plays a pivotal role in the urban planning process. “In the search for an adequate balance between tourism activities, cultural heritage and impacts on the local community, better management of tourism/culture initiatives is the obvious solution but at the same time it is one of the greatest challenges.” As such, the Declaration acknowledges the complexity of managing tourism/culture initiatives and draws a more sophisticated picture than just balancing visitor expectations and inhabitant needs. The reality is that urban heritage involves a wide variety of stakeholders interested in heritage-related urban management and planning processes and a great number of people are affected, often forming a silent majority. Their concerns or needs also have to be met. Balancing in this case is more than just implementing tools and interventions that address visitor management, restrictions, pricing, diffusion of tourists and signage. It is there to promote a proper code of conduct (City of Regensburg; Ripp 2011, 39).
The most recent, comprehensive interpretation of this concept has been applied to Amsterdam. The program "Stad in Balans" (City in Balance) includes studies in user impact, measures to resolve consequent problems and trials of different policy actions. According to the program manager Claartje van Ette (2018), the studies, measures and trials affirm that tourism is an important economic sector of Amsterdam. In 2015, visitors spent 6.3 billion Euros in the city; from 2005 to 2017 the number of visitors increased from 11 million to 18 million; and the worldwide trend of rapid growth in tourism is predicted to bring more tourists to the cultural centre of the Netherlands. Approximately 10% of all jobs in the city are tourism related, attested by the wide variety of outstanding museums, shops, restaurants, attractions and other facilities. Although there was broad citizen support for tourism industry growth after the 2008 economic crisis, this changed in 2014 when the economy recovered and the number of visitors began to increase. The invisible tourism burden became more and more visible.
The problems resulting from the high number of visitors was particularly apparent in the streets around main tourism attractions and the red light district – all of them densely inhabited. Some parts of Amsterdam’s historic city centre with its narrow streets and waterways are simply incapable of dealing with large numbers of people and overcrowding is the result. When local residents increasingly reported that their neighbourhoods were changing and their quality of life was under pressure, the municipal government took action. Unwanted tourist related developments were targeted – ranging from simple nuisances to overcrowding, rude behaviour, shops and services focused only on visitors, and illegal hotels, etc. It was not enough to simply spread visitors across the city or to influence visitor itineraries. A lasting solution needed to be found to tackle the conflicts between different user groups. Wide ranging measures were applied to encourage balanced use of the city; new rules were introduced to regulate or sometimes even prohibit particular kinds of tourist activities and facilities.

The program specifically followed four main strategies. One is to maintain the quality and diversity of stores and facilities. Since 2017 no new tourist shops have been allowed to open in the city centre. The municipality has designated a number of areas, including all popular areas, as exclusionary to any new hotel permits. Private holiday accommodations are allowed, but only to a maximum of four guests up to 30 days a year. Landlords have to also register their property and pay tax on
the respective rental income. This is all in an effort to clamp down on illegal holiday rentals. Visitors, too, have to pay a higher tourist tax. The second strategy is to regulate tourist activities and to reduce nuisances. Corresponding measures include restrictions on certain vehicles (horse-drawn carriages, ricksha taxis, segways etc.), stricter rules for guided tours, and awareness raising campaigns on what is acceptable behaviour for young Dutch and British male visitors. The third strategy is to spread tourists out of the city and across the region. Amsterdam Marketing, accordingly, promotes attractions in the surrounding neighbourhoods, outside of the crowded city centre (Visit Amsterdam, See Holland). Strategy four aims to create more public space in busy areas by redesigning streets and redirecting traffic flows. Motor coaches are to be kept out of the city centre, car free and parking free zones are to be expanded, and the public transportation system is to be noticeably enhanced. Bicycles are to be the main form of transportation along the Gracht, the artificial waterways of the city. These rings of canals, masterpieces of hydraulic engineering, were constructed in the 17th century. Reducing vehicular traffic to mainly bicycles along these waterways allows for greater appreciation of the famous canal-houses; their setting forms an exclusive residential area, which has been inscribed onto the UNESCO World Heritage List in 2010 (Vlaardingerbroek 2016).

These strategies can only be applied when there is open dialogue between a municipal government and various interest groups. In Amsterdam’s case, this was made possible by a think tank provision within the “City in Balans” program. It involved residents of different backgrounds and ages from all of Amsterdams’s neighbourhoods. It allowed them to share ideas and to find possible solutions to the problems resulting from the impact of tourism. Participants worked together with a special task force from the tourism sector composed of representatives from museums, tourism businesses and the municipality. Their objective was to better coordinate the services and programs of the local cultural institutions and the tourism and hospitality industry. To clearly understand what impact tourism has on the city, a comprehensive process was implemented involving research, permanent monitoring, quantitative data collection (e.g. resident & visitor numbers, job surveys) and qualitative data collection (e.g. the opinions of residents and entrepreneurs). In anticipation of an increasing number of visitors in the future, the City of Amsterdam definitely considers tourism a part of its international character even though there could be negative consequences looming. A renewed balance is therefore required in which residents are given priority and visitors remain welcome (van Ette 2018; Richard/Marques 2018).

As such precedence should not be given to selling the city, or re-making it four tourists, but rather finding new ways of sharing its positive attributes. This idea has specifically been applied to the City of Barcelona’s civic codes and regulations for tourist facilities in that they consider tourists as temporary citizens. The Catalan capital is another cultural and heritage hot spot for tourists, but has witnessed
some violent reactions against tour buses and cars. Here, too, a program was set into action to deal with resident grievances. To get a more detailed picture of the state of tourism in the city a public forum was created where the municipality makes all data available to its citizens (e.g. number of visitors, available beds, occupancy rate, and added value created etc.). The aim was to develop a clear understanding of the city – one that is shared among the different groups that use it – and, more importantly, to increase the quality of life of residents. “The Barcelona approach can be seen as an attempt to re-vision the relationship between culture, residents and tourists, and to move to a situation in which all share a proactive and beneficial relationship” (Richards/Marques 2018, 19). This move correlates quite well with the developing debate about the “right to the city” and the notion of citizenship versus consumption. The post-industrial growth of cities has shifted the role of city centres from productive (working class) spaces to consumptive spaces, dominated by the middle class. In recent years, tourism and post-industrial industries, such as finance, have re-valued city centres as productive spaces, with the most visible industry being tourism. Space theorists, like Henry Lefebvre (1993), have provided evidence that cities have always been spaces shared between different groups, and that conflicts have arisen only when space is scarce. Currently, the “right to the city” discourse is being weighed against the “right to tourism.” This is a delicate issue in the context of WHSs, as the right to visit these exquisite places should be considered a human right that is inviolable. However, the "right to tourism“ has its limits, especially when the cultural rights of locals, who are being inundated by tourists, are ignored or neglected. A kind of tourism-phobia can appear among residents, which is identified by increased rejection of tourists and hostility towards them – in both instances predominantly irrational.

The on-going public debates around over-tourism and tourism-phobia (Milano 2017) ignore the more diverse and complex conflicts behind the scenes. There are continual controversies about urban development, the quality of life and the commodification of urban space that go beyond the processes of gentrification and resident displacement because of the touristic transformation of inner-city neighbourhoods. At WHSs suffering from over-tourism destination managers and policy makers, fearful of the negative consequences from unregulated tourist numbers, have allowed for Destination Management Organizations (DMOs) to supersede Tourism Marketing Organizations – as what happened in Amsterdam. DMOs have a far broader perspective that can be used in urban planning, zoning and / or public transport system interventions.

Richards/Marques (2018, 26) argue that sharing a city results in a greater cultural dynamic and diversity, more cultural exchange and open contacts between people of different origins, and new connections between locals and temporary residents. Then again, the tendencies to consume culture quickly and easily lead to the simplification and superficial presentation of cultural phenomena. “Without a deeper understanding of the culture around them, mobile populations, and tourists...
in particular, will take away their own “fleeting” impressions, but may lack understanding of what they see.”

A broader cultural concept that envisages visitors and locals as the beneficiaries of creative place-making has been implemented in the Dutch city of ‘s-Hertogenbosch. The small provincial city placed itself on the world stage with a program of events themed on the life and works of the medieval painter Hieronymus Bosch, who was born, had worked, and had died in the city. The 500th anniversary of his death provided the catalyst to use the genius loci as a brand for the city. Through events, new administrative models, community development programs, innovative housing, new transport solutions and other creative strategies, the city became a cultural tourist destination (Richards/Duif 2019). WHCs with their vast cultural treasures can learn from these networked activities and apply this knowledge to their own programming, thereby enhancing their contribution to urban development.

5 Towards Sustainable Tourism and Development

World Heritage is conceptually a central component of tourism and it accents both sustainable tourism and development. WHSs call for the development of quality standards appropriate to their assets as they are dedicated to all of mankind. In other words, there is a great need for a legal framework that prevents the destruction and/or misuse of the heritage. UNESCO requires that WHSs have management plans and that they be implemented. Moreover, WHSs need to have a clear vision and sound strategies for developing tourism.

Although regulations around preservation and protection are legal preconditions for the responsible use of architectural heritage, there is no guarantee that every stakeholder will comply to them. This is because old towns are highly coveted spaces for value investments and speculation in the real estate market. Many WHSs have shown that legislative protection is not enough. Italy’s most valuable assets from antiquity and the renaissance are suffering from decay; many of France’s heritage sites are for sale; and the United Kingdom’s sites are being divided into “heritage cash cows” and “charity objects” (van Oers 2015). In some cases neither public administrators nor politicians have any valid instruments or official authority to balance—carefully and responsibly—the development and preservation of the most valuable features their communities have (McKercher/du Cros 2002). To effectively deal with this issue, long-term urban plans are required, extending beyond the World Heritage perimeter and buffer zone.
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If there is commitment to the overarching goal of sustainability, it is necessary to develop indicators for appropriate tourism activities with all regional World Heritage participants. What generally happens in tourism, will especially affect the sensitivities of World Heritage and cultural tourism since the long-term preservation of existing heritage is considered priority. Tourism is on a sustainable path when:

- it can exist over the longterm because resources are developed and utilized sparingly;
- it is culturally compatible because it expresses respect for local conventions and rites, renounces commercializing that exploits and adapts to local standards;
- it is socially balanced because the benefits and drawbacks are equally spread, regional disparities are prevented and locals are involved in negotiations and decisions;
- it is ecologically viable because it has the lowest possible impact on the environment, protects biodiversity and promotes environmental awareness;
- it is economically sensible and productive because it profits the local and national economy and is a significant income generator for the local population (Luger 2008).

The United Nations World Trade Organization (UNWTO), in collaboration with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, has developed the concept of sustainability into a program. Its overall objectives fall under the following five areas:
• Integrating sustainable tourism principles into the mechanisms of the World Heritage Convention;
• Strengthening an enabling environment by advocating policies, strategies, frameworks and tools that support sustainable tourism as an important vehicle for protecting and managing cultural and natural heritage of OUV;
• Promoting broad stakeholder engagement in the planning, development and management of sustainable tourism that follows a destination approach to heritage conservation and focuses on empowering local communities;
• Providing World Heritage stakeholders with the capacity and the tools to manage tourism efficiently, responsibly and sustainably based on the local context and needs;
• Promoting quality tourism products and services that encourage responsible behaviour among all stakeholders and foster understanding and appreciation of the concept of OUV and the protection of World Heritage (whc.unesco.org/en/tourism).

A pilot study of the World Nature Forum/Swiss Alps Jungfrau-Aletsch and the UNESCO Chair at the University of Salzburg linked tourism and World Heritage with the objective of developing positive synergies that allow for “benchmark learning” in sustainability. It proved the hypothesis that tourism makes a valuable contribution to preserving a WHS when integrated in a comprehensive regional/urban planning instrument aimed at sustainability (World Nature Forum 2012).

6 Changing Contexts – Challenges and Opportunities of Urban World Heritage Sites

The challenges WHSs face and the parameters they find themselves in are fluid and continuously changing. Important parameters when considering European heritage sites include:
• increasing use of sustainable energy
• changing retail structure and retail patterns – due to changes in consumer behaviour,
• changing ownership because of economic forces in the market – owners are often located elsewhere and / or are institutional like in the case of stock funds,
• growing inventories of listed buildings – as in the case of Germany,
• digitalizing within cities – a challenge to preservation efforts,
• threatening trends in historic urban landscapes – for example high rise construction,
• developing new forms of green mobility which call for new infrastructure – often at the edge of historic towns (railways, parkades, bicycle infrastructure, harbours),
• varying political and economic circumstances (Deutscher Staedtetag 2019).
Above and beyond these parameters and challenges, in recent years urban heritage has ranked high on political agenda. The European Year of Cultural Heritage 2018 – albeit not as successful as some had hoped – helped raise greater awareness of Europe’s cultural heritage. At present, the European Commission is in the process of mainstreaming culture and cultural heritage across its various initiatives and programs. This process reached a milestone with the European Framework for Cultural Heritage which facilitates a great number of activities that continue to be realized after the European Year of Cultural Heritage 2018 (https://ec.europa.eu/culture/content/european-framework-action-cultural-heritage_en). In addition to the Commission, other global organizations have also specifically recognized the connection between urban heritage and development (UNESCO 2016). Even so, the existing structures in the preservation sector are still determined by “the authorized heritage discourse,” as Laura Jane Smith (2006) calls it, and are centred around the material aspects of heritage.

Nonetheless, the important role of communities has been recognized in the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention – Council of Europe 2005). Under “Aims of the Convention,” Article 1e reads: “the conservation of cultural heritage and its sustainable use have human development and quality of life as their goal.” In the “Aims,” society is referred to as “constantly evolving,” given that there is “the need to put people and human values at the centre of an enlarged and cross-disciplinary concept of cultural heritage,” and that there is “the need to involve everyone in society in the ongoing process of defining and managing cultural heritage” (Council of Europe 2005). This reformed view has yet to fully establish itself at academic institutions and the same holds true for capacity building activities in the cultural heritage and tourism sectors. However, it definitely has the potential to redefine the relations between tourists, general users and stakeholders in urban heritage sites.

The special requirements for UNESCO WHSs that arise from the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 1972) and its Operational Guidelines also have the potential, sadly, to complicate site management. A case in point is the requirement of visual integrity; it presents a constant challenge for WHCs, such as Liverpool (Rodwell 2015) and St. Petersburg (Bumbaru et al. 2008). The construction of high-rise buildings in these cities can often harm the OUV and, more specifically, the visual integrity of a site. Infrastructure, such as for transportation, is another common threat to the OUV of WHCs. For example, the construction of the Waldschlösschen Bridge in Dresden resulted in the delisting of the city’s World Heritage (Rodwell 2015). Other urban interventions that can be categorized as infrastructural include parkades, railways stations and railway lines and these, too, have the potential to harm the OUV of a site. Currently, infrastructural interventions are the focus of many cities as they shift towards new forms of urban mobility (Bosetti et al. 2014). In order to coordinate the various challenges, threats and changes in urban development, a systemic understanding of a city and its heritage is required.
By applying an integrated approach and the strong coordinating skills of a heritage site manager, different divisions within public administrations can work together towards the benefits of sustainable development. Integrative support is also required for the growing involvement of civil society organizations in heritage-related processes.

The first step is to anchor participation in the heritage-related processes by communicating the heritage values and measures to local communities, stakeholders and other users of the city, including tourists. The task is complex as the means and structures of communication have changed dramatically over the past decade with the meteoric rise of social media and the blurring of roles between message producers and receivers. For WHCs this poses an enormous challenge: their communication and interpretation activities need to be adapted and refined to be much more open and bi-directional. The values of the World Heritage fabric have to be communicated repeatedly anew to address a constantly changing society (demographically and otherwise). Moreover, they need to employ clear narratives that are attractive to the various users and stakeholders.

At the same time, migration, integration and greater cultural diversity are becoming ever so more relevant to WHCs, especially as these factors become topics of climate change. Cities have always been places of long-term immigration and are characterized by a great diversity of cultures and lifestyles. This diversity should be considered opportune and be promoted by various civic institutions (Deutscher Staedtetag 2019,11).

More pressing, now, is the challenge of increased tourist numbers in some WHCs. Because of their general interpretation of the World Heritage Convention, tourism authorities argue that WHSs should be accessible to all. However, on closer look at the original document a slightly different interpretation can be made. The World Heritage Convention holds to its core “identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage” (UNESCO 1972, article 4&5). The term “presentation” does not necessarily imply access for everybody in an unlimited and unregulated way. Furthermore, if “presentation” did imply unlimited tourism and it was compromising the three other objectives (protection, conservation and transmission for future generations), the sustainability of the World Heritage would be under threat. Therefore, limited access for the purpose of safeguarding World Heritage is justifiable and fully in line with UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention. Managing visitor numbers by introducing a time-slot ticketing system is more than reasonable; this system has already long been in place at sites like Schönbrunn Palace in Vienna and the Palace of Versailles outside of Paris. More recently, it has been introduced to Alhambra in Granada, once more to mitigate the mass numbers of tourists. At all of these sites this system ensures a higher quality visitor experience, appropriate to the culturally prestigious World Heritage designation.
Managing urban heritage has become more difficult and complex for local authorities. Because of the ever-expanding and changing understanding of urban heritage as a system and process – essentially belonging to local communities (Ripp 2018) – authorities are struggling with it because their administrative divisional structures are still focused on the preservation of historic buildings. To take on a new role in this altered environment requires changes to managerial processes. This new role needs to handle interpretation and participatory activities, integrative and cross-sectoral projects, and cooperation with external partners such as NGOs, educational institutions, the media, etc. The traditional line of thought on preservation kept the heritage asset as its main objective, but now this is being supplanted by the idea that heritage is a resource for urban development and other processes (Vandesande/Van Balen 2016; Blagojevic/Maruna 2017); moreover, current thought holds that heritage preservation of any kind only makes sense when a local community can create cultural, social or economic value from it and benefit accordingly (Council of Europe 2005).

The new role of site managers is difficult to fully define as it involves many aspects of mediation, facilitation, communication, cooperation and project management. Nevertheless, a new and different style of managing is required that sets itself apart from the traditional role played in heritage preservation.

Heritage preservation and management have always been closely associated with political power. Those who define the terms of what heritage is and what it is not are usually those in command. Accordingly, a site manager has an influential position that is also political in nature, and he or she should be aware of the accountability that goes with it.

To fully appreciate urban heritage as a complex system requires professionals who are flexible in understanding and interpreting their job roles. Only then will doors open to a multitude of opportunities that require cooperation, interpretation and development.

7 Conclusion
Managing World Heritage is cross-cutting in function and involves a range of actors including field-related specialists, institutions and networks, not to mention the residents in and around a respective site. The close cooperation of all actors and their involvement in the decision-making processes are indispensable right from the start. These are important to securing the Outstanding Universal Value of a World Heritage designation and to realizing the full potential of a site / World Heritage City. Even though respective residents are to be the primary beneficiaries, a variety of differing interests and demands must be collectively addressed in the pursuit of heritage preservation and sustainable development (Erlewein 2017; Lutz/Koch 2017). This cross-cutting approach is an important principle of the UN’s New Urban Agenda (Habitat III) setting the agenda for sustainable urban development (UNESCO 2016).
On-site tasks call for the strong presence of a site manager, whose role is to coordinate, personally and institutionally, all kinds of matters. He or she needs to show leadership in designing and implementing projects and processes ranging from heritage interpretation to stakeholder mediation, each possibly having contesting requirements and interests. He or she must also have an innovative drive to respond to current challenges like climate change or housing shortages and to deal with related issues such as local population growth or migration. Although managing urban heritage involves a variety of tasks, most important is the constant, overarching aim and mission: safeguarding the heritage site.

Inscription onto the World Heritage List would not be possible without the historic urban fabric. As such the processes and activities around preservation are inevitable. Then again, this does not mean, ‘nothing can be changed.’ Instead, managing a heritage site / city calls for objectives, actions and interventions that acknowledge the heritage as a complex system. Implementing these elements requires flexibility, dedication, an open attitude and a holistic understanding of the processes involved. Failing that, managers will not be able to integrate the various urban actors and agencies.

Specialists from various disciplines who carefully analyze the developments in this interactive field, speak of a thoughtful management of change, which is responsive to the historic environment and to the social and cultural processes that have created it. It is a necessary contribution to sustainability which is considered import not just in guiding decisions about heritage conservation but most of all in providing a long-term holistic framework for interpreting how economic, social, cultural and biological systems fit together (Throsby 2003). The concept of sustainability is recognized as having great potential for “bringing heritage conservation, tourism and economic development into a balanced and constructive relationship” (Loulanski/Loulanski 2011, 843).

Without question it is of utmost importance to valourize heritage; and tourism in World Heritage Cities is the most profitable means to this end. Ensuring in the long run both a positive experience for visitors and a source of income for local residents is site management. Not only is it there to regulate tourist numbers, but also to preserve the authenticity and integrity of a site. It follows that close cooperation between heritage management authorities, business sectors and civil society is obligatory. Site managers have to frame the concept in which market forces can develop for whatever industry – tourism, construction, etc. Of highest relevance, though, is a holistic understanding of urban heritage management that leads towards good governance and contributes to a network of measures for sustainable development.
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At a glance

The European Commission announced the European Year of Cultural Heritage under the motto **Sharing Heritage** (2018). With its World Heritage List, which is popular worldwide, since 1972 UNESCO has accumulated more than 1000 inscriptions of World Heritage Sites. Since then, the international quality label UNESCO World Heritage has experienced a multi-layered revaluation. However, a spatial imbalance in the real access of UNESCO World Heritage Sites is discernible.

The primary question first of all is what concrete meaning does sharing have in the context of the accessibility of a world heritage site? Further research questions will contribute to answering this introductory question:

- What spatial conditions exist in the global distribution?
- Which possibilities of participation in the World Heritage are actually given?
- What is the relationship between the number of World Heritage Sites and tourism?

The contribution addresses the spatial disparities of the real access to World Heritage with its problem-related questions using secondary statistical data from supranational organizations. The visualization of the numerical distribution of the World Heritage Site by means of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) based cartograms reveals the current imbalance of a possible participation. In addition to raising awareness and developing a relationship between World Heritage Sites as tourism drivers, the aim is to provide impulses for decision-makers and a basis for discussion of solution strategies.

1 From shared trust to shared responsibility

The natural, cultural and mixed sites recognised by UNESCO as particularly worthy of protection are designated as World Heritage Sites. These fulfill the central criterion of the 1972 World Heritage Convention (WHC) by demonstrating "outstanding universal value". The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the WHC note that the parameter of "integrity" should be satisfied by all nominated properties (UNESCO 2017), the parameter of "authenticity" mostly be proved by cultural properties. It is precisely the aspect that World Heritage Sites are com-
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1 From *shared trust* to *shared responsibility*

The natural, cultural and mixed sites recognised by UNESCO as particularly worthy of protection are designated as World Heritage Sites. These fulfill the central criterion of the 1972 World Heritage Convention (WHC) by demonstrating “outstanding universal value”. The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the WHC note that the parameter of “integrity” should be satisfied by all nominated properties (UNESCO 2017), the parameter of “authenticity” mostly be proved by cultural properties. It is precisely the aspect that World Heritage Sites are com-
mitted to authentic cultural and natural experiences of integrity that seems to pre-
destine them for the use of a shared travel experience worldwide (Knöbl 2015).

The term sharing alone triggers associations and links with the economy of sharing, which is essentially based on cooperation and trust.

This economy based on “sharing” is attracting increased scientific attention, especially in tourism research, since tourist services such as accommodation, transport and gastronomy are often in the foreground of mediation services (Linne 2014; Kagermeier, Köller and Stors 2015). The distinction criterion of the economic sharing model is to share exchange or lend goods and services with others. In social and scientific discourse, the term “communal consumption” (Linne 2014, 5; Botsman and Rogers 2011) and “collaborative consumption” (Kagermeier, Köller and Stors 2015, 117) are often used for this purpose. Mutual trust is an indispensable requirement for the internationally operating companies of the Sharing Economy, especially in the accommodation and transport segment (Airbnb 2019; Frevert 2017; Slee 2016). This sharing model expresses hope for more sustainable forms of the economy, a fairer distribution of goods, new international networks, fears of commercialisation of the living environment and the ruin of entire economic sectors (Ströhl and Blaumer 2017; Slee 2016). The postulate of the economic sharing concept is “access not ownership” of things (Scholz 2017, 187; Slee 2016, 11).

It can already be seen that the sharing of the economy is more about trust and the sharing of World Heritage is more about shared responsibility. In addition, both concepts have a common desire for more sustainable consumption. In the case of World Heritage Sites, this is to be achieved by promoting “cautious and highly qualified tourism on a scale compatible with historical monuments” (UNESCO World Heritage Sites Germany 2019a). This “soft tourism” under sustainable conditions is provided by the offers of the “economy of access” through the use of brownfield resources and a prudent use of shared space (Slee 2016, 12). The special feature of collective consumption is that it unfolds its effect only through joint participation (Linne 2014).

However, this sharing phenomenon is not an innovation of Internet trade, but rather a “basic constant of our human coexistence” (Lehmann and Ebert 2017, 9). The introductory question arises as to the significance of sharing in the context of real access to world heritage. Is the World Heritage listed by UNESCO shareable in principle in this context? In order to operationalize this question, the following leading research questions arise:

- What are the actual spatial conditions in the global distribution for participation in the World Heritage?
- How can World Heritage be shared?
- What is the relationship between the number of World Heritage Sites and tourism?

A shared heritage is usually about the common cultural heritage. Sharing gains the importance of active participation. The aim is to clarify whether, given the current
distribution of World Heritage sites, spatial access is difficult or possible for active participation. The causes of the worldwide and categorical (cultural) findings of spatial disparities will be identified and ideas for remedies and solutions developed.

These questions are of particular relevance to society and cultural policy, as the European Commission has announced the European Year of Cultural Heritage under the motto Sharing Heritage (2018). Numerous projects and initiatives are coordinated in the member states under the leitmotif “Become part and share” (German National Committee on the Protection of Monuments 2019, Die Welt 2018). The aim of this theme year is to make Europe's cultural heritage visible from now on and to let others participate in it.

In the present article Sharing Heritage, cartograms are used to examine the global distribution disparities of World Heritage sites and, building on this, real spatial access to World Heritage sites is discussed as a possible hurdle for immediate sharing.

At the centre of a Sharing Heritage is the fact that it is mostly the common cultural heritage that is at stake. Sharing is more likely to gain the meaning of owning something together and of active participation in culture. Awareness-raising is promoted, which connects one with the other, “recognizing their potential for identity, participation and development and also making it usable” (Parzinger 2017, 267). The responsibility for the preservation of the World Heritage should be shared by as many people as possible (Knöbl 2015).

In this way, in the context of Sharing Heritage, questions about the global and categorical (cultural) disparities in the global distribution of World Heritage sites are addressed. The visualization of the identified distribution disparities is made recognizable for decision-makers and provides a basis for discussion for the development of suitable solution strategies.

2 From the Protection Convention to Sharing UNESCO World Heritage

The idea of protecting exceptional universal cultural and natural assets worldwide has experienced an enormous surge in popularity and multi-faceted enhancement in recent years. This is also reflected in the dynamic list maintained by the Special Agency of The United Nations: The Organization for Education, Science and Culture (UNESCO), which now lists the almost unmanageable number of currently (2019) 1092 World Heritage Sites (UNESCO 2019c). But how does the principle of economic sharing, based on trust, fit in with an understanding of the sharing of common responsibility for cultural and natural assets across States Parties within the framework of a UNESCO Convention? Can the notion of a “Shared UNESCO World Heritage” really be spoken about in this way? How can participation and thus mediation take place? UNESCO itself uses a linguistic style close to the idea of sharing: “What makes the concept of World Heritage exceptional is its universal application. World Heritage sites belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespec-
tive of the territory on which they are located” (UNESCO 2019a). In addition, UNESCO provides an interactive map on its homepage, which allows virtual sharing as access to the UNESCO World Heritage worldwide (UNESCO 2019e).

This sharing, however, is more in a consciously informed about the common global heritage (UNESCO 2019c). However, for active participation in the shared World Heritage, both virtual and real spatial access should be guaranteed worldwide. Albert and Ringbeck (2015) express the wish that humanity's heritage, must be made accessible to people in such a way that each individual can identify with the world heritage, protect it and use it sustainably.

3 Research Design and Visualization

This contribution is to be classified as secondary research. With his central question of worldwide spatial participation in World Heritage, the article accesses the databases of the major supranational organizations UNESCO and the UN Organization for World Tourism (UNWTO).

Initially, the 167 countries were listed among the 193 States Parties of UNESCO that had a World Heritage inscription in one of the UNESCO World Heritage lists (German Commission for UNESCO 2019). The data collected were retrieved online by UNESCO (Paris). A Geographic Information System (GIS) is used to visualize the distribution by means of cartograms, in which the geometry of the States Parties is related to their number of World Heritage sites in the respective country. Cartograms are particularly suitable for the investigation of thematic representations. The size in the representation is not selected in proportion to the actual geometric size, but as a function of the selected attribute. In this case, the selected attribute is the number of World Heritage sites.

This map preparation as cartogram is didactically particularly suitable to illustrate a presumed imbalance. The scientific utility of such cartograms is widely acknowledged, but there are only few empirical studies on their reception. However, an interest in provocative potential is attributed to them (Spektrum der Wissenschaft Verlagsgesellschaft 2001). In this way it can be understood whether the UNESCO World Heritage Site is also shareable for all people everywhere in the sense of spatially accessible.

In addition to a global overview, this study is intended to provide a categorical view of cultural heritage in terms of the distribution of World Heritage. Accordingly, Europe is to be presented as the most important tourist destination due to its numerous cultural heritages (European Parliament 2011). This region will also be examined more closely in relation to international tourist arrivals under the aspect of UNESCO World Heritage. The data of the international tourist arrivals on geographical basis of the “UNWTO-Region Europe” are made available online by the UNWTO (UNWTO 2017).
4 Disparities in the Distribution of UNESCO World Heritage Sites

In the following, the above questions about global and cultural spatial distribution, participation and tourist arrivals will be answered.

4.1 Sharing UNESCO World Heritage

Among the 1092 World Heritage Sites (as of 2019) are 845 cultural sites, 209 natural sites and 38 sites listed as mixed heritage in both lists (Culture and Nature) (UNESCO 2019c). Although UNESCO is always committed to preserving the world heritage, much of the listed heritage is still concentrated in Europe. Thus UNESCO had to hear the accusation of a “Eurocentric evaluation of World Heritage” (Albert 2002, 35) at an early stage. Distribution disparities are investigated in detail by Steiner and Frey in their study “Imbalance of World Heritage List” (2011). The authors focus on achieving the Global Strategy objectives (1994) for a more balanced, representative and credible list. The objectives were an improved categorical distribution of cultural and natural heritage sites, a distribution that also takes into account the economic development of a country and an improved continental distribution. In summary, the authors state that the Global Strategy was not successful in terms of balance and representativeness of the list. The continental distribution of sites has become even more unbalanced, and Europe's share has continued to grow (Steiner and Frey 2011). Cameron and Rössler (2013) also come to this conclusion in their chronological documentation of the history of the World Heritage Convention. They show the number of inscriptions, the categorical balance of culture, nature and mixed world heritage as well as the regional distribution of the global heritage with much background knowledge, but only up to the year 2000. Since 2011, there have been no current findings on the distribution problem of World Heritage.

The accusation of a dominant European participation in the World Heritage Programme also appears justified in so far as the functional administrative centering of the most important World Heritage organizations is taken into account: UNESCO (Paris), International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM, Rome), International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS, Paris), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN, Gland/Switzerland). All key organizations have their headquarters in Europe. Further valid reasons for the existing imbalance in the “popularization of the World Heritage Programme” in Europe, which has since increased, are identified above all as a lack of knowledge and competence for the complex elaboration of a nomination application for World Heritage Sites in developing countries (Albert and Ringbeck 2015, 91).

The disparities of the worldwide “shared” UNESCO World Heritage become particularly visible through the distorted representation of a cartogram (see fig.1), without influencing the topological relationships.
A global view of the 10 States Parties with the most World Heritage Sites, i.e. the number of listed cultural and natural assets, reveals that 5 of these States Parties alone are located in Europe (see fig. 2).

The global perspective also shows that, in addition to a north-south divide, there is still a strong imbalance in the distribution of World Heritage Sites. Germany and...
4.2 Sharing UNESCO Cultural World Heritage

UNESCO has 514 inscriptions in the World Heritage List for the UN region “Europe and North America” (UNESCO 2019c). According to this regional division, a total of 440 belong to the cultural properties, 63 to the natural properties and 11 to the mixed heritage category. In the global distribution of the UNESCO World Cultural Heritage, the European concentration is highlighted as inflation (fig. 3). Germany contributes to this Eurocentring with 44 World Heritage Sites, including 3 World Natural Heritage Sites (Messel Pit, Wadden Sea and the ancient and primeval beech forests) (German Commission for UNESCO 2019).

The numerical imbalance of the States Parties participating with cultural sites has also led to the public misinterpretation that the World Heritage Convention is a pure “cultural convention” (Plachter, Kruse and Kruckenberg 2006, 8). The lack of balance of the global heritage is not only reflected in the lack of balance between cultural and natural heritage, but also in an imbalance of the individual themes within the list (Braun 2007). This calls into question the representativeness of the World Heritage List.

A Sharing Cultural World Heritage is made possible not only in Europe but also in China, India and Mexico due to the large number of world cultural heritage
sites. Many African States Parties still have a relatively small number of inscribed cultural and natural sites on the World Heritage List. Continental Africa participates in the World Heritage Programme with only 52 cultural sites, 38 natural sites and 5 mixed World Heritage sites, i.e. a total of 95 sites. It thus has only 8.7% of the world's total number of World Heritage Sites (UNESCO 2019c).

4.3 Participation (Sharing)

A spatial proximity to world heritage sites initially only answers the fundamental question of access, but not in what form an active participation, a *sharing heritage* can be realised. To this end, Article 27 of the World Heritage Convention, which explicitly calls for the implementation of “education and information programmes”, formulates an educational mandate for World Heritage Sites (UNESCO 2019a). Since the beginning of 2000, educational institutions, World Heritage organizations and UNESCO World Heritage Sites have been devoting more and more attention to this issue (Ströter-Bender 2010). Although the protective function for the World Heritage Site should remain an original obligation, the educational function should be at least as important as the tourism function. In this way, an active participation in the World Heritage could be ensured – a *Sharing Heritage*. This educational development, in turn, is not yet equally developed internationally and nationally everywhere (Dippon 2012). A lack of information for visitors and the local population about the unique selling point, the significance and the special nature of the World Heritage Site is criticized (Eschig, 2008, 174). A “handbook” of the German Commission for UNESCO (German Commission for UNESCO 2018) is now systematically devoted to mediation work in information centres in the World Heritage and, in addition to physical accessibility through adapted mediation formats and methods, is intended to promote “accessibility for all” (2018, 59).

4.4 The example of World Heritage Tourism in Europe

The European area is predestined to show the relationship between the distribution of the UNESCO World Heritage Site and its international arrivals. The German National Tourist Board (GNT), in its forecast for 2030, describes Europe as “the world's largest destination” (GNT 2019). In an international comparison, Germany ranks first as a “cultural destination for Europeans” (GNT 2019).

An interaction between UNESCO predicate and international tourism development is usually difficult to prove statistically due to the bundle of motives. Therefore, there is no scientific consensus on the actual economic effects of the “tourist seal of approval of world renown” (Eschig, 2008, 174) and the global trademark “UNESCO World Heritage” (Adie, Hall and Prayag 2017, Williams 2010, King and, Prideaux 2010). A study conducted by the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs (BMVBS) and the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR) has focused on the relationship between heritage-friendly urban development funding and de facto tourism development. For this purpose,
East German UNESCO reference cities in particular were examined. Afterwards, only limited conclusions could be drawn about the effects of a UNESCO predication from the data of the statistical state offices. From the high proportion of overnight stays by foreigners in the UNESCO reference cities, it was nevertheless possible to interpret the “importance of this label for the foreign market” and to determine an “internationalisation in the demand streams” (BMVBS and BBR 2007, 28 and 90). In addition, the study showed that the UNESCO predicate has a high recognition value of 87%, that the respondents are aware of the significance of the predicate and that they assess this label positively without reservation (BMVBS and BBR 2007). Therefore, the following cartogram presents the geometry of the UNWTO region Europe, based on its World Heritage distribution, in relation to the number of international tourist arrivals in the same region (by coloring) (fig.4).

![Cartogram of UNESCO World Heritage and international tourist arrivals in Europe](image)

**Fig.4: Geometry of distribution of UNESCO World Heritage as well as international tourist arrivals (by coloring) in the UNWTO region Europe**

*Source: Own presentation, data basis: UNESCO, 2019c and UNWTO, 2017*

The figure above clearly shows that countries with a high number of international tourist arrivals (in millions) such as France (82,600), Spain (75,315), Italy (52,375), but also Germany (35,595) and the United Kingdom (35,814) as well as Turkey (30,289) and Greece (24,799) always have a high number of World Heritage sites (listed in brackets below) in 2019: France (44), Spain (47), Italy (54), Germany (44), Great Britain (31), Turkey (18), Greece (18). In an international study on whether the World Heritage Convention is a suitable tool for the protection of World Heritage, van der Aa states that the awarding of the title is more likely to be accompanied by an increase in the foreign guest segment. He sees the reason for this in the lower time budget of foreign tourists, the predicate
gives the places the international rating “worth seeing” (Van der Aa 2005, 112). Only Austria (28,121) and Poland (17,463) are characterized by a high number of international tourist arrivals, while Austria (10) and Poland (15) still have a relatively medium number of World Heritage Sites (UNESCO 2019c and UNWTO 2017). In Europe, spatial access, authentic encounter and participation is easily possible due to the accumulation of World Heritage sites. In this way, the jointly shared UNESCO World Heritage in the sense of Sharing UNESCO World Heritage is also one of the drivers of growing tourism in Europe.

A specific UNESCO World Heritage Tourism, as already announced by experts and site managers, is clearly emerging (Luger 2008, Dippon 2012, Knöbl 2015).

5 Solution approaches for a Shared UNESCO World Heritage

Numerous initiatives, programmes and measures have been developed in recent decades to reduce the disparities in the distribution and participation of World Heritage. It is “an ongoing priority” for the World Heritage Committee “to strive for an appropriate balance between the number of cultural and natural heritage properties on the World Heritage List” (DUK 2017, 20).

5.1 UNESCO’s approach to a solution

As part of the Global Strategy, a more representative thematically balanced and credible distribution of global world heritage was to be achieved as early as 1994. The number of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention has since risen from 139 (Albert and Ringbeck 2015) to 192 (UNESCO 2019a). New categories have been introduced to facilitate recognition in previously disadvantaged regions: cultural landscapes, cultural routes, industrial heritage, deserts, coasts and small islands (UNESCO 2019d). However, the number of possible nominations per State Party as well as the number of sites to be assessed annually by the World Heritage Committee was strictly limited (Albert and Ringbeck 2015).

Nevertheless, the current analysis results of the cartograms still show a global and categorical imbalance in the distribution of World Heritage. A worldwide participation in the UNESCO World Heritage, a Sharing UNESCO World Heritage is therefore still not possible for all people in real terms.

The UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of 2003 is a promising way out for States Parties that have so far been disadvantaged under the World Heritage Programme to also receive a coveted UNESCO cultural award (Hafstein 2018). This Convention should also be seen as the result of the recognition of an existing imbalance in the distribution of World Heritage (Walcher 2015). For example, this Convention aims to safeguard practices, ideas, knowledge and skills. An equivalence of tangible and intangible heritage should thus be made visible by this UNESCO predicate. The intangible cultural heritage
that has been honoured in this way is mostly tied to local and regional influences (Knöbl 2015). A geographical location of the traditional knowledge and skills is therefore usually also clearly possible. European Heritage scholars have been discussing the usability of Intangible Cultural Heritage for the purpose of tourism (Luger and Wöhler 2015; Camp, Eggmann & Taufer 2015). A responsible, cautious, theme-related staging of the Intangible Cultural Heritage seems necessary to generate an “experiential benefit” (Knöbl 2015, 85). There are now 508 entries on the “Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage”. This means that 122 States Parties already have this more recent UNESCO cultural predicate (UNESCO Section for Intangible Cultural Heritage 2019). Although no financial support is provided for recognition as an Intangible Cultural Heritage, it is expected to bring significant prestige and integration into a global community. It is regarded as a “tourist hope” for economically weak regions and for soft tourism (Walcher 2015, 75). A sharing of the Intangible Cultural Heritage is made possible on the UNESCO database according to content, significance and year of inclusion (UNESCO Section for Intangible Cultural Heritage 2019).

5.2 Digital sharing as a solution approach

Increasing digitization, which enables unlimited worldwide access and a new perspective on World Heritage mediation, also offers a promising approach to mitigating the impact of existing spatial access disparities. Current practical examples show that digital technologies such as apps and responsive websites are used to make world heritage accessible in this way. These apps usually contain multilingual audio guides, interactive maps and a calendar of events. In this way, for example, the Romanesque churches of Cologne and the World Heritage Site of the Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests can be presented in an informative way with the help of an app installed on the mobile phone (Pausanio 2019). Through interactive, playful and personally appealing communication strategies, “the wealth and diversity of cultural heritage can be opened up in a particularly sustainable way” (Pausanio 2019). A communication concept developed for the Aachen Cathedral World Heritage Site focuses on the themes of seeing, experiencing and learning. A virtual and freely navigable sightseeing flight through the cathedral, even in places that are usually not accessible to visitors, is realized by high-contrast photography (Power and Radach 2019).

The Tourist Association of North-Rhine-Westphalia presents a “visit at the click of a mouse” with the help of virtual reality glasses, thus providing an impressive 360-degree feeling of space and detailed insights into its World Heritage Sites (Tourism North-Rhine-Westphalia 2019). On the Google Arts and Culture platform, the World Heritage Site is presented in addition to a geographical location: The World Heritage Speicherstadt Hamburg (warehouse district) offers virtual tours. 360-degree images allow insights into the historical memory (Google Arts and Culture 2019).
6 Concluding Observations

The worldwide fascination of the marketing approach of sharing has certainly led to the initiative of the European Commission and the motto Sharing Heritage. In the economy of sharing in tourism, where accommodation, transport and catering services are usually provided, Sharing in the World Heritage is understood to mean the conscious perception of cultural and natural sites with outstanding universal value. This participation should be as active as possible.

There is indeed still a spatial and categorical (cultural) imbalance in the real access to World Heritage. This described fact was examined, worked out and visualized accordingly. A spatial access to the World Heritage Site may be a prerequisite for Sharing Heritage, but an associated active participation in the World Heritage Site is not necessarily always associated with it. Recently, a digital participation in the World Heritage Site has come to meet this need worldwide, but this virtual participation is usually not enough to identify with the World Heritage Site, to experience it and to understand it. To this end, educational institutions, UNESCO Chairs and UNESCO Project Schools, World Heritage institutions and World Heritage Site Managers must have a greater role to play in enabling more extensive participation in World Heritage through mediation within the framework of World Heritage Education. A World Heritage tourism that promotes understanding for a globally balanced cultural and natural heritage to be preserved together in all its diversity, strengthens exchange and peaceful coexistence, requires an approach such as a Sharing UNESCO World Heritage is able to present today. Authentic participation should be guaranteed to all people. In this respect, further public funding is needed for the provision of education at World Heritage sites and for application-oriented research activities with regard to a spatial and content-related imbalance of the previously listed sites within human heritage.
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The discussion about the policy making of creative cities as tourism destinations can be identified (Pratt 2010). These commonalities are largely explained by two phenomena: the globalizing process which is transforming cities, and the shift towards the knowledge-based economy. Both move culture and creativity to the core of policy-making. In relation to tourism, cities face increasing competition to attract tourists and they are turning to a mix of tangible and intangible forms of competitive advantage to differentiate themselves. Similarly, tourists are increasingly looking for authentic, engaging experiences and are evolving from simple consumers to active co-creators of the new urban atmosphere (Richards 2011a).

In this context, the literature basically presents three interconnected conceptual approaches for cities to add value to their urban (tourism) experiences: the creative economy, the creative class, and the network society. In the last two decades these three approaches, that will be briefly described below in their connection with tourism, have also inspired the policy making of many cities.

The creative economy is linked to the concept of creative industries, whose principal purpose is the production, reproduction, promotion, distribution or commercialization of goods, services and activities of a cultural, artistic or heritage-related nature. The creative economy has the potential to provide creative contents and engaging experiences to make a city more attractive for both tourists and residents. In addition to the opportunity to revitalize tourism products and generate innovation, creative industries add atmosphere and vibrancy to the districts where they tend to cluster. They work as a catalyst for the creative class and supersede

1) Creative industries have their roots in individual creativity, skills and talent which have a potential for job and wealth creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property. They encompass various sectors such as: advertising, architecture, the art and antiques market, crafts, design, fashion, films and videos, interactive leisure software, music, performing arts, publishing, computer services, television and radio (UN 2013). Many examples demonstrate that local development occurs in a new urban landscape where art and innovation-driven enterprises converge to form a creative cluster (Boix et al. 2016).
The discussion about the policy making of creative cities as tourism destinations

A number of common characteristics among successful cultural and creative cities can be identified (Pratt 2010). These commonalities are largely explained by two phenomena: the globalizing process which is transforming cities, and the shift towards the knowledge-based economy. Both move culture and creativity to the core of policy-making. In relation to tourism, cities face increasing competition to attract tourists and they are turning to a mix of tangible and intangible forms of competitive advantage to differentiate themselves. Similarly, tourists are increasingly looking for authentic, engaging experiences and are evolving from simple consumers to active co-creators of the new urban atmosphere (Richards 2011a).

In this context, the literature basically presents three interconnected conceptual approaches for cities to add value to their urban (tourism) experiences: the creative economy, the creative class, and the network society. In the last two decades these three approaches, that will be briefly described below in their connection with tourism, have also inspired the policy making of many cities.

The creative economy is linked to the concept of creative industries, whose principal purpose is the production, reproduction, promotion, distribution or commercialization of goods, services and activities of a cultural, artistic or heritage-related nature1). The creative economy has the potential to provide creative contents and engaging experiences to make a city more attractive for both tourists and residents. In addition to the opportunity to revitalize tourism products and generate innovation, creative industries add atmosphere and vibrancy to the districts where they tend to cluster. They work as a catalyst for the creative class and supersede

1) Creative industries have their roots in individual creativity, skills and talent which have a potential for job and wealth creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property. They encompass various sectors such as: advertising, architecture, the art and antiques market, crafts, design, fashion, films and videos, interactive leisure software, music, performing arts, publishing, computer services, television and radio (UN 2013). Many examples demonstrate that local development occurs in a new urban landscape where art and innovation-driven enterprises converge to form a creative cluster (Boix et al. 2016).
traditional models of cultural tourism. Similarly, tourism plays an important supporting role for creative industries as it provides assets to preserve a city’s cultural heritage, broaden the creative audience, and create a strategic network for knowledge development (OECD 2014).

Secondly, the creative class\(^2\) (Florida 2002, 2008) and the emerging concept of the creative tourist class (Gretzel/Jamal 2009) are coming to the fore as the boundaries blur between tourism and everyday life. Specifically, the life of the creative class encompasses “travel as an everyday experience and tourist experiences as part of the everyday life” (Gretzel/Jamal 2009, 477). This framework has challenged the old way of conceptualizing tourism products, obliging policymakers to find solutions that allow permanent and temporary citizens (tourists) to share the city and co-create their own urban experiences (Richards/Marques 2018).

Lastly, creative city networks have emerged in order to utilize the benefits of the sharing, learning, and branding mechanism (Rosi 2014). The creative city concept can be regarded as a system of social networks where ideas spread and innovation circulates not only at local level but also within a global circuit of information. In particular, network connections converge in cities where creative industries and talents cluster. For a city to be recognized as “creative”, connectivity is key (Çetindamar/Günsel 2012). Global and local connectivity and accessibility have several implications: people are free to move and innovation can spread across communities; different people get in touch and communities become open and tolerant; trade and exchanges become easier and less expensive. This approach, focusing on local specificities, has challenged the normative approach to creative city development (OECD 2014). It suggests the existence of a variety of cultural and creative cities rather than promoting a standard “cookbook” strategy for policymakers (Pratt 2010), also reinforcing the position of who affirms the risk of a creative standardization based on a one-size fits all tourism strategy (Richards 2011b).

2 ‘One size fits all’? The objectives of the current study

The literature underlines how the creative turn that characterizes urban development strategies increasingly affects also the tourism sector, with many studies dealing with cultural policies and the emergence of creative tourism at large (for an overview see Richards 2011b and Galvagno/Giaccone 2019). However, less attention is given to the empirical examination and measurement of different underlying dimensions of culture and creativity in cities, to the segmentation of urban

\(^2\) Following Florida’s conceptualization (2002, 2008), the creative class includes a variegated group of talented people whose work entails capitalizing a high level of formal education to create innovation and manage creative problems in an environment where talented human capital has a premium value. Cities with a higher share of creative people will have better economic performances because they will attract creative business, thus, higher levels of entrepreneurship and innovation. Nevertheless, it has been demonstrated that the creative class is unevenly distributed across locations and higher concentrations are usually found in inspirational, cultural environments (Florida 2008).
areas based on these different dimensions, and to the assessment of their relationship with cities’ tourism performance. Therefore, through a quantitative and cross-sectional approach, this chapter has two main objectives. First, it wants to explore the relationship between creative cities and tourists’ attractiveness, by providing empirical evidence of those urban features that define the cultural and creative essence of cities and that have a positive impact on tourism. The underlying hypothesis is that creativity can, to a certain extent, positively affect tourism. Second, it aims at setting out a framework to segment cities on the basis of their cultural and creative specialization, exploring if and which differences exist among cultural and creative cities. The underlying hypothesis is that cultural and creative urban development can be achieved by means of different strategies rather than by a one-size fits all recipe thus reinforcing – through quantitative data – the existence of different patterns of development of cultural and creative cities. The analysis is conducted over a representative sample of European cities, as they are rich and diversified in terms of creative and cultural environment and constitute a substantial study context.

3 The European cultural and creative cities under analysis

The European Commission provides a comprehensive open-access ‘Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor’\(^3\) that observes the cultural and creative performance of 168 cities around 30 European countries, through 29 indicators linked with the ‘Cultural Vibrancy’, the ‘Creative Economy’, and the ‘Enabling Environment’ of cities (Montalto et al. 2017). Indicators include the number of cultural attractions, the number of people employed in cultural and creative sectors, as well as local characteristics that tend to increase the urban attractiveness such as the intercultural traits of a city and the perceived integration of foreigners. The cities included in the database stand out in the European panorama as important cultural and creative hubs, including European Capitals of Culture, members of the UNESCO Creative Cities Network, and cities hosting world heritage sites or international festivals. The sample is heterogeneous and covers cities with different population size, GDP per capita, and level of employment. Having cities with different dimensions minimizes selection bias\(^4\) and, as the variables are normalized in per capita terms, this enables comparisons across cities and indicators.

The cities are distributed across Europe and evenly cover six areas: 42 cities are located in Mediterranean Countries (Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Cyprus and Malta); 32 in Continental Europe (Germany, France, Austria and Switzerland); 13 in Scandinavian Republics (Sweden, Norway, Finland and Denmark); 16 in Anglo-Saxon Countries (United Kingdom and Ireland); 45 in Eastern Europe (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, Poland, Romania, and former Yugoslavia); and 20 in

---

\(^3\) www.composite-indicators.jrc.ec.europa.eu

\(^4\) The monitor includes 21 small cities (50.000-100.000 inhabitants), 36 medium cities (100.000-250.000), 38 large cities (250.000-500.000), 54 extra-large cities (500.000–1.000.000), and 19 extra-extra-large cities (>1.000.000).
Benelux (Belgium, The Netherlands and Luxembourg). On the base of the indicators provided by the database, we can say that Mediterranean countries are the richest in number of sights and landmarks; Continental Europe has the greatest share of people employed in cultural and creative sectors; Scandinavian countries are characterized by the highest tolerance of foreigners; Benelux is the most accessible European area in terms of infrastructure. Eastern Countries, although do not overperform on any indicator, are developing an important creative economy.

4 Culture and creativity as drivers of cities’ tourism performance

With the purpose to investigate the relationship between the creative and cultural features of cities and their tourism performance, we extracted 18 indicators out of 29 from the Monitor, according to their relevance in terms of tourists attractiveness. Then, the number of indicators was reduced by means of a principal component analysis\(^5\) (PCA) and the dropped factors were used as covariates in a multiple linear regression model with the scope to reveal which of them has a significant effect on tourism, calculated as overnight stays. The variables included in the analysis are treated in per capita terms in order to enable comparisons across cities, without favouring big cities during the evaluation procedure. Moreover, data have been normalized and missing values winsorized in order to compare different data on a common scale and to trim the extreme values in the dataset.

Table 1 summaries the indicators used in this study and their classification into the dimensions that derived from the PCA. The indicators factor into six different dimensions: (1) cultural offer; (2) creative class; (3) creative entrepreneurship; (4) accessibility; (5) openness & tolerance; and (6) education & human capital. The dimensions are consistent with the existing literature on creative and cultural cities.

The first dimension is cultural offer. It includes the traditional cultural venues of a city such as sites and landmarks, museums, theatres, concerts and shows. The cultural offer is still a key determinant of a city’s attractiveness and quality of life and it provides tourists with a meaningful motivation to visit a place (Ritchie/Zins 1978). The second factor, creative class, is composed by the number of people employed in cultural and creative sectors. It partially reflects Florida’s creative class (2002, 2008) but here it does not include all the people engaged with problem solving such as managers and lawyers. The third factor identifies the flow of jobs created per year in cultural and creative enterprises and it might be considered as a proxy for creative entrepreneurship: creativity will not generate economic growth without entrepreneurship (Landry 2010). The fourth factor, accessibility, measures the local and international connections of the city. In addition to the importance of accessibility for tourism development, an efficient infrastructure system also increases the easiness

\(^5\) The monitor of the European Commission, instead, treats the indicators separately and creates aggregate indicators just as a simple sum of the single indicators.
of knowledge spill-overs since proximity to potential partners make easier collaboration and mutual learning (Çetindamar/Günsel 2012). It includes the number of flights per day, the number of direct trains to other cities and an indicator of potential road accessibility. The fifth factor is openness and tolerance and it approximates how intercultural a city appears. Places open to migration and diversity gain creativity advantage by supporting the contamination and the flow of ideas (Florida 2002; Landry 2010). The last is labelled as education and human capital because it measures the number of graduates in art, humanities and in ICT. Beyond a high share of people employed in cultural and creative sectors, the city must provide a structured education system. Skilled people, with high human capital, play a key role in economic, cultural and social development (Florida 2008; Powell 2007).

Table 1. Underlying dimensions of cultural and creative European cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>(1) Cultural offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts &amp; shows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sights &amp; landmarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs in arts, culture &amp; entertainment</td>
<td>(2) Creative class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs in media &amp; communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs in other creative sectors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs in new arts, culture &amp; entertainment enterprises</td>
<td>(3) Creative entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs in new media &amp; communication enterprises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs in new enterprises in other creative sectors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger flights</td>
<td>(4) Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct trains to other cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of foreigners</td>
<td>(5) Openness and tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of foreigners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates in arts and humanities</td>
<td>(6) Education and human capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates in ICT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Notes: (KMO) MSA = 0.72; Barlett’s Test of Sphericity p-value=0.000; Cronbach Alpha Tests > 0.5; Total Variance Explained 74.8%. Extraction method: Varimax.

Data Source: Elaboration on the European Commission ‘Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor’ (2017)

As investments in cultural policies and creative cities development have been increasingly considered relevant in order to influence tourism outcomes concerning attractiveness, place-branding and economic flows (Bianchini/Parkinson 1994; Richard 2011b; Landry 2010), here the relationship between tourism and the city’s cultural and creative performances is investigated through a multiple linear regression model. The total annual number of tourist overnight stays, normalized into a 0-100 scale, is used as dependent variable as the length of stay, more than simple arrivals, is relevant in terms of positive returns for a city (Cracolici/Nijkamp/Rietveld 2008). The follo-
wing variables are entered as endogenous: cultural offer (factor 1), creative class (factor 2), creative entrepreneurship (factor 3) and accessibility (factor 4). The other two dimensions, openness and tolerance (factor 5) and education and human capital (factor 6) have been excluded because, over data screening, they resulted uncorrelated with the dependent variable. Moreover, population size and GDP per capita are included as indicator variables with three categories – the highest being the reference – in order to control for the effect of different population size and GDP levels. Table 2 summarizes the estimates of the coefficients and the p-values of the t-tests for each of the different specifications of the model.

Table 2. The relationship between cities’ cultural and creative dimensions and their tourism performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Offer</td>
<td>8,199</td>
<td>8,199</td>
<td>8,199</td>
<td>8,174</td>
<td>8,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Class</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>3,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.078)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>2,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td>(0.046)</td>
<td>(0.046)</td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Offer*Accessibility</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>2,807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low GDP</td>
<td>0,855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.870)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium GDP</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.692)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Size</td>
<td>-0,315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.951)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Size</td>
<td>-3,507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.267)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>20,04</td>
<td>20,04</td>
<td>20,04</td>
<td>20,04</td>
<td>21,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0,203</td>
<td>0,22</td>
<td>0,254</td>
<td>0,27</td>
<td>0,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table reports the estimates, the p-values and R² of the model fitted. The regressions are estimated under different specifications (1)–(5). p-values are in parentheses.

Data Source: Elaboration on the European Commission ‘Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor’ (2017)

The first regression includes only two covariates: cultural offer and creative class. In the second specification, creative entrepreneurship is added, while accessibility is included only in the third step. The stability of the parameters estimated across models (1)–(3) permits to gauge robustness of the results: an overperformance of the city among each of the aforementioned covariates – indicated by a positive value of the covariates – is systematically associated with a greater number of tourist overnight stays. Specifically, results (1)–(3) suggest that cultural offer has
the greatest effect on our measure of tourism ($\beta_{\text{Cultural Offer}} = 8.19$). This value is almost constant under specifications (1)–(5) and always significant at 1% level ($p=0.00$). The role of the creative class on tourism is also positive, even though the magnitude of its effect is lower in absolute terms ($\beta_{\text{Creative Class}} = 2.809$) and its statistical significance is poorer. Similarly, a widespread entrepreneurial activity in cultural and creative sectors, as well as an efficient infrastructure system are positively associated with the tourism performance of a city. Clearly, a vibrant business environment may attract business tourism and act as an engine for young entrepreneurs looking for both business and leisure experiences. As well, a connected and accessible city is more likely to attract a greater number of domestic and international tourists: in line to what Landry (2010) says, an efficient infrastructure system increases the creative potential of a city.

Most of all, results suggest that – although international research widely agrees upon the growing importance of the creative economy as a driver of tourism flows – the traditional cultural offer still has a stronger effect as compared to these emerging factors. This result does not deny the relevance of the creative industries pointed out by many authors (i.e. Evans 2003, 2009; Richards/Wilson, 2007; OECD 2006) but suggests that in the field of tourism this evolutionary process has just begun.

In model (4) the estimates are slightly affected by the introduction of an interaction variable between cultural offer and accessibility, and the interaction coefficient provides with a further intuition: the higher the cultural offer, the greater the effect of accessibility on tourism; and vice-versa. In other words, the effects of accessibility and cultural offer keep reinforcing each other. Indeed, while cities can develop tourism by leveraging on several assets, infrastructure is a sine-qua-non characteristic that supports tourist flows and makes cultural offer accessible.

Model (5) introduces population size and GDP per capita as controlling variables: this reduces the effect as well as the significance of creative entrepreneurship. Although the coefficients of the socio-economic variables are not significant, the sign of the parameters suggests that small and medium size cities tend to have – in proportion – a lower number of tourist overnight stays as compared to big ones. This can be due to the fact that big cities are usually a stage for many things to happen, so that cultural and creative tourism is only a niche of the market. In contrast, low and medium GDP per capita tend to come with higher value of tourist overnight stays as compared to richer cities, suggesting that price is still a relevant factor in tourism and higher purchasing power stimulate tourists to stay longer.

5 A segmentation of the European cultural and creative cities

Finally, a possible a posteriori segmentation (Mazanec 2000) of the cities is explored through a cluster analysis that uses the cultural and creative dimensions identified above (see Table 1) as the basis for the segmentation process. In particular, clusters are built in such a way that differences within clusters are minimized while
differences between them are maximized. Table 3 summarizes the average performance of clusters across factors: a negative sign suggests a poorer performance on the dimension as compared to the average value; a positive value an overperformance. Ultimately, six clusters are identified and they tend to diverge into two separate groups in terms of tourist overnight stays per capita. Cluster 1, 2 and 6 on average show a weaker performance in terms of tourist overnight stays per capita as compared to cluster 3, 4, and 5. This evidence may be explained by the fact that cultural hubs, creative capitals, and attractive cultural centres found a healthier balance between the four factors positively correlated with the number of tourists’ overnight stays in the city: cultural offer, creative class, creative entrepreneurship and accessibility. Moreover, it must be noted that, in line with previous results, cluster 5 – that is the top performer in terms of cultural offer – has also the longest tourist overnight stays per capita.

Table 3. The 6 clusters of cultural and creative European cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Skilled cities</th>
<th>2 Innovative business centers</th>
<th>3 Cultural hubs</th>
<th>4 Creative capitals</th>
<th>5 Attractive cultural centers</th>
<th>6 Emerging and cultural creative cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative class</td>
<td>0,07770</td>
<td>-0,30765</td>
<td>1,87155</td>
<td>0,09003</td>
<td>-0,38714</td>
<td>-0,38808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural offer</td>
<td>-0,48383</td>
<td>-0,36016</td>
<td>0,12091</td>
<td>0,46802</td>
<td>2,21521</td>
<td>-0,28692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative entrepreneurship</td>
<td>-0,04792</td>
<td>0,14352</td>
<td>-0,32175</td>
<td>2,43340</td>
<td>-0,23829</td>
<td>-0,40954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>0,65734</td>
<td>1,06574</td>
<td>-0,19813</td>
<td>-0,31668</td>
<td>0,17132</td>
<td>-0,60008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness &amp; tolerance</td>
<td>0,20987</td>
<td>0,25645</td>
<td>0,01271</td>
<td>-0,37919</td>
<td>0,49974</td>
<td>-0,20875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; human capital</td>
<td>1,68519</td>
<td>-0,6421</td>
<td>-0,32702</td>
<td>-0,17327</td>
<td>0,69073</td>
<td>-0,14001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Besides their tourism performance, clusters suggest a larger perspective on the role of the diverse cultural and creative dimensions for European cities.

Cluster 1: Skilled cities

Cities included in this cluster are mostly university cities that show a high degree of tolerance and good level of employment. On the other hand, they are not particularly rich in cultural venues and few new cultural and creative businesses seem to flourish. This might represent a limit in term of students’ retention once concluded the academic experience. This cluster does not include large cities (>1.000.000 inhabitants). Two cities are representative for this group: Leuven (Belgium) and Manchester (UK). The former hosts the oldest and one of the most innovative university of Belgium. The latter has set as its strategic priority the attraction and retention of students, and now hosts more than 96.000 of them6).

6) The strategic priorities sets out by the local DMO are available at the following link: www.markettingmanchester.com
Cluster 2: Innovative business centers

This cluster is made up by cities that are strongly connected by means of trains, planes, and roads. In addition, here it seems easy to start a new business in a creative sector and inhabitants are tolerant towards foreign-born population. Most of them are key nodes in the “creative cities network” as shown by their performance in terms of national and international connections and by their relative geographical centrality in Europe. Although these cities are heterogeneous in terms of socio-economic characteristics, a common pattern seems to emerge: they are characterized by a strong post-industrial background and they are successfully going through a culture-led requalification process. Examples such as Rotterdam and Frankfurt show how policy makers have been working in order to replace a manufacture-led economy into a service-oriented one. Nevertheless, the cluster performs worst in terms of creative workers and cultural offer. This might suggest that the culture-led requalification processes have not yet resulted into a permanent high share of cultural and creative jobs.

Cluster 3: Cultural hubs

The main peculiarity of this cluster is its over-performance in terms of creative class (Factor 2). Moreover, these cities are rich in museums, theatres, cultural sites and landmarks and this may have led to an important demand of creative and knowledge-based workers. However, these cities do not perform well on Factor 3: few new jobs are created and this might push creative talents and young entrepreneurs to move away, looking for better business opportunities. This cluster includes no small cities (<100,000 inhabitants) and it is characterized by high level of GDP per capita. This cluster includes cities such as Rome, Madrid, and Athens known worldwide for their value in terms of artistic, historical, and cultural heritage. An important artistic background and the presence of many cultural venues require tailor-made management strategies and effective governance to preserve them. Therefore, the demand for cultural and creative jobs is expected to be higher as compared to other clusters. In contrast, these cities do not show a vibrant cultural job market (\( Job_{t+1} \equiv Job_t \)). This result might be explained by two arguments: a data construction problem or an economic alarm. If culture-leg regeneration projects started before the reference year (\( t \)), this variable do not capture the actual vibrancy of cultural and creative industries. The second explanation is more alarming as it may suggest that these cities do not provide, as compared to the other clusters, a favourable business environment for the emergence of new creative enterprises.

Cluster 4: Creative capitals

Cities included in this group are cutting-edge cultural centers where arts and culture flourish and nurture the global economy. Paris, Amsterdam, Berlin, Lisbon, Rome, Madrid, and Athens are examples. The main peculiarity of this cluster is its over-performance in terms of creative workers and cultural offer. This might suggest that the culture-led requalification processes have not yet resulted into a permanent high share of cultural and creative jobs.

Table 3. The 6 clusters of cultural and creative European cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Creative enterprises</th>
<th>Cultural offer</th>
<th>Cultural hubs</th>
<th>Creative capitals</th>
<th>Innovative business centers</th>
<th>Skilled cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.04792</td>
<td>0.14352</td>
<td>-0.32175</td>
<td>2.43340</td>
<td>-0.23829</td>
<td>-0.40954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.48383</td>
<td>-0.36016</td>
<td>0.12091</td>
<td>0.46802</td>
<td>2.21521</td>
<td>-0.28692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.68519</td>
<td>-0.6421</td>
<td>-0.32702</td>
<td>-0.17327</td>
<td>0.69073</td>
<td>-0.14001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.20987</td>
<td>0.25645</td>
<td>0.01271</td>
<td>-0.37919</td>
<td>0.49974</td>
<td>-0.20875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cluster 2 is innovative university of Belgium. The latter has set as its strategic priority the attraction and retention of students, and now hosts more than 96,000 of them.

Most of the cities included in cluster 2 are located in the very centre of Europe, both in Continental countries and Benelux.
Brussels are just some examples of cities characterized by a huge cultural offer as well as a great number of people employed in creative jobs. They represent important cultural destinations for thousands of tourists because of their strong brand identity, cultural heritage, and powerful storytelling capacity. This cluster includes 14 cities whose socio-economic traits are rather similar to cluster 3. However, these cities exhibit a healthier balance between cultural offer, cultural employment, and job creation. Amsterdam, for example, has been engaged in developing policies to stimulate cultural participation and tourism (Richards/Marques 2018) and its cultural infrastructure has been renovated, as in the case of the Rijksmuseum and the Van Gogh museums8). Moreover, the Municipality has recognized the relevance of new business development and it is supporting artists and entrepreneurs through the provision of incubators, affordable workplaces, and requalified warehouses for festivals and events. What seems odd, however, is the average underperformance of the cluster in terms of openness and tolerance. This result may be explained by the fact that bigger cities are generally characterized by bigger inequalities and gentrification mechanisms that tend to leave peripheral areas apart. In particular, in the case of Amsterdam, these tensions might be due to the pressures that tourism generates on residents’ livability9) (Richards/Marques 2018).

**Cluster 5: Attractive cultural centres**

The fifth cluster is composed by cities with a huge cultural offer that, despite their small dimension, host important UNESCO sites and attract plenty of tourists every year. The historical center of Edinburgh, the Alhambra and Albaycin in Granada, the city and the lagoon of Venice, the Flemish Beguinages in Ghent and the historical center of Florence, to mention but a few, represent well-known tourist destinations under the UNESCO brand included in this cluster. In general, the cluster is characterized by small-medium size cities, none of them with a population larger than 500.000 inhabitants, while employment level and GDP per capita are heterogeneously distributed. However, if tourism represents on the one side a big opportunity for small/medium cities, it is also a potential threat for local well-being, especially when they overcome their tourism carrying capacity (UNWTO 2012). Venice, for example, is struggling under the pressure of tourism: as largely documented, local community is moving away, prices are dramatically increasing, and historical sites are progressively threatened by over-exploitation.

**Cluster 6: Emerging cultural and creative cities**

The last cluster is the biggest and includes cities that have the potential to improve. Indeed, as compared to the average performances of the other clusters, they under-

---

8) The renovation of the Stedelijk was completed in 2012. The Rijksmuseum reopened after the renovation project in April 2013. One month later, the renovation of the Van Gogh Museums was also completed.

9) In 2015 the city launched a programme called “The city in Balance” in order to find a better balance between the liveability of residents and the urban experience of tourists. For further information: www.amsterdam.nl
perform in every dimension and are characterized by a low level of cultural employment, small or medium population size, and low level of GDP per capita. Moreover, most of them, although characterized by a great historical value, have not yet created an adequate cultural offer and a dynamic economic environment to attract the creative class. An interesting example is the case of Budapest, one of the fastest growing cities of the Eastern Europe, that is experiencing an annual employment growth rate of 18%. Such a rapid growth has followed the development of tourism and design as the key sectors for the social, cultural and economic development of the city. Therefore, if the city is not yet comparable to the Western creative capitals, probably it will be soon.

6 Conclusions

Even though still explorative in nature, our empirical results generally confirm expectations and corroborate previous theoretical speculations. This study identifies some key factors useful to investigate the relationship between creative cities and tourism. Results confirm that cultural and creative cities can be evaluated on 6 relevant factors: cultural offer, creative class, creative entrepreneurship, education and human capital, openness and tolerance, and accessibility.

This allows to explore the relevance of different dimensions over the tourism performance of the European cities under analysis. It also allows to cluster cities, based on their specialization, into homogenous groups. The proposed segmentation offers a new perspective to look at European cities. In turn, this enables cities to understand their competitive advantage and its relationship with tourism performance, and to compare themselves with similar urban areas.

The research is far from being exhaustive. Further research is needed to clarify the direction of the relationship between culture, creativity and tourism. In particular, possible extensions of the analytical framework should include the effect of the different creative industries on tourist attractiveness and how their effect changes across different clusters. Indeed, the impact of traditional cultural industries could be the driving force of economic growth for attractive cultural centers and cultural hubs while it could be of lesser strategic importance for skilled cities and innovative business centers. In contrast, media and communication enterprises could be crucial engines of urban growth for cultural and creative cities, but less important for emerging cultural cities.

Moreover, the effect and the impact of tourism can be evaluated by means of many different indicators. Future research could take into consideration additional elements such as the number of local and international arrivals in the city or the level of visitor spending in tourism-related economic and cultural activities. Indeed, increasing the number of tourist overnight stays might not be a strategic goal for many cities, that, in contrast, could benefit more from improving the quality of the experience for the current level of tourists. Small cities in particular,
once achieved the maximum level of their carrying capacity, risk to be damaged by intensive tourist flows rather than enhanced.

To conclude, although the main findings of the analysis need to be further tested, a number of suggestions for policy-makers can be drawn. The globalizing process which cities are going through and the shift towards the knowledge-based economy have moved creativity at the core of policy making. This analysis confirms that the cultural and creative sectors have the potential to provide contents to make a city more attractive. This is particularly significant considering that cities face a growing competition to attract tourists and increasingly turn to intangible forms of competitive advantage to differentiate themselves. Moreover, also tourists are changing, evolving from ardent consumers of tangible attractions to active co-creators of the intangible urban buzz. Therefore, it emerges that, in addition to the opportunity to revitalize tourism products, creative industries add atmosphere and vibrancy to the districts where they cluster, working as a catalyst for the creative class and superseding traditional models of cultural tourism.

Obviously, the relevance of culture and creativity for cities is wider than what can be said just with respect to their relationship with tourism. As synergies among tourism and creative cities continue to grow, it is imperative that policy-makers understand the strategic importance of an integrated development strategy that capitalizes the distinctive characteristics of their city for the benefit of the city itself. These sectors can complement each other and be an engine for sustainable growth whose benefits go far beyond the economic realm alone. While fostering endogenous economic growth, tourism, culture and creativity offer the city an opportunity for community building, international recognition and cultural preservation. However, it shall not be overlooked that these sectors must not cannibalize each other: if the economic rationale must not prevail over the cultural, the opposite is equally true. This is particularly true considering that no cluster of cities overperforms in all the dimensions, which would suggest that the numerous beneficial effects of creativity cannot be achieved at the same time in each place. Rather, urban cultural policies should envisage a long-term development strategy, with clearly defined goals and timelines that are dealing respectfully with local needs, as a ready-to-adopt or a one-size-fits-all recipe to be creative does not exist.
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World Heritage – Sacramental Experience, Heterotopia, and Sustainable Tourism

Heritage tourism – a meaningful experience of the universal outstanding value

In societies striving for modernity, benefit and prosperity, the lives of individuals are often subject to increasingly rigid temporal rules. The ‘high-speed society’ has seemingly turned its back on the promises of autonomy, self-realization, and other freedoms of a deliberative democracy and finds itself trapped in an accelerated circle of constant motion. The forces of globalization and technological acceleration trigger faster social change, thus expediting the pace of life (Rosa 2013). The development of society with its permanently excessive speed leads to a disembedding or separating of space and time (Antony Giddens), to a threefold split of the self – with the society, with the inner nature and with the external nature (Habermas 1976). The transient sense of current life allows fewer and fewer resonance relationships with increasing self-alienation and alienation from the world being the consequences (Rosa 2016).

Contrary to this temporal dictate, tourism and holiday-making seem to be part of the promise of modernity, even if they remain trapped in the societal norms of temporality, which create a shortage of time in late modern societies. It is part of the system in the sense of a repair company, which is unable to escape the time-economic calculus. Nevertheless, it somehow falls out of time, because the extent of disposable (i.e. freely available) time, which is enshrined as a legally stipulated holiday entitlement, gives the individual the freedom to decide how to spend that time. Like an adventure, which experiences its extraordinary status as a foreign body of our existence only in contrast to common, everyday life routines, working hours and vacation time remain inextricably linked.

This exit is particularly accentuated in World Heritage tourism, because in the quasi-sacralized places of humanity’s heritage, the travel ego is able to find a temporary retreat in holiday destinations where it can escape from a world of excessive and unreasonable demands. Tourism habitats can thus be considered as heterotopias that are experienced as destinations of desire and places of happiness (Wöhler 2011).
1 Heritage tourism – a meaningful experience of the universal outstanding value

In societies striving for modernity, benefit and prosperity, the lives of individuals are often subject to increasingly rigid temporal rules. The ‘high-speed society’ has seemingly turned its back on the promises of autonomy, self-realization, and other freedoms of a deliberative democracy and finds itself trapped in an accelerated circle of constant motion. The forces of globalization and technological acceleration trigger faster social change, thus expediting the pace of life (Rosa 2013). The development of society with its permanently excessive speed leads to a disembedding or separating of space and time (Antony Giddens), to a threefold split of the self – with the society, with the inner nature and with the external nature (Habermas 1976). The transient sense of current life allows fewer and fewer resonance relationships with increasing self-alienation and alienation from the world being the consequences (Rosa 2016).

Contrary to this temporal dictate, tourism and holiday-making seem to be part of the promise of modernity, even if they remain trapped in the societal norms of temporality, which create a shortage of time in late modern societies. It is part of the system in the sense of a repair company, which is unable to escape the time-economic calculus. Nevertheless, it somehow falls out of time, because the extent of disposable (i.e. freely available) time, which is enshrined as a legally stipulated holiday entitlement, gives the individual the freedom to decide how to spend that time. Like an adventure, which experiences its extraordinary status as a foreign body of our existence only in contrast to common, everyday life routines, working hours and vacation time remain inextricably linked.

This exit is particularly accentuated in World Heritage tourism, because in the quasi-sacralized places of humanity's heritage, the travel ego is able to find a temporary retreat in holiday destinations where it can escape from a world of excessive and unreasonable demands. Tourism habitats can thus be considered as heterotopias that are experienced as destinations of desire and places of happiness (Wöhler 2011).
In World Heritage tourism, visitors experience, study and consume basic elements of a culture as well as icons of national identity. They represent vanished worlds that can shed light on the history of humanity. When visiting such a site, tourists enter a space that is subject to another era (Luger 2015). Experiencing World Heritage therefore enables the visitor to be a part of that history, to see oneself as part of a larger whole when coming into contact with ancient time periods spanning over centuries. They are “a storage place of previous cultural forms” (Odo Marquard), of superimposed epochs of time. Karlheinz Wöhler (2008) therefore speaks of a sacramental experience, for it reveals transcendence. This requires a reasonable respect for certain places, memorial sites, natural monuments, etc., since they are transformed in the secular world, through their exaltation as World Heritage (a recognition of their outstanding universal value) and the associated cultural meaning ascription, into something sacred. Through this heritagefication, they are given a value that can claim validity for all humanity. Because of this canonization of spaces, cultural memory is formed, as from a variety of cultural artefacts some are deemed to be memorable. A place, a region is given a permanent code, thus establishing the timeless nature of its meaning.

This experience of the meaningful also constitutes the uniqueness of the World Heritage site, and through this, one becomes aware of its extraordinary and universal value. Therein also lies the great tourist potential of such sites, as there is a great yearning for emotionality and wholeness and the desire to feel at one or in agreement with the world. World Heritage tourists thus take part in a profane pilgrimage. Experiencing the sacred World Heritage sites with their own senses is the main reason why tourists travel thousands of miles and climb hundreds of steps, thereby contributing to the modern phenomenon of overtourism (Rolandberger 2018).

While tourism is based on the underlying principle of consumption or usage of landscape and resources, cultural heritage is a fragile, non-renewable resource that requires protection in order to preserve its exceptional character for future generations (Luger 2008). Both material and intangible treasures are threatened, but it is the material, essentially buildings or cultural landscapes, that are at the forefront of consideration. Most endangered is the cultural heritage in developing societies (Timothy and Nyaupane 2009). The reasons behind the endangerment are manifold and tourism can also cause significant disturbances in the cultural fabric. Uncontrolled tourism development is one source of danger among many. To a large extent, the resolution of this fundamental conflict of goals and principles — as seen in reality — can be achieved through quality-oriented cultural tourism. It takes place when there is, firstly, a conceptual discussion dealing with world heritage that provides a meaning-giving or “meaningful experience” (Prentice 2003, 166), and secondly, if a tourism policy based on sustainability and the preservation of heritage is implemented in practice.
2 Tourist value creation from cultural heritage

For tourism, the treasures of culture and nature form the raw material for high-quality products. Without them, tourism would not have become one of the world's fastest growing business sectors. This dynamic can have positive and negative effects on world heritage sites. The inherent contradiction within tourism has led the UNESCO World Heritage Centre in Paris to devote greater importance to the issue of heritage management and sustainable tourism. It is ultimately a question of answering two crucial questions. Firstly – How many tourists can a world heritage site ‘carry’ without harming the quality of the experience or the site itself? Secondly – How many visitors does it need to create economic benefits for the stakeholders of the world heritage site and to foster preservation of the site?

Tourist value creation will be illustrated in the following examples – the historic city of Salzburg, Austria, and the churches and convents of (Old) Goa, India – by referring to a benchmark pilot study (World Nature Forum 2011).

Few tourism destinations have such an outstanding image like Salzburg does, one that is manifestly associated with culture. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and the Salzburg Festival (of Classical Music) have significantly contributed to Salzburg’s reputation as a “Music capital of the World”, while the Hollywood movie “The Sound of Music” – a multiple Oscar and Golden Globe winner in 1966 – underlined the city's musical image and made the city's beauty and the surrounding region famous worldwide. Since 1997, the historic city is a UNESCO world heritage site. The close link between culture and tourism is widely visible in Salzburg, which has become a centre of classical music and a leading destination of value-adding quality tourism. Salzburg owes its distinctive brand image in the popular genre of the entertainment industry to the location placement through the “Sound of Music”, the annual “Advent Singing”, the Christmas markets and the famous Heimatfilme, sentimental movies in idealized regional settings. The dramatic and impressive urban landscape, the sacral architecture of the former prince-bishopric as well as Mozart and the festivals are also elements that led to Salzburg being accepted on the UNESCO world heritage list. Millions of tourists are attracted by Mozart's birthplace in order to experience the “City of Music” and to visit the house where he was born and the place where he lived. The international prominence of the city, achieved by this “brand”, extends far beyond its provincial city character. For the tourism destination, Mozart in connection with the Salzburg Festival is its most important branding and advertising topos. Salzburg’s image is best seen in its probably most famous souvenir product, the Mozartkugel (chocolate and marzipan balls with Mozart image on the wrapping) (Unesco Chair 2012).

Salzburg’s immense tourist popularity results in the exceeding of the carrying capacity during the summer months and the weeks before Christmas. During this time, the number of people in the narrow lanes and passage ways in the historic city creates a sense of density that exceeds the limits of the tolerable. Effective
concepts for visitor guidance in historical old towns or at world heritage sites, which unlike castles or temples do not benefit from a natural visitor guidance system that controls access in the form of walls, rocks or water trenches, have not yet been developed (Arnberger 2015). The problem is that at peak times tourists obviously all seek to find what they are looking for at exactly the same time. Cities such as Florence, Venice or Cesky Krumlov are even more affected than Salzburg and run the risk of being literally crushed by their fans (Rolandberger 2018).

In 2019, Salzburg received two million tourist arrivals creating three million overnight stays in approx. 13 500 beds, almost 60% of them in four-and five-star hotels. The average occupancy rate was around 61 % over the year, with a stay of 1.7 nights (Salzburg Statistics 2018). The attractiveness as a tourist destination is underscored by the approx. 6-9 million daily visitors each year. More than 40 000 coaches unload their passengers near the city centre, congesting the streets and creating discomfort for the local inhabitants (Neuhold 2019). 75% of all Salzburg tourists come from abroad and they consume a total product composed of elements of high and popular culture, the architecture of the Baroque, the culinary arts as well as the intangible Cultural Heritage. The visitors come primarily because of this cultural mix of unique architecture, the “Spirit of Mozart” and the “Sound of Music”, and thus due to reasons mentioned in the UNESCO World Heritage List. Culture shapes Salzburg’s profile and is the core of its unique selling proposition when compared to other cities. The cultural offering as the pivotal factor of this city, in combination with the architectural beauty and uniqueness of the world heritage, thus contributes to its touristic success. A tourism study conducted in 2012 showed the high added-value creation as well as the indirect benefits and value creation that results from cultural tourism in Salzburg (UNESCO Chair 2012).

When compared to Salzburg, the pilot benchmark study mentioned previously shows that the UNESCO World Heritage Site of Goa does not perform as successfully in the fields of regional development and value creation (Nayak 2017). The common opinion of experts was that the low demand for heritage tourism in Goa can be attributed to the fact that it is better known as a beach destination. Although it has a lot of heritage sites and historical monuments, they are only ancillary to the main purpose of visiting Goa, which is leisure and relaxation. Those tourists that do visit the sites are more interested in sightseeing rather than learning more about the colonial history. It is the role of communication and awareness to change this image of Goa, thus improving the tourist’s lack of awareness of (world) heritage. In particular, the world heritage site management needs to target the group of ‘serendipitous cultural tourists’ i.e. travellers who visit cultural sites ‘unintentionally’ as part of the tour to try and convert them into ‘purposeful cultural tourists’ (Herdin 2008).

Numerous shops/stalls near and at the Goa world heritage site selling souvenirs, refreshments, trinkets etc. are small businesses that are run by the local population. Thus, the world heritage does contribute to a certain extent to the regional
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Numerous shops/stalls near and at the Goa world heritage site selling souvenirs, refreshments, trinkets etc. are small businesses that are run by the local population. Thus, the world heritage does contribute to a certain extent to the regional...
economic development and local livelihoods by attracting tourists who spend their money at these stalls. However, Goa has much to learn from the other sites in the benchmark study, especially regarding the authenticity/regional signature of the products sold at the site. Like other world heritage sites in the study, the site management could assist local communities in making handicrafts and selling them to the tourists, thus greatly improving income generation opportunities for the local community (World Nature Forum 2011). Indeed, world heritage site conservation often only makes sense to the locals when placed in the context of tourism. Therefore, it is crucial to improve the value creation and economic development resulting from world heritage tourism. The importance of a world heritage site in the eyes of the local community lies in its ability to positively affect regional development, thus providing economic rationale to conserve heritage. Heritage conservation, the overarching goal of the world heritage convention, hence depends to a large extent on world heritage tourism and the income it generates for the local community and heritage and tourism need to be integrated in a sustainable manner for tourism to become a productive form of economic activity that contributes to regional development (Luger 2008).

3 Preservation and promotion of the heritage of mankind

World heritage as a central component of a tourism concept sets positive accents for both – the site itself and the tourism product sides. It requires the development of quality standards that are appropriate to the heritage of mankind i.e. there is a great need for a legal framework to avoid destruction or misuse of the heritage. UNESCO requires that the world heritage site management provides management plans and their implementation, as well as clear ideas and strategies for the development of tourism.

Laws for preservation such as the Salzburg Historic City Conservation Law (Salzburger Altstaderhaltungsgesetz) are regarded as a precondition for the responsible use of the architectural heritage, but they do not guarantee, however, that they will be implemented accordingly. Historic towns are coveted spaces for value investment and speculation in real estate. Numerous world heritage sites show that the legislative protection of the heritage is insufficient. In Italy, the most valuable testimonies of antiquity and the Renaissance are suffering from decay; in France, there are many for sale and in the United Kingdom, they are to be divided into ‘heritage cash cows’ and ‘charity objects’ (van Oers 2016).

There are conflicts almost everywhere – including Salzburg and Goa. Despite the Historic City Conservation Law, a strict protection of historical monuments and the UNESCO world heritage award, Salzburg’s investors are able to impose on the city their fashionable and/or functional aesthetics of new buildings even in the core heritage zone. Neither bureaucracy nor politics have any proper instruments to find the necessary balance between careful development and responsible preser-
vation of the city’s treasures. Only a strong civic protest against construction projects planned in the protected core zone, which would have aesthetically challenged and compromised the world heritage ensemble of architecture, put the topic on the public agenda. In order to deal with such a problem, long-term urban planning that extends beyond the world heritage perimeter and buffer zone is needed (Luger/Ferch 2014).

The increasing number of illegal constructions in the Goa world heritage site buffer zone pose a great threat to the architectural heritage of Old Goa (Team Herald 2012). Despite the fact that these huts were illegally constructed and despite numerous concerns raised by the authorities at the Bom Jesus Basilica, the local village government seems to be turning a blind eye, especially since the residents of these illegal dwellings represent a potential vote bank for the next election. There are, however, certain legal precautions being taken on a national and regional level. The National Monument Authority of India was created with the explicit aim of strengthening the laws regarding the protection of the buffer zones, with the Goa world heritage site as one of the pilot projects. Although a (proposed) Goa Draft Regional Plan 2021 exists, that clearly defines land use at the Goa world heritage site as well as at the surrounding buffer zones, many heritage homes and buildings of the Portuguese era are missing in this plan (Sharma 2013).

Thus, although all the monuments within the boundaries of the Goa world heritage site are relatively well maintained and preserved with necessary conservation work being carried out, the threats from deforestation of trees as well as uncontrolled real estate speculation, development in the buffer zone are likely to result in damage to the site itself in the coming decades. Although the world heritage management (Archaeological Survey of India/ASI) does coordinate with the state government and the local village panchayats with regards to conservation, it does so only informally. The unbridled construction in the buffer zones shows that the world heritage management has little influence on regional development policies and strategies despite its best efforts. Closer involvement and support of the state government is required with regards to the buffer zone and a formal agreement, embedded in a clearly defined management plan, would help to improve participation and involvement of all the stakeholders in conservation efforts. This is an issue that must be taken up seriously and resolved at the earliest. As seen above, a protected historic city has to communicate with its environment. Only in this way can the districts be merged into a larger working construct. Tourism must also be seen in a broader context. Integrated into a sustainable regional development, sustainable cultural and natural tourism can develop and thus also make a significant contribution to the preservation of the world heritage (Nayak 2017).

Committed to the overarching goal of sustainability, it is therefore necessary to develop indicators for appropriate tourism activities of all participants in world heritage regions. What is valid for tourism in general, applies to the sensitive world
heritage and cultural tourism in a very special way, because the long-term preservation of the existing heritage is at the forefront of all considerations. Tourism is sustainable when it is

- possible in the long term, because resources are developed and utilised sparingly
- culturally compatible, because respect for local conventions and rites is expressed, a renunciation of exploitable commercialising and an adaptation to local standards takes place
- socially balanced, because the benefits and disadvantages are spread equally, regional disparities are avoided and locals are involved in the decision-making
- ecologically viable because of the lowest possible pressure on the environment, the prevention of biodiversity damage and the promotion of environmental awareness
- economically sensible and productive, because it is profitable for the local or national economy and contributes significantly to the creation of income for the local population (Luger 2008, 35).

Together with the UNESCO WH Centre, UNWTO has developed this concept of sustainability into a programme. Its overall objectives can be divided into the following five areas:

- Integrate sustainable tourism principles into the mechanisms of the World Heritage Convention.
- Strengthen the enabling environment by advocating policies, strategies, frameworks and tools that support sustainable tourism as an important vehicle for protecting and managing cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value.
- Promote broad stakeholder engagement in the planning, development and management of sustainable tourism that follows a destination approach to heritage conservation and focuses on empowering local communities.
- Provide World Heritage stakeholders with the capacity and the tools to manage tourism efficiently, responsibly and sustainably based on the local context and needs.
- Promote quality tourism products and services that encourage responsible behaviour among all stakeholders and foster understanding and appreciation of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value and protection of World Heritage. (OS 1)

Assessing tourism and world heritage in order to discover positive synergies in the form of benchmarks was objective of the abovementioned benchmark pilot study 2011. In comparison with other UNESCO world heritage sites, Salzburg performs well in terms of architectural preservation and tourism management; however, in terms of its communication achievements, it lags behind the others. A world heritage visitor centre is not available in Salzburg. Since no visitor guidance
system is available, one could critically note that the greatest weakness of the Salzburg world heritage can be seen in the lack of communication with locals and visitors. As mentioned above, until the escalation of the conflict due to new construction projects whose architecture threatened to overshadow the world heritage ensemble, the topic was not present in public at all. Political support is also considerably greater elsewhere, which can be seen by the fact that the title of world heritage is given relatively low importance by the responsible city administration. It took 17 years after Salzburg was recognized by UNESCO as a heritage of mankind for the municipality to nominate an officer responsible for the world heritage site of Salzburg. Among his first tasks was the revision of the management plan, which was requested by UNESCO several times. Given the enormous benefits to the image and economy that the city’s world heritage and cultural tourism brings, this is an astonishing finding in every respect. Eight years after publishing this study, the visitor centre remains in planning and the management plan remains under revision. The communication activities have been improved by the municipality. The world heritage is frequently in the media as a widely discussed subject in the context of overtourism, real estate speculation and the traffic problems (Salzburger Nachrichten 2018).
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The Goa world heritage site suffers from similar problems as Salzburg with regards to communication and awareness. Indeed, in the Communication & Awareness dimension, Goa saw its worst performance of the benchmarking study. Although a certain amount of coordination/networking takes place between the stake-
holders at the site of Goa – the Catholic Church (Archdiocese of Goa and Daman), which is responsible for the churches/convents and conducts religious services at the site, the state government & local village panchayat – the lack of a formal agreement/management plan that clearly delineates the partners’ roles and responsibilities (Nayak 2017) shows that there is room for improvement. The Archaeological Survey of India (ASI), the governmental body responsible for the conservation and management of the world heritage site, sees its role primarily in preservation. The world heritage site of Goa completely lacks communication and awareness-raising activities as well as a clear communication concept.

Churches and Convents of Goa

Located between the Arabian Sea and the Western Ghats, Goa is famous for its “white sandy seashores…beautiful landscapes dotted with palm trees…Exotic sun-kissed beaches along a crystal clear sea, sparkle like a trove of diamonds under the magic of the smiling sun” (Goa Tourism 2011). However, if one ventures beyond the palm-fringed beaches, there is much to see including numerous “gleaming whitewashed churches with Portuguese-style facades” in Old Goa (Menon 1993, 57) that date back to the 16th century. These churches, along with the surrounding convents and monasteries form the ‘Churches and Convents of Goa’, as the UNESCO world heritage site of Goa is officially known. Goa was proposed as a world heritage site on the basis that the site represented “an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble which illustrates the work of missionaries in Asia” (OS 2). When the Portuguese colonialists entered the Indian Ocean, they did so in search of ‘Christians and spices’. Having set foot in Goa, Christianization and acculturation (in a eurocentric, colonial framework) became the dominant themes of

4 The dissonant nature of postcolonial world heritage and its communication

What makes the communication and awareness efforts at the UNESCO world heritage site of Goa even more challenging is the dissonant nature of its (postcolonial) heritage. According to Misiura “there is great disdain amongst the general indigenous public for most of that which has been inherited from their colonial past” (2006, 16). This gains greater importance in postcolonial tourism destinations, since these “edifices of colonialism are often left in the hands of the formerly colonized who may be indifferent to the global significance” (Hitchcock 2005, 184). Those formerly colonized share a complicated relationship with these ‘edifices’ as
they view them as symbols of occupation and oppression as well as associating them with a colonizer-colonized power relationship that has been unfair and unequal in the past (Henderson 2007).

However, historic places with a postcolonial past (such as Goa) have not just one but a ‘multiplicity of stories’ that need to be told (Goodey 2002). According to McKercher/du Cros (2015), these multiple, contested histories often share the same physical space at the world heritage site. Deciding whose story to communicate thus becomes a key political decision of heritage communication. As not all aspects of the past can be interpreted and communicated to tourists and locals, a choice must be made as to which aspects of the past will be interpreted and communicated and which will not. This depends on “who is telling the story, who is in a position of power to influence the past…and therefore which stories or versions of those stories are told” (Timothy 2011, 132). Kuutma (2007, 177) speaks in this regard of the “politics of contested representation”. Indeed, “one of the most pervasive political manifestations of heritage and heritage tourism is the intentional disregard (or societal amnesia) of certain elements of the past” (Timothy 2011, 128). Rather than an objective representation (Saretzki 2008), the recalling of the past is more a subjective reconstruction as forgetting/suppressing/distorting are all part and parcel of cultural memory (Schacter 1999 cited in Saretzki 2008, 59). The fact that cultural heritage and thus world heritage is imagined, perceived and remembered differently, lies in its social embeddedness and is determined by social, political and hegemonic processes. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) refer to this as ‘dissonant heritage’. Despite this dissonant nature of heritage, researchers remain reluctant to include this dissonance as part of heritage, preferring instead to highlight an ideal of heritage that is inherently good. However, it is this dissonant character that is core to understanding the nature of heritage as it involves negotiating multiple, sometimes painful meanings of the past as can be seen in the case of Goa (Nayak 2017, 224).

Located between the Arabian Sea and the Western Ghats, Goa is famous for its “white sandy seashores…beautiful landscapes dotted with palm trees…Exotic sun-kissed beaches along a crystal clear sea, sparkle like a trove of diamonds under the magic of the smiling sun” (Goa Tourism 2011). However, if one ventures beyond the palm-fringed beaches, there is much to see including numerous “gleaming whitewashed churches with Portuguese-style facades” in Old Goa (Menon 1993, 57) that date back to the 16th century. These churches, along with the surrounding convents and monasteries form the ‘Churches and Convents of Goa’, as the UNESCO world heritage site of Goa is officially known. Goa was proposed as a world heritage site on the basis that the site represented “an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble which illustrates the work of missionaries in Asia” (OS 2).

When the Portuguese colonialists entered the Indian Ocean, they did so in search of ‘Christians and spices’. Having set foot in Goa, Christianization and acculturation (in a eurocentric, colonial framework) became the dominant themes of
their colonial imperialism, which were characterized by “conditions of coercion, radical inequality and intractable conflict” (Pratt 2008, 6). The local Goan population experienced numerous traumas as a result, including the destruction of temples, the transformation of the socio-religious patterns of its village communities and religious persecution. While the locals suffered from violent proselytization, given the ‘choice’ to either leave Goa, face discrimination or convert to the new religion. Unfortunately, it were the converts who suffered most from one of the most infamous periods in colonial Portuguese history – the Goan Inquisition, known also as the ‘Terrible Tribunal for the East’ that took place between 1560 and 1820. Despite adopting the same lifestyle as their colonial masters, converts continued to be judged by the colour of their skin with discrimination taking place concerning social position, marriage and exclusion from highest-level posts in the local administration. The new converts were also forced to leave their old cultural ways and adapt to the Lusitanian way of life as part of colonial attempts to de-structure the local culture and replace it with a model that promoted colonial interests (Nayak 2017).

Although Goa had a proud cultural heritage dating back before the arrival of the colonialists, during these 450 years of colonial rule, the colonial masters had managed to inscribe their colonial selves onto the body and space of the Goan Other. While Goa has gained freedom from its colonial rulers, the process of historical reconstruction highlights the pervasive effects of colonialism on the psyche of the Goan. Till date, historical works on Goa usually avoid a critical discourse, preferring instead to focus on what De Souza (1994) refers to as ‘tourist brochure history’. While this recollection of the colonial past might be painful, it is crucial that a community is educated about it if it is ever to come to terms with its own history. “If such memories are not remembered then they will haunt the social imagination and disrupt the present” (Morrison 1988 cited in Hall 1996, 66) with Bhabha referring to this process as a “putting together of the dismembered past to make sense of the trauma of the present” (1994, 63).

By and large, all the parties so far have remained quiet and a “fanciful doctrine of convenient inaction has come to prevail” (Afonso 2008, xxxv). However, there is a moral imperative to re-examine old wounds and search for a lasting cure as to “construe superficial conviviality and…bonhomie as deep rooted communal harmony is just fooling ourselves” (Afonso 2008, ii). Delaying the healing of old wounds and divisions could pose a serious threat to Goa’s current peaceful state as demands by right wing nationalists for a return to a ‘pre-colonial reality’, which although understandable given the brutal and unequal nature of the relationship between colonizer and colonized, is impossible as this ‘original’ past cannot be recovered since it has undergone a transformation and thus no longer exists in its original form.
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The Basilica of Bom Jesus is considered to be one of the best examples of Portuguese colonial architecture in India. (© Mihir Najak)

The Se Cathedral was built to commemorate the victory of the Portuguese under Afonso de Albuquerque and the beginning of Portuguese colonial rule in Goa. (© Mihir Najak)
Despite the increasing number of controversial attempts to stir up communal disharmony, there are still those who question the need to highlight the dissonant aspects of heritage as long as the tensions are not openly visible. Indeed, the mere absence of conflict does not necessarily mean that communal disharmony is not a threat. The colonial scars are merely simmering below the surface and can be easily reopened by right-wing nationalists wishing to sanitize Goa’s colonial (heritage and) past (Nayak 2017). Thus, although the region might currently lack open conflicts, the potential for tensions to flare up remains a constant threat unless intercultural dialogue is established and (mental) decolonization completed. True peace will only be possible once the dissonant issues of the past are openly discussed rather than swept under the carpet (Dann and Seaton, 2001).

Tilden (1977) postulates the goal of heritage communication and interpretation should be to offer a holistic version of the story, instead of merely restricting itself to a particular part. Details of a conflict-laden history thus need not be avoided during the process of interpretation (Nayak 2017) and visitor communication at the world heritage site need not be limited to a nostalgic perspective, but instead include a constructive yet critical dialogue on the more controversial aspects of the site’s history (Rodrian 2011). Indeed, dissonant heritage interpretation offers a great opportunity to deal with conflict by trying to locate common ground with Merkel even referring to it as being a “beautiful learning challenge” (2002, 148).

Despite divergent perspectives on its symbolic significance, the different communities at the Goa world heritage site must participate in sharing meaning together for intercultural understanding to take place. Stakeholder participation that involves all the local communities in decisions regarding their cultural heritage is a crucial element of successful heritage interpretation and communication. Participatory mechanisms at world heritage sites that encourage communication and dialogue between various local stakeholders also fulfil the aim of the world heritage programme, i.e. to promote intercultural understanding by transforming world heritage sites into spaces of intercultural encounters and thus, intercultural dialogue. Given their universal relevance, world heritage sites such as Goa have the potential to transcend cultural boundaries and become spaces of dialogue where cultural differences regarding the significance and meaning of cultural heritage can be resolved. If interpreted and communicated properly, world heritage sites such as Goa can help the local population appreciate the intercultural aspects of their history, thus enabling them to have a better understanding and tolerance for the intercultural aspect of their present (Harrison 2005).

5 Learning from history and intercultural understanding

The cultural heritage of a site provides a ‘history generated unique selling proposition’ and is a key advantage over other destinations in the increasingly competitive global tourism market (Luger 2015a). Colonial heritage spaces are not merely a
symbol of imperialism and oppression but also tourist magnets, as they are often specifically angled towards and made more relevant/compelling for foreign tourist visitors (Hitchcock 2005, 184) in order to boost tourist numbers. By enabling local communities to meaningfully participate and contribute to the heritage attribution and communication process, it is possible to deflect Harrison’s (2005a) criticism, that destinations designate colonial architecture as heritage only in order to attract international tourists from the ex-colonizing countries.

The objective of world heritage tourism is, on the one hand, to preserve the world heritage site, while on the other hand, to make cultural heritage accessible. The cultural task of comprehensive information formulated in the world heritage convention also includes the promotion of understanding for other cultural orders, ways of thinking and life forms. Dialogue skills and the understanding of other cultures are not only developed by visiting a cultural site that has been prepared for tourism and intercultural encounters require more than the mere entering of and curiously gazing at a foreign space (Rössler 2005).

World heritage tourism can be an outstanding intercultural medium (Saretzki/May 2012). The whole site or the entire region becomes a world stage, an open-air auditorium, every world heritage site can be considered a huge educational platform. Cultural tourism enables insights and understanding, reduces cultural confusion (Hottola 2004) and enables intercultural learning and understanding, without the need to establish a typical learning situation. Many tourists come highly motivated to make sense out of the site’s history and do not need any classroom-like didactics – the world heritage site is an open-air classroom! However, unless an immersion in the complex meaning systems and meaning worlds takes place, a cultural system cannot be understood or comprehended.

To experience means to first see, then comprehend and understand its meaning. The task of cultural mediation both opens the eyes of the inhabitants of a region to their past as well as explains to the visitors from abroad what shaped the peculiarity of living patterns in the past and perhaps what still influences them today. The quality of the mediation, which must keep up with the extraordinary importance of the world heritage, is therefore crucial for cultural and heritage tourism. The quality lies in the presentation or in the history which is told – in storytelling, in the atmospheric experience character and thus also in the overall tourism product. Ultimately, it is the combination of service and price, of importance and appreciation that determines whether the visitors are able to take with them a positive experience as a result of a successful sojourn in a previously unknown configuration of space and time. The profane pilgrimage to sites of world heritage thus corresponds to a collective process of emotional appropriation of a space. This place making can be interpreted as an expression of the highest esteem for the extraordinary achievements and the cultural heritage of a place as well as its bygone and current residents (Luger 2019).
Cultural heritage becomes a creative and communicative learning space for cultural tourists in their leisure time. Using a non-school didactic, visitors come closer to that what is often unspecifically referred to as “broadening the horizon” (Lauterbach 2011). In this manner, as individual treasure seekers, they may reach a goal that was already referred to in the 16th century by the travelling scholar Theodor Zwinger in his Methodus Academicus. In the same way that valuable goods were shipped from all over the world to the important trading towns and further distributed from there, the “treasures of wisdom and of virtue” spread over the globe, were gathered as a result of trade-related intercultural encounters in these towns, becoming centres of knowledge and exchange. It is up to institutions like trans-confessional churches or academies in the sense Platon had in mind to then process these treasures into instructions for daily life by means of clear thinking. Picked up and experienced by visitors, one can say that travelling in this sense will be of importance for any form of living (Stagl 2002, 158).
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Site Managers for Urban Heritage – Competencies, Roles, Skills, and Characteristics

How urban heritage is perceived has changed significantly over the past years, and so too has the role of local communities. A more systemic and holistic understanding of urban heritage has been gaining favour as urban heritage sites face a number of global, regional and local challenges. In order to coordinate the complexities of urban heritage sites, new roles for site managers have evolved over the past two decades, not only as part of pertinent international instruments, but also as a bottom-up development at many urban heritage sites around the world. That being said, there is still no official occupational profile for site managers. The following discourse will initially address: how urban heritage is currently perceived, the concept of historic urban landscapes, and the current challenges. Accordingly, the different roles, requisite skills, and relevant personality dimensions of site managers will then be examined and elaborated.

1 Urban Heritage: A System and Processes that belong to Local Communities

A new understanding of heritage is manifesting – one that has shifted from an initially object-based approach to a more holistic understanding of heritage that presently represents a system of diverse entities with an increasingly strong emphasis on communities and the varied use of heritage over time (Kalman 2014). This perspective on cultural heritage gives a more active role to local communities and includes a variety of actors, different mind-sets, different skills and, most importantly, a different attitude that animates cultural heritage for the benefit of all (Ripp/Hauer 2017). Appreciating the role of communities in heritage practices and acquiring a modern understanding of cultural heritage has serious implications for heritage professionals, heritage communities and organizations active in the field of cultural heritage.

Given the increased importance of local communities, their participation from the outset is absolutely essential for reaching a common understanding of the objectives connected to a cultural heritage (Ripp/Rodwell 2016). To achieve the greatest potential benefit to all it is important to create an interactive space by identifying and integrating all stakeholders. These stakeholders could be institutions...
and individuals who have a controlling political or financial interest in a place, or they could be anyone who has physical or intellectual access. Stakeholders can be classified as follows:

First: the direct users (local community);
Second: indirect users (incoming business people, consumers and tourists, service providers and other employment and visitor-related entities);
Third: influencers (governmental, non-governmental, academic, and external vested agents).

At present cultural heritage is understood within an inherent complex of interrelationships that is community-oriented, dynamic rather than static, and systemic not linear; it requires management systems, especially those found within acting administrations and institutions, to replace “the usual sector or one-dimensional approaches with new transversal or multidimensional ones, aligning different policy areas and resources … taking into account the role of each part in the whole structure” (Council of European Union 2010). It is the communities of practice (Wenger 1998), the informal, self-generating networks that determine whether an organization functions as a dynamic self-reflection. Today, cultural heritage is perceived much more comprehensively than in previous generations – going beyond the aims of protecting and safeguarding for future generations. “Traditionally, planners viewed historic areas as a collection of monuments and buildings to be preserved as relics of the past, whose value was considered to be totally separate from their day-to-day use and city context” (Siravo 2014 p. 161). This tangible approach to heritage was rooted in the physical appearance of monuments, material conditions and a traditional understanding of heritage preservation as a mainly material science – the territory for conservators (Ripp 2018). Laurajane Smith has labelled this the “authorized heritage discourse” (Smith 2006).

This perception of cultural heritage still prevails, especially in Europe. The traditional approach to the identification and delineation of cultural and natural heritage as properties is firmly embedded in the 1972 UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, known as the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 1972). Under “Definitions”, Article 1 simply embraces monuments, groups of buildings and sites as “cultural heritage”. Looking back to the 1964 Venice Charter in its founding doctrinal text – adopted by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) in 1965 – passing references to “setting” and “some socially useful purpose” (ICOMOS 1964) are made that when interpreted, do anticipate a shift in understanding cultural heritage. As an extension to this position, Article 5(a) of the 1972 Convention also expresses the aspiration “to adopt a general policy which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes”. A more recent comprehensive interpretation, which establishes a major shift in understanding cultural heritage, acknowledges the dependent relationship between “heritage” (tangible and intangi-
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Urban Heritage in Krakow (© Matthias Ripp)

Understanding heritage as a system and operation / process with modern-day challenges and valued participation from local communities calls for coordinating roles that integrate different entities, operations and processes in a specific setting. In the “New Urban Agenda” that was drawn up from the Habitat III Conference in
Quito 2016, a people-centred approach to sustainable development that is participatory and civically engaging is emphasized (UNESCO 2017 p. 5, 8, 15). The use of cultural heritage for urban development is also addressed (UNESCO 2017 p. 32).

2 Urban Heritage and the Historic Urban Landscape

Heritage, particularly Urban Heritage, is significant in drawing people to a place. In Europe, the 2018 Year of Cultural Heritage attracted millions of visitors to specific events and activities – most of them taking place in urban settings (European Commission 2019). The number of sites is growing both on the World Heritage List (UNESCO 2019) as well as in other heritage-related programs like the European Heritage Label (European Commission 2019). For instance, European Heritage Days, started in 1985, is held on various days in 50 different countries and attracts millions of visitors each year (European Commission 2019). A large number of initiatives focus on cultural performances that are directly related to a cultural heritage site and are facilitated through programs like the European Capitals of Culture or through projects funded by the Creative Europe Program (European Commission 2019). For many Europeans, cultural heritage, and urban heritage in particular, is an intrinsic part of their daily lives as they regularly “use” historic public places, transportation structures, and buildings in activities such as education, employment, recreation, shopping, and more.

How heritage is understood has been changing consequently. Whereas in the early beginnings of the preservation movement, heritage was simply associated with iconic buildings, like churches and castles (Riegl 1903), in the 20th century heritage was increasingly apprehended as tangible ensembles and urban landscapes. The categories used in defining cultural heritage in UNESCO’s Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO 1972) reflect the international community’s understanding of heritage at the time. In the last years of the 20th century and increasingly in the 21st century new categories of heritage have been identified: Intangible Heritage (UNESCO 2003) and the Memory of the World Register (UNESCO 2019) were added, thereby expanding the definition of cultural heritage.

- Cultural Heritage
  - Tangible cultural heritage:
    - movable cultural heritage (like paintings, sculptures, coins, manuscripts)
    - immovable cultural heritage (like monuments, archaeological sites)
    - underwater cultural heritage (like shipwrecks, underwater ruins and cities)
  - Intangible cultural heritage:
    - oral traditions, performing arts, rituals, techniques and practices
• Natural Heritage
  Natural sites with cultural aspects such as Cultural Landscapes; physical, biological or geological formations
• Heritage in the Event of Armed Conflict (UNESCO 2019)

The Convention on the Historic Urban Landscape (UNESCO 2011) was adopted by UNESCO’s General Conference in 2011. It incorporates ideas from the discipline of urban morphology (Whitehand 2007) and acknowledges Urban Heritage as a complex matter defined by a variety of factors. The Convention takes into account not only the existing built environment, but also the functions and values that help interpret the heritage. In the Convention, Urban Heritage is apprehended holistically and systemically within the context “…that urban heritage is for humanity a social, cultural and economic asset, defined by a historic layering of values…” (UNESCO 2011 Preamble). This new framing broadens our understanding of the complexity of Urban Heritage more than ever before (ICOMOS, 1964). Ron van Oers and Francesco Bandarin describe the Historic Urban Landscape approach not as something radically new or a substitution for existing approaches, but rather as “…the layering and diversity of visions and methodologies that have been handed down from a century-long tradition” (Bandarin, Francesco, and Ron Van Oers p. xvii). Moreover, they state a key objective of the Historic Urban Landscape approach is to “…help redefine Urban Heritage as the centre of the spatial development process…” (Bandarin, Francesco, and Ron Van Oers p. xvii)

Upon reflection of this general shift in understanding of cultural heritage (as previously described), Urban Heritage, in its diversification and re-coding, has become a topic of integration affecting different fields, sectors, stakeholders and “users” in a cross-cutting way. When we presently speak of Urban Heritage, a variety of “heritages” is being considered: either cultural, natural, tangible, or intangible, etc.

This new complex appreciation of Urban Heritage has many ramifications. On the one hand, it opens the door to new and different connections between heritage and urban development (Mina/Marija 2017, Ripp/Hauer 2019). The inclusion of local communities in the concept of Urban Heritage makes it possible to improve people’s lives by integrating urban development processes /operations. This approach has been implemented in the COMUS (Community-Led Urban Strategies in Historic Towns) project (Ripp/Stein 2018). On the other hand, local authorities will find it more complicated to manage Urban Heritage, as the larger parameters include many more “layers” and factors for a holistic appreciation. At the same time different skills and a greater number of competencies are required in the management of heritage addressing the issues of coordination, interpretation and cooperation.
3 New Trends, Challenges and Opportunities for Urban World Heritage Sites

According to Fusco Girard (2013 p. 4330), cities can be understood as dynamic complex systems represented by “interdependences (between human-made, natural, social capital, etc.); circular processes (which stimulate creativity) and synergies (which increase the resilience capacity)”. This also counts for World Heritage towns / cities which are part of much larger systems and subsystems that embody the economy, migration, the economy, and culture.

Current trends and challenges such as climate change, demographic shifts, and individualization within society are also issues relevant to World Heritage towns / cities. When dealing with population growth, housing demands, traffic, tourism and issues concerning sustainable urban management (Städtetag 2019 p.4), there are significant Urban Heritage features to contend with (CHCFE Consortium 2016). The safeguarding of heritage, either tangible or intangible, proves to be a challenge for many World Heritage sites as they try to adapt to the demands of modern society by accommodating new developments in urban mobility, and digitalization etc. Mediating between different heritage objectives and societal demands has become more difficult like in the case of Liverpool (Rodwell 2015). A number of World Heritage sites are struggling to implement, for instance, new transportation infrastructure without damaging the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the sites (Ringbeck /Rössler 2011).

In general a World Heritage designation has positive connotations and is a source of pride for a community. It can attract visitors, give a favourable impression of the local economy, and foster the establishment of new businesses. Companies from whatever sector that set up in or near a World Heritage town / city anticipate positive economic outcomes and find prestige in their association with World Heritage (Koller 2016). Moreover, heritage preservation itself directly stimulates the economy. UNESCO World Heritage towns / cities contribute considerably in this by collaborating with conservation commissions, medium-sized companies, and craft trades from various disciplines (Städtetag 2019 p.7) Their labor-intensive goods and services provide for high quality standards and for site sustainability.

The negative impacts of climate change are some of the most overt challenges facing UNESCO World Heritage towns / cities around the world. The increased frequency and intensity of storms, heavy rains, floods, and droughts are examples of extreme weather conditions that can lead to the rise or fall of moisture levels in soils that threaten archaeological sites and historical buildings. UNESCO World Heritage towns / cities are in need of special programs to protect their sometimes fragile historic urban fabric from these events in order to maintain their OUV. (City of Regensburg, Ripp et al. 2009)

Strategies and tools to lower carbon-dioxide emissions are also required in World Heritage towns / cities. The use of energy-saving building materials is one
possible adaptive measure. However, in as much as these measures are gaining new and greater importance in combating climate change, they can also be potentials for new conflicts. For example, the introduction of more plants and greenery in historic urban areas can challenge the authenticity and integrity of a respective site’s preservation (Städtetag 2019 p.8/9).

The challenges and opportunities presented to World Heritage towns / cities are complex, diverse, and constantly changing. Respective administrators are called to flexibility, adaptation, and a systemic understanding of a given Urban Heritage.

4 An Integrated Approach to Heritage Management

An integrated approach to heritage management is an appropriate response to the aforementioned holistic and systemic understanding of Urban Heritage and sustainable urban development. The EU defines sustainable urban development within this approach – associating the physical aspects of Urban Heritage with urban renewal, as well as social and intangible components.

“It is increasingly clear that the various challenges facing urban areas – economic, environmental, climate, social and demographic – are interwoven and success in urban development can only be achieved through an integrated approach. Hence, measures concerning physical urban renewal should be combined with measures promoting education, economic development, social inclusion and environmental protection. The development of strong partnerships involving local citizens, civil society, the local economy and the various levels of government is an indispensable element. Combining capacities and local knowledge is essential to identify shared solutions and to achieve well accepted and sustainable results” (European Commission 2014).

Communities are playing a more important role in Urban Heritage management across Europe ever since local citizens and civil society, in general, have been included in the operation / process (Göttler/ Ripp 2017).

The Faro Convention (Council of Europe 2005), in addition to the UNESCO Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscapes (UNESCO 2011), gives communities a more central position in heritage activities. Across Europe, especially at the European Commission level, there is recognition that the integrated approach is a key strategy that enables administrations to act and react effectively in the field of cultural heritage (European Commission 2014). In the 2007 Leipzig Charter, ministers in charge of urban development in the member states of the European Union, declared:

“For us, integrated urban development policy means simultaneous and fair consideration of the concerns and interests which are relevant to urban development. Integrated urban development policy is a process in which the spatial, sectoral and temporal aspects of key areas of urban policy are coordinated. The involvement of economic actors, stakeholders and the general public is essential. Integrated urban
Within Urban Heritage the integrated approach is particularly relevant as it engages a complex system in which a great number of interdependent parameters and operations/processes are occurring and are concurrently having an effect (Ripp/Rodwell 2016). Matters concerning Urban Heritage usually fall under the responsibility of local governments, and are often delegated to a conservation department. This local authority is determined in a governance-system that is “one-dimensional” – one that aligns specific matters to different sectors, such as finance, urban planning, economic development, housing, education and social services. However, the challenges and responsibilities [of Urban Heritage] are not limited to the office of a single authority. Cross-sectoral access is required in which matters stimulating innovation. As such, a number of developments in the management of Urban Heritage will arise. Firstly, operations and processes that managers deal with will change and expand. Secondly, a variety of methods and tools will be required to support the cross-sectoral cooperation within administrations. And thirdly, also most importantly, the relevant competencies and skills for managing heritage will change.

5 The Role of Site Managers

A role as defined by Bell (2013) in the Open Education Sociology Dictionary is “a position containing a set of socially defined attributes and expectations that determine appropriate behaviour for an individual or group based on their status in relation to other people or groups.”

The apparent need to coordinate heritage-related activities that go far beyond the concepts of preservation or conservation comes from the changed perceptions and broadened understandings of heritage. These have been realized in a growing number of international and national programs, like the UNESCO World Heritage List and the European Heritage Label. Even though site managers are not mentioned in the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO 1972), in the latest version of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 2019) site managers are referred to again and again. They are considered key users of the Operational Guidelines and are identified with the preparation of tentative lists and documents (e.g. maps) for the World Heritage Committee, not to mention the process of periodic reporting and on-site missions carried out by advisory bodies. The German Commission for UNESCO recommended already in 2006 that UNESCO World Heritage sites in Germany secure full-time coordinator positions.
for large and complex sites. Ringbeck (2008 p.33) lists a number of responsibilities for these positions including: strategy development, monitoring, scientific work, cooperation in community networks, information transfere, participation, conflict management, fundraising, and public relations. Albeit site managers have been included in the conceptual governance system of World Heritage sites and have been given a significant number of responsibilities in the Operational Guidelines, there is still no definition of what a site manager exactly does, and what his/her role is. However, over the course of [my]15 years of interaction between heritage professionals across Europe and the world, there is consensus that the main roles of site managers are those of coordinator, leader, mediator, interpreter, facilitator and innovator.

Coordinator
Heritage is understood more broadly today, encompassing different sectors within local administrations, members of local communities, and other private and public stakeholders. It follows that there is a need for coordinating the dealings of different issues between these entities. For example, the documentation and communication of Jewish Heritage in Regensburg (City of Regensburg 2019) has drawn on collaboration with the Jewish community, local museums, the Department of Culture, tourist guides and other stakeholders.

Leader
Heritage projects and operations / processes need not only to be coordinated, but also designed and implemented. Leadership is required especially for projects and operations /processes that are not essentially regulated or legislated by laws. Their cross-sectoral nature calls for one person, a leader, to discern issues, design facilitation, and to carry out actions effectively.

Mediator
Few heritage sites are conflict free, and the disputes that do occur often arise from the different needs and interests of affected people and stakeholders. A string of conflicts can exist between the interests of preservation and modernization, between tourist requirements and the needs of inhabitants, and / or between shop owners and residents. A balancing act is required between the different public / private interests and the safeguarding of the heritage site (Mühlmann et al. 2012). Mediating a balanced outcome is a core responsibility of a site manager and the process should be imbedded in the development of a World Heritage management plan.

Interpreter
Creating and communicating narratives for a given heritage site is another major role of a site manager. Delivering the message to local communities and various target groups usually involves cooperation with different partners. A World
Heritage visitor centre can also help in professionally communicating and interpreting a site (UNESCO 2019).

**Facilitator**
Events, conferences, round tables, working groups and meetings are many of the formats that bring a site manager together with other actors. This facilitation is essential to organizing the different tasks of a site manager with partners, and is another important responsibility of the site manager.

**Innovator**
To deal with the on-going challenges and opportunities for Urban Heritage sites, new strategies have to be developed. How to deal with the impacts of climate change on Urban Heritage is one such challenge. Developing innovative, collaborative ideas and strategies to deal with changes, and providing corresponding actions and interventions is another key responsibility of a site manager.

6 The Tasks of Site Managers

According to the European Commission’s initiative, Voices of Culture (Voices of Culture 2017 p. 13), tasks within the roles of cultural heritage management are wide ranging and affect policies, expertise, mediation, and the public. Tasks from the technical side require hard skills, but tasks from the social side draw on significant soft skills. The following discourse lists the most relevant tasks to each of the aforementioned managerial roles:

**Coordination**
The coordination of projects, cross-sectoral concerns, and urban interventions requires regular communication, feedback and monitoring. More specifically, this means managing projects and communicating different concerns across sectors as well as monitoring their development. In communicating projects, decision makers at various political levels need to be addressed in order for political decision-making to take place. Proposal writing for grants is also required to secure funding for projects. Networking, continually, with cooperative partners from different positions is also necessary.

**Leadership**
Integrated projects not only need a coordinator, but also a leader who looks after their development by guiding and and promoting the associated activities. This includes presenting and marketing projects to decision makers on local, regional and national levels. To keep projects on track mid- or long-term strategy flow charts need to be created with marked targeted objectives and milestones. Decision-makers need to have convincing documentation to provide the resources for a pro-
ject, and in cases of delayed implementation or problems the site manager needs to intervene [using this tracking tool].

**Mediation**

An essential task for mediators is arbitrating between agents of different interests and/or needs and finding compromise in the conflicts. Mediation finds relevance in the development of long-term management plans and strategies for a heritage site, and finds purpose in the specific planning and development of independent projects. It demands the identification of interests and needs and the recognition of conflicts. Consequently, skills in communicating with a wide range of stakeholders are required. When mediation is found necessary, the site manager must provide the right setting and negotiate as a neutral participant.

**Interpretation**

To communicate heritage values and narratives is a broad and diverse task that gives consideration to a wide range of target groups. Interpretation involves skills in the presentation of heritage, the designing and delivery of activities (like events, or digital and analogue interpretive mediation), and the development of narratives. The design and operation of interpretative facilities like visitor centres can also call a site manager to task. Content needs to be produced and media partnerships need to be established and maintained. These tasks require a considerable amount of cooperation with partners and stakeholders in the field. Moreover, the effectiveness of communication activities need to be evaluated on a regular basis.

**Facilitation**

Collaboration between the sectors of a local public administration, external partners and stakeholders takes place in various formats and must be organized accordingly. Gatherings of different scope are facilitated differently, ranging from meetings to conferences. This involves organizing and procuring required resources, as well as coordinating and implementing their use. The outcomes from these venues are to be documented and the attendance of political representatives accounted for.

**Innovation**

In keeping with heritage values, innovative ways of communicating and meeting urban challenges are required. Tasks that are applicable to this end are the joint development and application of newly created tools and methods in addition to the elaboration of innovative content. A site manager needs to acquire an open mindset towards the process of continuous learning and the exploration of exemplary best practices. The transferability of solutions from other sectors and fields must also be kept in view. Furthermore, existing projects and interventions need to be adapted and/or changed according to requirements and environments that regularly vary over time.
Although not exhaustive, the roles of a site manager include new elements that are clearly different and set this position apart from others. The need to be knowledgeable in a specific discipline is minimal as expertise can be hired from the outside or from other departments of the local administration. The tasks that site managers perform generally coordinate operations / processes and especially focus on communication.

7 Skills and Competencies

The publication “Voices of Europe” addresses training and capacity building in traditional and new occupations, and was compiled from a formal discourse on the preservation of European cultural heritage between the European Commission and the cultural sector (Voices of Culture 2017). A range of competencies was identified including language, technical, digital, learning, and social skills. However, the list disregarded a number of technical competencies and skills that are connected to the preservation and conservation of cultural heritage. Nonetheless, the stated competencies and skills remain relevant to site managers even when profiled slightly differently (Table 1):

The tabulated competencies and skills from the Voices of Europe report are useful in identifying many of the requirements for site managers. While these numerous skills and competencies relate to site managers, others are still missing, for instance: narrative development – pertinent to the interpretation role of a site ma-
Although not exhaustive, the roles of a site manager include new elements that are clearly different and set this position apart from others. The need to be knowledgeable in a specific discipline is minimal as expertise can be hired from the outside or from other departments of the local administration. The tasks that site managers perform generally coordinate operations / processes and especially focus on communication.

Table 1: Relevant Competencies and Skills for Site Managers (column 1 & 2 based on (Voices of Culture, 2017 p. 16) and column 3 – 5 based on own considerations):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transversal Competencies for Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Associated Skills to Meet the Transversal Competencies for Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Relevance for Site Managers</th>
<th>Additional Relevant Skills for Site Managers</th>
<th>Corresponding Role of Site Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; advocacy within an organization and between stakeholders</td>
<td>active listening, participative dialogue, cultural awareness</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>mediation addressing conflicts, addressing decision makers &amp; political levels</td>
<td>Mediator, Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogic knowledge transfer</td>
<td>cultural exchange, interpretation, storytelling, developing communication with expert &amp; nonexpert audiences, developing skills in other languages</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>narrative development</td>
<td>Coordinator, Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial competence</td>
<td>entrepreneurship, risk assessment, awareness of financial &amp; social impacts, budget management, sustainable business model awareness, fundraising understanding &amp; engagement</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>proposal writing &amp; development</td>
<td>Coordinator, Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management competence</td>
<td>stakeholder management, volunteer management, human resources management, change management</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>scoping of projects, interventions &amp; processes</td>
<td>Mediator, Coordinator, Facilitator, Innovator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic thinking</td>
<td>developing resilience through innovative, analytical &amp; critical thinking, investment in multidisciplinary training, research, advocacy &amp; negotiation, mediation &amp; facilitation, marketing, evaluation, stakeholder analysis</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>design of participation processes, analytic, synthetic &amp; systemic thinking, connecting &amp; relating different elements of heritage (tangible, intangible)</td>
<td>Mediator, Coordinator, Leader, Innovator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital competence</td>
<td>openness to &amp; awareness of new technologies (digital), ICT, organization &amp; strategy alignment, development of digital literacy</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>knowing digital means for interpretation &amp; participation</td>
<td>Interpreter, Innovator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective thinking</td>
<td>trend spotting, horizon scanning, curiosity, creativity, continue &amp; manage open learning and development</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>development of training &amp; capacity building strategies</td>
<td>Innovator, Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared stewardship</td>
<td>realizing commonalities, citizen engagement, team working, inclusivity, networking</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>mastering participation &amp; integration methods</td>
<td>Innovator, Coordinator, Mediator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Competence</td>
<td>social adjustment, social performance, social skills</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mediator, Interpreter, Facilitator, Coordinator, Leader, Innovator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nager, or mediation – important to the mediator role. Not only do site managers have to demonstrate these competencies, they have to acquire a wider variety of competencies and skills in their role of coordinator; the two most relevant are communication and social competencies.

In the field of human resource management and recruiting there exists one personality model that is widely acclaimed and commonly used for the selection of candidates. The Big Five Model for Personality (Howard/Howard 1995) defines five personality dimensions: 1.) extraversion, 2.) emotional stability, 3.) agreeableness, 4.) conscientiousness, and 5.) openness to experience. Relating these personality dimensions to the different roles of site managers gives some indication as to which personalities would feel comfortable working as a site manager and how successful they would be in carrying out their roles:

When applying the Big Five Model for Personality, the dimension parameters allow for a detailed profile. It is beyond the scope of this discourse to examine all of the relevant personality factors of the Model and how they relate to the rolls of site managers, but some general assumptions can be made:

1. Extraversion and emotional stability are of high importance for site managers because they directly relate to communication and social competencies.
2. Openness is a personality factor relevant for the role of innovator.
3. Neither extreme of Agreeableness, i.e. challenger or adapter, (Howard/Howard 1995 p. 4ff) equips a person well enough for his / her roles as a site manager. A middle profile is considered more beneficial.

### Table 2: Big Five Personality Dimensions Related to the Roles of Site Managers (column 1 & 2 based on (Howard/Howard 1995 p. 4-7) and column 3 based own considerations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>High Relevance for roles of Site Manager as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>refers to the number of relationships with which one feels comfortable</td>
<td>Mediator Coordinator, Leader, Interpreter, Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional stability</td>
<td>refers to the number &amp; strengths of stimuli required to trigger negative emotions in a person</td>
<td>Mediator, Facilitator, Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>refers to the number of sources which are forming the norms for a person’s “right” behaviour</td>
<td>Mediator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>refers to the number of goals a person is working on in parallel</td>
<td>Leader, Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>refers to the number of interests to which a person is attracted &amp; the profoundness by which the interests are followed</td>
<td>Innovator, Coordinator, Leader, Interpreter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicable examples include management plans that function as tools to develop integrated aims and actions on how to preserve, communicate and develop a heritage site (Mühlmann et al. 2012; Ripp/Rodwell 2018). Communication methods like exhibitions, visitor centres, and brochures, as well as tools like digital applications, websites, social media etc., can be used to convey and interpret urban heritage to different target groups. Methods of innovation like “Design Thinking”...
4. Conscientiousness is most beneficial for the role of leader, but there are also elements of flexibility within it that are essential for the role of innovator.

5. When selecting persons for site managing, attention should be given to the personality dimensions of extraversion, emotional stability, and openness to experience.

6. Training by way of capacity building activities, coaching, mentoring and other tools can, to a degree, develop the required competencies and skills.

8 Tools and Methods

Having a set of tools and methods is also important to carrying out the tasks and roles of a site manager. The tools and methods are with only a few exceptions, such as in heritage impact assessment, transferable across the field of site management and its many contexts; they are not exclusive to site managers. They do not target preservation and conservation directly, but rather focus on different operations / processes like presentation, cooperation, and facilitation.

Applicable examples include management plans that function as tools to develop integrated aims and actions on how to preserve, communicate and develop a heritage site (Mühlmann et al. 2012; Ripp/Rodwell 2018). Communication methods like exhibitions, visitor centres, and brochures, as well as tools like digital applications, websites, social media etc., can be used to convey and interpret urban heritage to different target groups. Methods of innovation like “Design Thinking”
can be used to develop new narratives, projects, and even products. Project management methods help steer and control plans of different scale ranging from local to international. Mediation methods are advantageous in addressing the conflicting interests of stakeholders and local communities. Methods of facilitation and moderation are useful to integrate a broad range of stakeholders and to balance different interests. By following a people-centred approach and using various formats (i.e. advisory boards, stakeholder workshops and digital means) facilitation methods help to attain the cooperation of different stakeholders and decision makers.

With all of these tools and methods to choose from it seems almost impossible that a site manager, alone, could apply them in his or her wide range of roles. However, having an organized core-set of tools and methods is essential to carrying out the main managerial responsibilities of a site. In cases of special operations / processes, outside expertise can be hired; nevertheless, a site manager should be able to assess, select, and deploy this expertise.

9 Conclusion

In my 15 years of coordinating both temporary and permanent national and international networks in Urban Heritage, I was rarely asked about what qualifications a site manager needed. Instead, I was often asked where a site manager could best be placed within a local government. In general, heritage and especially World Heritage is considered prestigious with many options for media exposure. This is one reason why local administrative departments engage in placing a site manager within their sectoral reach, and why political leaders find favour by associating themselves with heritage – keeping in mind that administrations often change after every election, as well as their political direction. In my assessment it is clearly more important to understand who the site manager is rather than which department he / she is assigned to. A credible site manager is not the better conservationist or curator of an exhibition, but rather the one who stimulates and facilitates cooperation. A site manager who is capable of fulfilling his / her different roles achieves great results regardless of being placed in a relevant sector of a local administration.

Identifying and analyzing the tasks and roles of site managers is one thing; finding the right people, or training those (already employed) in the competencies and skills they need, is another. It has been common practice to select an employee who is already part of the local government for a site managerial position. His or her professional background would have been favourably based in one or more fields, such as conservation, communication, and / or law. After being assigned to the position he / she would receive very little training in the competencies and skills important to site management.

Although international and national institutions concerned with heritage management provide training opportunities, with few exceptions they have not
directed their attention to the specific needs of site managers (Council of Europe 2016 p. 49f, OWHC 2019).

Consequently, the different tasks of managing a site are often delegated to different members of a team. The leader of the team is considered the site manager. Having a team for site management is highly recommended when the roles of the site manager are clearly understood. These managerial roles gain breadth when delegated – enriched from the different personalities, competencies and skills of team members.

Students [interested in heritage] usually find themselves in university programs that follow the embedded curriculum of specific disciplines. More room for opportunities to research concepts, roles, competencies and skills for site managers would be desirable in these disciplines. One idea would be to use the Grounded Theory approach to analyze articles, documents, interviews, etc. on site management and thereby deepen understanding of the operations / processes, competencies and skills for the different roles that site managers have.

Underlying the described different roles of a site manager is an integrated approach that is now widely accepted. As a result, managing a site has become a story of success. The increased popularity of Urban Heritage can be attributed to the important roles site managers play in their assignments. By balancing the different needs and addressing the constant challenges within Urban Heritage and World Heritage, site managers have become indispensable.
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An Integrated Development Plan and a Spatial Development Framework for the Greater Stellenbosch, South Africa

1 Synopsis

Stellenbosch Municipality is in the process of preparing an Integrated Development Plan (IDP) and a Spatial Development Framework (SDF) for the Greater Stellenbosch. At the request of the executive committee of e'Bosch Heritage Project (www.ebosch.co.za), this report was prepared by the undersigned in consultation with e'Bosch as a contribution to the public discussions that are taking place during the preparation of the IDP/SDF process and with due regard for the commitments e'Bosch have made in the joint endorsement of the Declaration of Intent between Stellenbosch Municipality and the University of Stellenbosch on 12 July 2012.

Established in 2011 as a voluntary non-governmental organization, the e'Bosch project aims to help develop ways to promote social inclusion and eliminating social injustice in communities in the greater Stellenbosch area. At the heart of this commitment is to promote a mutual culture (a way of life), which could be handed down to future generations. e'Bosch views this culture as synonymous with a sustainability culture that arises from a sustainable development process. In democratic South Africa, a culture of the above kind commenced with Mr Mandela's release from prison in 1990, which introduced a culture of cooperation and nation-building and is consistent with the Bill of Rights of South Africa's Constitution.

In 2001 Stellenbosch Municipality was established in its current form and in 2007 its area of jurisdiction was included by UNESCO in the World Network of Biosphere Reserves in terms of its Man and the Biosphere (MaB) Programme. With the listing of the Cape Winelands Biosphere Reserve (that includes parts of the mountain range along its eastern boundary of Stellenbosch as World Heritage Sites), the Greater Stellenbosch was recognised as an international environmental asset of significance.

Since 2001 Stellenbosch has prepared several cycles of IDP's (Integrated Development Plans) and SDF's (Spatial Development Frameworks) that served as roadmaps for the Greater Stellenbosch. The revision and updating of the Stellenbosch IDP/SDF are once again underway. The review of the IDP/SDF is, for the first time, being prepared in accordance with legislation that had been aligned with the Constitution. A public participation process is underway to enable the public to contribute to its making.
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This document is premised on the principle that sustainable development has sustainability as its ultimate goal. e’Bosch is of the view that the promotion of a mutual culture, seen in this context, is a way of life that drives behaviour and decision-making that promotes sustainability in practice. In this regard reference is, amongst other considerations made to the policy decision taken by the 3rd Congress of the UCLG (United Cities and Local Government) that recognised culture as the fourth pillar of sustainable development, the other three being environmental, social and economic.

The dominant role that culture can play in promoting sustainable development and long-term sustainability does not feature strongly in mainstream planning and governance and often does not take centre stage in decision-making pertaining to the preparation of IDP/SDF’s. Ultimately, culture drives sustainable development and underpins long-term sustainability and would, therefore, shape the future heritage of the Greater Stellenbosch.

In this regard, it is accepted that, without an inclusive culture of sustainability embedded in the conscience of humankind, it will not be possible for humans to overcome the current threats to its existence, posed by climate change, pollution of the seas and the devastation of the natural integrity of the biosphere. Embedded in the concept of culture is creativity that is a springboard required to unlock human capital that has to be employed synergistically together with monetary, environmental, infrastructural and social capital to enable sustainable development and sustainability.

From a practical perspective, the spatial organisational and managerial portal through which a mutual culture of excellence and sustainability can be promoted in the Greater Stellenbosch is the Cape Winelands Biosphere Reserve in context of the Stellenbosch IDP/SDF. This also provides the route through which global partnerships could be forged, having regard for the principal objectives of UNESCO pertaining to education, science and culture. e’Bosch recognises that culture and creativity are inextricably integrated and supports the principle that culture plays a decisive role in the promotion of the Creative Economy.

The Creative Economy includes the Cultural Economy that has both consumer-demands and symbolic value characteristics (UNESCO/UNDP). These concepts should also be considered in the context of the views of UNESCO/UNDP that “there is no such thing as “the economy”, but rather that all human beings are caught up in rhythms, movements, relationships and exchanges of resources. These phenomena are grounded, lived, and guided by cultural norms and predilections” (UNESCO/UNDP 2013, 24–25). In essence, this has to be translated into the practical and implementable language of an IDP/SDF strategically, spatially and three-dimensionally as required in planning law, policy and best practice.

This article is a condensed version of the discussion document which provides a perspective of the role Stellenbosch could play in promoting sustainable development and sustainability in the preparation of the IDP/SDF with due regard for the Decla-
ration of Intent of 12 July 2012. It refers to the background that had given rise to the current opportunities and the events relating to spatial and environmental planning and design that took place in the period 1990–2001 when Stellenbosch Municipality was formally established and to the history of the establishment of the Cape Winelands Biosphere Reserve as well as its current and future value.

The nature and value of the Declaration of Intent are explained in the context of the Constitutional Principles relating to sustainable development, the legislative/policy framework and best practice required to make this explicit. This includes a motivation for recognising the imperative that spatial planning and design decisions have to be informed by a multi-scalar and normative decision-making process to ensure that optimal integration of decisions and concomitant actions would be achieved. In this regard, best practice and spatial planning and design practices are highlighted and demonstrated.

The need for promoting a mutual culture of sustainability, to be considered in the context of the spatial economy, the creative economy and the cultural economy, is briefly addressed. It is within this context that short-term IDP/SDF cycles are to be considered in medium-term (30 years) and long-term (50 years and more) planning horizons.

It emphasised that the establishment of partnerships on all scales is a critical success factor and that Stellenbosch University and the Municipality are the principal institutional role players in achieving this optimally, as is contemplated in the Declaration of Intent.

The Cape Winelands Biosphere Reserve and its concomitant World Network of Biosphere Reserves provide a unique portal through which this can be optimally promoted and practically achieved.

A fundamental objective of the Constitution of South Africa is to serve as a transformational instrument to enable a developmental state that is sustainable. This resonates with the September 2015 UN Resolution Transforming our World: 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development and the December 2015 Paris Agreement on Climate Change.

In South Africa these objectives are to be achieved by a systematic sustainable development process as contemplated in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution (Section 24) and as aligned with applicable planning legislation and policy. In essence, this requires the efficient and just use of resources (capital) in a manner that would enable human well-being and the promotion of the integrity of the environment by an integrated multi-scalar systems approach to planning, design and resource-use. The purpose is to “ensure that the whole would be greater than the sum of its parts” (South African Department of Environmental Affairs: Need and Desirability, 2017).

The international agreements that South Africa is committed to, read together with the South African Constitution and concomitant legislation and policy, have placed a profound responsibility on society to turn its back on a “business as usual
A systems-approach to the promotion of sustainable development is a requirement of South Africa’s planning legislation and policy and it is, therefore, a foundational principle that should inform decision-making. Such an approach requires an understanding of how the parts of a system interrelate, how the system works over time and how systems fit into larger systems. A system should be viewed as a group of interconnected elements that work together to achieve a common purpose or a function. A system comprises elements, interconnections and purposes of functions. If one of these components are missing, a system does not exist (Rutherford 2018).

The ability of humanity, to give effect to sustainable development is severely constrained by an outdated world-view, imbedded in a business-as-usual approach that remains stubbornly entrenched in society (Capra 1996). He describes this as a crisis of perception and argues that the latter phenomenon is derived from the fact that most of society share a perception of reality that is inadequate to successfully address the challenges a globally interconnected and interdependent world faces.

The figure below illustrates the Sustainable Development System as required by the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) and that is also a requirement of NEMA.

The sustainable development system, as is illustrated above, comprises governance-, ecological-, social- and economic sub-systems. It requires seeing wholes and preparing frameworks through which interrelationships, spatial patterns and three-dimensional form, and processes are considered as integrated systems rather than isolated stand-alone sectoral issues.

In this article it is demonstrated how municipal spatial planning could be enhanced by employing systems-based planning policy, informed by international best practice spatial planning and design theories and principles. In this regard reference is made to the seminal publications included in the bibliography of this document. The practical application of best practice theories and principles, as listed in the bibliography of this article, demonstrates how legislation and policy could be made explicit with specific reference to the UN 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change and the UNESCO’s listed Cape Winelands Biosphere Reserve.
2 A Culture of Sustainability

It was only recently (especially after World War II) that a common (mutual) global sustainability culture emerged, based on the promotion of a way of life, characterised by shared values and a global cooperation. Since the 1960’s an awareness emerged for the fragile nature of global ecological systems and the need to promote a way of life that respects the limits of the carrying capacity of the earth. During the past 40 years a global culture of sustainability emerged and grew steadily. Landmark agreements in this regard were the global adoption of the definition of sustainable development by the Brundtland Commission in 1987; first world summit on sustainable development that took place in Rio de Janeiro in 1992; the seminal Seville MaB Conference that took place in 1995; UN’s 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development of 2015 and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change that was also adopted in 2015.

A global culture of sustainability is destined to remain a distant prospect unless it is inculcated in the hearts and minds of individuals, small groups, communities and society at large to the extent that it truly becomes a way of life (culture) on all scales, from the local to the global scale.

It is the principal aim of e’Bosch in the Stellenbosch municipal area, having regard for its commitments to the promotion of a mutual culture, as is contemplated internationally. In this regard, it is recognised that human decision-making and behaviour are primarily influenced by culture. The global consumer culture, modern agriculture, car culture etc. are mainstream forces that place stress on global sustainability. A global culture founded on respect for the limits of the carrying capacity of the earth’s finite resources (measured in terms of consumption and waste) is globally considered as the only way the ideals of long-term global sustainability can be achieved. A mutual culture can, therefore, be considered to be synonymous with a sustainability culture. The latter is to be promoted and achieved through a sustainable development process.

In the Western Cape region, the promotion of a culture of sustainability took a significant step forward in the early 1990’s when the then Cape Nature Conservation initiated and mobilized regional cooperation to employ the principles of UNESCO’s Man and the Biosphere Reserve (MaB) in decision-making on the Cape Floristic regional scale (macro-bioregion). It was not until post-1994 that these principles could gain traction. Following on the seminal UNESCO conference on the MaB programme in 1995 in Seville Spain (to which South Africa was invited), the adoption of bioregional planning principles and the establishment of biosphere reserves in South Africa were formally committed to by the Western Cape Province in terms of its Bioregional Planning Policy (2001) and Manual (2003). The Bioregional Planning Policy and Manual of the Western Cape served as a first-order decision-making planning informants and provided the context for the preparation for IDP’s and SDF’s at the time. The values, principles and strategies of this provincial policy and manual were principally informed by UNESCO’s MaB Programme.
The first map below indicates the extent of three MaB listed Biosphere reserves, Kogelberg, Cape Winelands and the West-Coast Biosphere Reserve. These are located to the South, East and North of the Cape Town city boundaries. Table Mountain National Park is located in Cape Town. The Kogelberg and the West Coast Biosphere Reserves are partially located within Cape Town’s boundary. The second map, the Cape Town Biodiversity Plan shown here serve as a principal informant for land use planning decision-making in the Greater Cape Town area. The Stellenbosch municipal boundary is indicated by the red line on both plans.

Graph 1: Cape Winelands, UNESCO MaB listed Biosphere Reserves (Source: Dennis Moss Partnership)
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Graph 2: Cape Town Biodiversity Network Plan (Source: Adapted from City of Cape Town, 2018, p 69)
3 Environmental Framework for Integrated Planning

An IDP must be prepared in terms of the Municipal Systems Act (MSA) of 2000 that, amongst other requirements, must reflect the municipal council’s vision for the long-term development of the municipality and must include a spatial development framework (SDF) that should include basic guidelines for a land-use management system for the municipality. In terms of the MSA, a municipality must establish a performance management system that should promote a culture of performance. A municipality must, in terms of the MSA, exercise their executive and legislative authority within the constitutional system of cooperative government.

Furthermore, the Constitution requires that international treaties, entered into or endorsed by the national executive, should be viewed as South Africa’s policy and should be respected (Section 231 of the Constitution). It is also to be noted that since 2016 an SDF must comply with the National Spatial Land Use Management Act (SPLUMA) and the Land Use Planning Act (LUPA) of the Western Cape that have been aligned with the Constitution of South Africa that came into effect in 2016. Furthermore, South Africa was a signatory to both the UN Agenda 2030 and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change (that also came into effect in 2016). Stellenbosch Municipality endorsed a national agreement with UNESCO in support of the establishment of the Cape Winelands Biosphere Reserve and the promotion of UNESCO’S Man and the Biosphere (MaB) Programme in 2007. The Cape Wine- lands Biosphere Reserve has been included in the World Network of Biosphere Reserves (one of 686 biosphere reserves globally) and incorporates several World Heritage Sites that are included in the Stellenbosch municipal area. It is a unique South African asset, recognised as an area of extraordinary value globally.

In the first edition of the National Development Plan (NDP) in 2012, it was stated that South Africa needs to “showcase its excellence”. Ultimately, the excellence of the municipal sphere of government would be measured by the degree to which a municipality and its people give practical effect to the vision and objectives of its IDP/SDF that would, in turn, demonstrate excellence in promoting sustainable development and long-term sustainability, as contemplated in the Constitution. This is a shared responsibility between a governing municipal council, every staff member of the municipality and the people of the greater Stellenbosch.

Given the progress that had been made during the enfolding democratization of local government during the past three decades and the recent commitment to the UN Agenda 2030 on Sustainable Development and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, the people of Stellenbosch have been enabled to undertake land-use planning, design and the management of resources in the Greater Stellenbosch in a globally integrated manner. It is, therefore, of particular importance that the IDP/SDF should be founded on the principle of sustainable development and long-term sustainability considered in a global context. The diagramme below illustrates an integrated planning approach, where decisions would be informed by legislation and policy on all scales, from the international to the local scale.
Since 1994 strategic planning and management were undertaken in terms of the emerging integrated development policies and principles and a number of IDP/SDF were accordingly prepared in the Cape region including those for Stellenbosch during the past 25 years. As from July 2016 integrated development planning had to be consistent with bespoke legislation that had to be aligned with the Constitution and in accordance with international treaties that South Africa was committed to.

The adoption of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Paris Agreement in 2015 present a watershed along civilisations journey towards long-term sustainability. The structures to optimise international collaboration to achieve this in practice are now, for the first time in human history, in place, and it is imperative for the review of the IDP/SDF to be seen through this lens.

South Africa is a signatory of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and the UN-supported Paris Accord on Climate Change and UNESCO’s Man and the Biosphere (MaB) Programme. As mentioned, the latter is regarded by the UN as one of the principal global instruments to promote and give practical effect to the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG’s). The SDG’s are a universal call to action to end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure that all people enjoy peace and prosperity. As is stated in the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development documentation, these goals are inter-
connected – often the key to the success of one will involve tackling issues more commonly associated with another.

In practice, this would require giving effect to the SDG’s, their 169 targets (and indicators) by aligning the SDG’s and applicable targets with the IDP/SDF strategically and spatially. Progress should ideally be measured in terms of bespoke methodologies aligned with municipal performance management systems.

The cultural and urban environment of the Greater Stellenbosch reflects a history of 340 years, spanning across the archaeological remains of the pre-colonial settlement in this area, its colonial past to the recent period of Apartheid and the current impact of the high levels of migration to the Greater Stellenbosch and the Cape Metropolitan region.

Making the Constitution explicit across the cultural and urban landscape is the central challenge facing all who live in this area. Constitutionally this has to be done by promoting sustainable development that should be guided by legislation and policy, and that requires the employment of resources, efficiently and justly.

Much has been written about the uniqueness of the built and cultural environment of the Greater Stellenbosch. Plans and strategies to protect and enhance this heritage are addressed to a significant degree in previous and current municipal SDF’s. Given the current legislation, policies and priorities, the focus of the SDF review process has to, in terms of legislation and policy, fall on how to enable sustainable development that is inclusive, and that responds appropriately to a multi-scalar approach.

4 Decision Making in a Participatory Way

The single greatest challenge is how to address the rapid urbanisation that the Greater Stellenbosch is facing and, in context of the latter to enable the Greater Stellenbosch to maintain its unique qualities and its global competitive advantages. For the past number of decades, a policy has been pursued to concentrate development in a hierarchy of nodal settlements with Stellenbosch, Franschhoek and Klapmuts as the principal urban centres. Klapmuts, located along the autoroute N1 with direct road links to Cape Town, Paarl and Stellenbosch, has been considered as the area with the most significant growth potential – it is the only node that has significant potential for urban expansion for housing, commercial and industrial development.

In the Greater Stellenbosch there are several informal settlement areas that require urgent and special planning attention and bespoke strategies for action. Integrated plans and strategies would have to be prepared that would optimise resource use. Innovative design and capacity building are required to enable sustainable development in these areas optimally. In particular, unconventional synergistic employment of capital (monetary, environmental, infrastructural, social and human) should ideally become the norm in addressing these challenges efficiently and justly. Furthermore, one of the most critical interventions is to generate renewable
energy (electricity) for individual households, in a manner that would not add costs to the household expenditure. Energy supplied in this manner should also unlock additional multipliers through access to the internet and educational programmes that would improve human well-being. Multipliers should ideally be scalable from the household, community, cooperatives to the neighbourhood scale.

Graph 4: Stellenbosch Municipality (Source: Stellenbosch Municipality)

From a design, construction and development perspective, new ways of thinking (as contemplated in the NDP) would be required to enable individuals, families and communities to be successful participants in shaping the places where they live in a manner that would resonate with the unique qualities of the Greater Stellenbosch. This will require innovative approaches that are currently under consideration by the SDF planning team. For example, approaches such as those advocated in Kelvin Campbell’s publication *Making Massive Small Change* that demonstrates how enormous urban challenges can be successfully overcome by small actions. “Harnessing the collective power of many small ideas and actions to make a big difference” (Campbell 2018, 12).

In addition to the rapid urbanisation of the informal sector, the urban areas of the Greater Stellenbosch have consistently experienced high growth rates that put pressure on the urban and natural systems of the municipal area as a whole. The latter must be considered in context of the rapid urbanisation in parallel to market-related property development demand and supply forces experienced in Cape Town, Drakenstein and Greater Stellenbosch and *vice versa*. Space to accommodate the rapid
urbanisation, market-related housing and commercial and industrial development in Stellenbosch is limited (with the exception of Klapmuts that was identified as a growth point for Stellenbosch decades ago). Innovative planning and design solutions would have to be agreed to in this regard. This should include qualitative densification of existing urban areas and the identification of new areas for expansion for subsidised, affordable and market-related housing and mix-use development. Of decisive importance is to pursue balanced solutions within the context of the socio-economic and biophysical carrying capacity of the Greater Stellenbosch and the maintenance and enhancement of the qualities of its landscapes. A sense of limits will have to be recognised as imperative in this regard.

The preparation of an IDP/SDF is a complex matter, and the question that can rightfully be asked is where one should begin. The objective is to prepare an SDF that would respond appropriately to the applicable constitutional imperatives on all scales, from the international to the local scale and that will have to be informed by constitutional norms and principles. It is also of importance not to consider the product of an SDF in spatial terms only. The human habitat is a lived-in three-dimensional space (social construction) with specific character and meaning. Traditional settlements (such as historic Stellenbosch) are good examples of such social constructions and demonstrate how their form and structure were determined by the culture of those who lived there. Whilst the remnants of traditional place-making principles are, to a degree, still found in new developments, modern settlement-form is primarily determined by pre-established spatial subdivision patterns and development rules and financial/market forces that dictate development outcomes relating to density, building heights, building lines, total floor area etc. The form and character of settlement in modern times are at present predominantly the products of zoning schemes, planning by-laws and the commercial market.

SPLUMA/LUPA requires an SDF to provide guidance on the form and structure of settlements and to inform the preparation of planning schemes and by-laws, in terms of the principles of efficiency, justice, sustainability, resilience and good administration. Municipal zoning schemes and planning by-laws should enable these principles to be translated into two-dimensional physical spatial planning and three-dimensional physical form and structure that would create character and atmosphere of a settlement that resonates with the unique sense of place of the Greater Stellenbosch (landscaping should form part of this).

In the period 1998–2000 the Winelands District Council prepared the Winelands Integrated Development Framework (WIDF). The WIDF area approximately corresponded to the area of jurisdiction of the current Stellenbosch and Drakenstein Municipalities (the area of the Cape Winelands Biosphere Reserve west of the Hottentots Holland/Drakenstein Mountain range). The WIDF was adopted by Stellenbosch Municipality in 2001. A volume entitled “Guiding Principles” was dedicated to the philosophy and good practice that should be considered in planning/design decision-making in historical, cultural landscapes and settlements that are located in
unique natural landscapes. The WIDF was prepared in parallel to the Bioregional Planning Policy of the Western Cape that was, in turn, informed by the principles of UNESCO’s MaB Programme. The WIDF, therefore, addressed sustainable development consistent with current legislation and policy at the time. A strategy that was incorporated in the WIDF documentation was to demarcate neighbourhood areas across the WIDF area to serve as building blocks for integrated “wall to wall” neighbourhood planning. It was during this time that the concept of a hierarchical nodal settlement pattern was incorporated into the formal planning process of Stellenbosch and the principles of bioregional planning and critical regionalism were adopted on both a provincial and the Winelands district scales. The concept of critical regionalism generally applies to unique areas (for example the Provence region in France, the Cotswold region in England, Tuscany in Italy – and the Greater Stellenbosch etc.). Such areas are recognised for both their global cultural landscape and settlement, qualities reflected on the district, farm, town neighbourhood and building scales.

Accordingly, five tenets identified by Douglas Kelbaugh, to give practical effect to the promotion of the essential qualities of historical regions were adopted for the Winelands in the WIDF. These are sense of place, history, nature, crafts and limits. The following extracts from Lynch (1998) and Kelbaugh (1999) provide a synoptic introduction to the subject.

**Sense of Place**
This is the degree to which a place can be clearly perceived and mentally differentiated and structured in time and space by its residents. Identity is the degree to which a person can recognise a place being distinctive from other places and having a character of its own – a convenient peg to hang personal memories, feelings and values on” (Lynch, 1981, 132).

**Sense of History**
History is a rich archive for planners and designers. Traditional architecture language can evolve much as the spoken language does. New places that rhymes with familiar imagery is as naturally pleasing to the eye as it is to the ear (Kelbaugh).

**Sense of Nature**
Nature is a good model for design as it holds the key to vitality and sustainability-working together designers, developers and owners can fulfil an ecological role to protect and preserve ecosystems, natural cycle chains and the symbioses between organisms and their environment (Kelbaugh).

**Sense of Craft**
The construction of buildings and structures have become lighter and even junkier over time and do not age well … notwithstanding these realities craft need to be promoted (Kelbaugh).

**Sense of Limits**
Sense of limits is a world view in which it is accepted that “we can’t have it all, in which there is tragedy as well as happiness, in which there are finite resources and a limited number of times we can get it right … The classical point of view favours harmony and
balance, rather than originality and freedom. Convention takes on as much or more importance as invention. Tradition is valued as much or more than innovation (Kelbaugh).

In the WIDF, the overarching question of how good settlements are to be achieved, in context of agreed to norms, principles and values (that should inform decision-making) was addressed with reference to the seminal work of Lynch. His normative model for good city form (that was developed by him in the early 1980’s) was adopted in the preparation of the WIDF (constitutionally relevant to this day if considered in context of SPLUMA and LUPA). The starting point of Lynch’s theory was that a good settlement form has to be determined by measuring its performance in terms of specific normative criteria. The criteria identified by him were, first of all vitality (the biological health of the system) followed by sense (the quality of place), fit (how the parts fit together), access (how do people get around) and control (how the settlement system is controlled, and who takes responsibility for it).

Lynch demonstrated that the values, efficiency and justice (the first two SPLUMA/LUPA principles) should always be appended to any list of good things. As a starting point, one should define these terms. Efficiency balances gains and losses amongst different values whilst, Justice balances the gains and losses amongst persons. Efficiency is the cost in terms of other valued things to attain the desired vitality, sense, fit, access and control in the area concerned. Justice is the way benefits and costs are distributed between persons.

The figure illustrates the above normative model.

In the WIDF planners, designers and participants in the planning process were encouraged to, in planning for the future, consider these principles in the planning and design of new settlements and to have regard for these principles in allocating resources and measuring the performance of settlements.

It is to be noted that, promoting the sense of place qualities was second only to vitality in Lynch’s
model. In the WIDF, much effort had gone into promoting the recognition of traditional and artistic fundamentals in settlement planning and design. In an SDF, the foundations should ideally be laid to recover this art. It is therefore of importance to enable planning by-laws to give effect to the traditional place-making qualities of the Greater Stellenbosch in practice. In so doing, the active participation of the authorities, design professionals, property developers and the public to develop a culture that appreciates traditional place-making qualities in the built and landscapes of the Greater Stellenbosch will be rekindled.

These matters were extensively addressed in the WIDF, from both a philosophical and a strategical/practical perspective. The former was described and demonstrated with reference to the seminal work of Norberg-Schulz (1984, 1985) and the latter with reference to the work of Roger Trancik (1986). Schulz applied the phenomenological method of inquiry to describe reality as is perceived and understood by human consciousness, as opposed to relying on technical, scientific description or data only. Trancik demonstrates how to recover the qualities of traditional urban space that had been lost as a consequence of the implementation of the philosophies of the modern movement in architecture.

These concepts and theories were extensively discussed and demonstrated during the preparation of the WIDF to help enrich public debate and participation. The current IDP/SDF could benefit from the work that had been done twenty years ago.

Having considered urban form and quality, informed by normative decision-making, and having regard for past policies adopted by Stellenbosch Municipality relating to traditional place-making philosophies and principles (that formed the foundation of the traditional settlements of the Winelands), it would be necessary to consider current best practice approaches for the fast pace development that settlements in the Greater Stellenbosch are experiencing.

In this regard, it is recommended that the recent work of Dovey be considered. He points out that his book was written primarily to demonstrate the application of particular ways of thinking rather than the exposition of theory. He regards theory as a toolkit – the means rather than the end.

He argues that ultimately, theory must be judged by its usefulness and introduces the concept of the Urban DMA (that resonates with the biological DNA). This is an alliance of Density, Mix and Access, as is illustrated by the figure below that demonstrates the synergy between the way’s cities (settlements and towns) “concentrate people and buildings, the ways they mix differences together and the networks we use to get around the city”(Dovey 2016, 3).
Dovey’s DMA should also be considered in context of the promotion of the Smart City philosophy, (that, in short, translates into the connected city) that already forms part of Stellenbosch Municipal Planning policy.

In this regard, Stellenbosch Municipality has taken steps to establish a TOD (Transit Oriented Development) hub. Future sustainable development planning would be significantly enhanced if the principles of the ‘1km walkable city” would be incorporated into the Stellenbosch SDF in all nodal settlements and adjoining neighbourhoods. This principle is illustrated in the figure below and also serves to demonstrate the importance of recognising scale in the planning and design process, starting from the 10m (face-face) scale.

Furthermore, it is imperative to recognise that good urban areas cannot be achieved by spatial thinking only – these systems are multi-dimensional. In this regard, it is recommended that the substantive urban design dimensions, identified by Carmona et al.(2010), be consulted and considered in the participation process. This approach is critical if the requirement of National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) that the “whole should be greater than the sum of its parts” is to be pursued.

Multi-scale thinking linkages, modes of transport and land-use mix (Source: Adapted from Dovey 2016, p. 255)
With regard to the IDP/SDF of Stellenbosch, value would be added if the review is considered in context of the matters raised in this document pertaining to the global sustainable development programmes that Stellenbosch is committed to and the critical role of qualitative place-making in context of the traditional socio-economic and cultural constructs of the built and cultural rural environment that has provided Stellenbosch with its uniqueness.

Of decisive significance is the preparation of the IDP/SDF plans and strategies to address the development challenges facing the Greater Stellenbosch in partnership with Stellenbosch University. The traditional “town and gown” concept is one of the unique comparative and competitive advantages that the Greater Stellenbosch has internationally in which the university plays a principal role. Having regard for the wealth of knowledge, skills and competences of the university and the speed at which innovation and technology would be advanced in the near future, the strengthening of the existing partnership between the municipality and the university would contribute decisively to the creation of a sustainable development trajectory for the Greater Stellenbosch that would be exemplary locally, nationally and internationally.

In the latter regard it is to be noted that the Sustainability Institute of the University and a range of specialist departments, management entities and individuals have vast knowledge and expertise in matters relating to urban, socio-economic, cultural and environmental challenges that are directly of relevance to sustainable development. A significant number of university departments, management entities and individuals are already in partnership with the municipality and these relationships could be strengthened in the context of the implementation of new legislation and the constitutional imperatives of the UN 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement. The IDP/SDF can strengthen these partnerships and serve as a bridge to NGO’s, communities and the general public.
5 Towards a Vision of Mutual Culture for the Greater Stellenbosch

The Declaration of Intent between Stellenbosch Municipality, Stellenbosch University and e’Bosch on 25 July 2012 resonates with both the UN Agenda 2030 Goals and targets, as well as with the MaB Programme and with the Paris Agreement on Climate Change and is consistent with the South African Constitution and the legislation and policies that circumscribe the preparation of Stellenbosch IDP/SDF. The central objective of the 2012 declaration was to “Create a mutual culture alongside existing cultural traditions. The aim is for the entire community to accept this mutual culture as a way of life, which could be handed down to future generations. To achieve this, every Stellenbosch residents’ voluntary participation is needed”. The IDP/SDF of Stellenbosch is an instrument that can be employed to achieve this most optimally.

It is within this context that the challenges facing Stellenbosch can be addressed. The most acute challenge is to address the pace and extent of the rapid urbanisation that Stellenbosch has experienced over the past number of decades that have, in the view of many people, become overwhelming. To this challenge must be added the need to address the legacy of historic injustices that has manifested itself in rising crime, violence, concomitant urban decay in some areas, inequality, lack of affordability of decent housing and poverty. These are huge challenges that have to be overcome and that would require responses that would measure up to the scale of the challenges. The framework within which this has to be addressed is the IDP/SDF that should enable the implementation of an optimal sustainable development process to be implemented over the short (5 years) and medium-term (30 years) in context of long-term (50 years +) planning criteria.

Having regard for the commitment to the UN Agenda 2030, the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) No. 11 that addresses community and urban development should, in particular, serve to inform IDP/SDF decision-making. In the latter regard, reference is also made to UN Habitat’s recommendation to, first identify the key principles and objectives that are to be achieved and then to demonstrate how to give effect to these (UN Habitat 2010). In this regard, differentiation should ideally be made between short and medium-term.

It is imperative to recognise the role that a qualitative built environment and cultural landscapes play in the long-term sustainability of Stellenbosch. This heritage should include an understanding of place as an art form that has developed over centuries. This art form has to be viewed in a multi-scalar perspective that starts with the building scale. Buildings are literally the building blocks of all settlements, the way buildings are designed (their aesthetical appearance), the way they are located on the land to create spaces and places that have meaning for those that live in the settlement, have to be guided by design principles and criteria provided in the SDF, “every community needs a symbol of its existence and... much of
community frustrations has come into being because the visual reason for its life is missing“ (Sitte 2013, viii). Creativity in the design of the built and landscape environment should be inextricably linked to spatial planning.

The promotion of qualitative development has been recognised as a priority in the planning policy of the Greater Stellenbosch for decades. A rule of thumb guideline that is proposed in the 2000 Winelands Integrated Development Plan (WIDF) and in the 2003 Bioregional Planning Policy of the Western Cape Province is to promote and maintain a: sense of place, history, nature, craft and limits in project planning and design decision-making and development as described above.

The work done by e’Bosch across Stellenbosch is cross-cutting, it strengthens a culture of inclusivity and promotes the advancement of mutual values upon which optimal integrated decision-making and actions depend. If the plans and activities of e’Bosch are aligned with the IDP/SDF and if the latter is aligned with the UNESCO’s MaB Programme, sustainable development efficiency and justice would be increased. SDG 17 of the UN 2030 Agenda focuses explicitly on the critical role that partnerships play in optimising sustainable development. Integrated partnerships across the board hold tremendous promise for the successful advancement of sustainable development. e’Bosch, Stellenbosch Municipality and Stellenbosch University have, in the spirit of the 2012 Declaration of Intent, played a constructive role in laying the foundations for such partnerships and could contribute towards partnerships in general to become a feature of the culture of sustainability of Stellenbosch.

The IDP/SDF are the principal instruments to strengthen this. It is imperative to recognise that the values upon which sustainable development are built are, in essence, ethical. The MaB Programme subscribes to the notion that ethical values form the basis of decision-making and action in accordance with an ideal accepted in a given moral system. It is accepted that what makes ethical values different from all other values, is their overriding character. They articulate an imperative, or a ‘must’, that cannot be escaped by anyone who subscribes to them and they are converted into practice through principles and rules.

If the imperative or ‘must-do’ that flows from an ethical value is denied, then that value and its importance itself is denied. Such a denial is therefore not a matter of arbitrary choice – the ethical domain is circumscribed not only by the value choices made by humans but also by the critical weighing of the expected consequences of their choices” (UNESCO 2010). The pillars of sustainable development, i.e. the promotion of human well-being and the enhancement of the integrity of the natural environment, are founded on ethical values. The principles through which these values should be given effect include the just and efficient use of resources (capital) in accordance with legislative and official policy frameworks. Sustainable development is therefore circumscribed by the ethical domain. In the 2012 National Development Plan for South Africa, a call was made for a new way of thinking. With South Africa’s formal commitment to the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement and UNESCO’s MaB Programme, the doors
have opened for South Africa to do so as an international partner. The preparation of the IDP and the SDF for Stellenbosch creates an opportunity for these documents to be pioneering global projects, having regard for the fact that the Greater Stellenbosch is entirely located in the Cape Winelands Biosphere, that forms part of the 686 strong World Network of Biosphere Reserves. At bottom, the challenge is to create a mutual culture for the Greater Stellenbosch as is contemplated in the Declaration of Intent of 2012 that would promote long-term sustainability. The SDF/IDP review that is, for the first time in the history of Stellenbosch, to be aligned with the Constitution of South Africa provides the portal through which sustainable development can be promoted and provides a roadmap for long-term sustainability to be facilitated in the global context. The MaB Programme is an instrument to promote integrated multi-scalar participation for institutions, business, NGO’s, communities and individuals to work together to promote this culture and to advance practical implementation in an integrated multi-scalar manner.

Sustainability could be optimised through multi-scalar partnerships as is contemplated in the Declaration of Intent and promoted in the context of UNESCO’s MaB Programme. In this regard, it would be of value to place the promotion of a sustainability culture centre stage and to have regard for the potential to advance the Creative Economy and the Cultural Economy, as advised in the UNESCO and the UNDP Creative Economy Report and having regard for the spatial economy that is a principal dimension of the Stellenbosch IDP/SDF.

6 Conclusion

The purpose of this document was to provide an overarching perspective on the potential participation of e’Bosch and its members relating to its core objective to promote a mutual culture for the people of Stellenbosch alongside other cultural traditions that can be handed down to future generations. Accordingly, the main focus of the report was on the Greater Stellenbosch in context of planning integration, from the local municipality scale to the international scale by respecting the values, principles, objectives and strategies that are addressed above.

The review of the Stellenbosch IDP/SDF, that is undertaken with due regard for a multi-scalar approach in context of the international commitments of Stellenbosch to integrate local planning with global commitments, would enhance the sustainable development value chain greatly.

Of particular significance is the preparation of a bespoke medium-term SDF (30 years) plan for the Greater Stellenbosch as the latter would help develop a greater understanding of the context within which the five-year IDP/SDF cycles should be considered.

Having regard for the 2012 Declaration of Intent, it follows that such a plan should ideally be prepared by Stellenbosch Municipality in collaboration with Stellenbosch University in a spirit of partnership with civil society.
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Heritage and Tourism
A Shared Concern for Locals and Visitors?

1 The importance of heritage in a touristified world

With tourism to cities in Europe increasing by 20% a year (ITB 2019), cultural heritage is fast becoming a focal point for city residents and ‘temporary citizens’: visitors, tourists and workers. However, the increased volume of city use also produces qualitative change in relationships to heritage. Visitation in the form of cultural tourism has long been seen as a ‘good’ form of tourism, because visitors supply income to conserve the heritage they visit, and heritage provides the ‘content’ that attracts visitors. But the addition of visitors to already crowded city centres often produces more negative outcomes. This chapter draws from a number of recent publications on culture, tourism and cities to chart some of the changes taking place in the relationship between heritage and tourism and resident and visitor communities.

Cultural heritage is an issue that affects large numbers of people. The recent fire at Notre Dame in Paris illustrated how a heritage site can be a concern not just for local residents, but for all those who have become involved with the site through visitation. The recent Eurobarometer research on Cultural Heritage reveals that 73% of the EU population lives near heritage monuments, works of art, heritage sites, traditional events or festivals that are related to Europe's culture and history (European Commission 2017). More than half the EU population consider themselves to be ‘involved’ with heritage in some way. The most frequent form of engagement with cultural heritage for European citizens is visiting monuments, museums, festivals, concerts and other heritage sites and events (31%). Visits to heritage are particularly popular in the Netherlands (59%), Sweden (56%) and Denmark (49%). This form of engagement is also increasing, with Europeans making more visits to museums and galleries (+13% between 2013 and 2017) or a historical monument or site (+ 9%). Compared to 2013, respondents in each EU Member State were more likely to have visited a historical monument or site at least once in the last 12 months in 2017.

The Eurobarometer research also highlighted the influence of cultural heritage on tourism behaviour. A majority of Europeans (68%) agree the presence of cultural heritage can have an influence on their choice of holiday destination. Those most likely to be influenced by cultural heritage were Polish (91%), Swedish (82%) and Dutch (78%), while those least likely to take cultural heritage...
into consideration came from Hungary (51%), Greece (55%) and Portugal (57%). Younger respondents and those with a higher education level, a high level of Internet use and city dwellers were most likely to consider culture in their holiday decisions.

As well as influencing tourism behaviour, cultural heritage can have broader social effects. More 70% of Europeans agree that living close to places related to cultural heritage can improve people's quality of life, and 70% also feel pride in a historical monument or site, work of art or tradition from a European country other than their own (European Commission 2017). Over 80% that agree culture and cultural exchanges can play an important role in developing greater understanding and tolerance. These scores are even higher for those with a higher education level, who are also most likely to be travelling to consume cultural heritage. In spite of increasing debate about the effects of mass tourism to cultural sites, most Europeans (57%) disagree that the number of tourists visiting certain areas represents a threat to Europe’s cultural heritage. The important role of the young also indicates that cultural heritage will be even more important in the future, as will travelling related to cultural heritage.

This makes local populations extremely important stakeholders in heritage conservation and use. The recent UNWTO report (2018) on Tourism and Culture Synergies has therefore underlined the need to involve a wide range of stakeholders, including representatives of culture, tourism, local communities and administrations, in developing positive synergies between heritage and tourism. The key to achieving this lies in understanding the relationship between people and places, and in particular the ways in which different groups, including residents and visitors, help to make, and therefore gain a stake in the places they use (Richards/Duif 2018).

2 The growth of cultural tourism

Cultural tourism, just as tourism in general, is also growing rapidly globally. It is estimated that there are now over 500 million international cultural tourists every year, and there is probably an even larger number of domestic cultural tourists (Figure 1). According to a range of experts, cultural tourism is also set to grow in the near future as well (UNWTO 2018).

The growth of cultural tourism has been largely driven by the growth of tourism itself, rather than any general increase in cultural interest in the population. However, both tourism and interest in cultural heritage are driven by increased education levels globally. As well as the increased demand for cultural experiences by tourists, destinations around the world are keen to receive cultural tourists, because they are perceived as highly educated and high spending visitors. The supply of cultural experiences for tourists therefore also continues to grow as places compete for their attention.
As cultural tourism grows, the content of the cultural experiences sought by and provided for tourists has also changed. The UNWTO (2018) emphasises a shift in the definition of heritage in many countries, expanding from the former concentration on tangible heritage, to include intangible and ‘everyday’ culture (Figure 2). This also reflects an expansion in the nature of cultural tourism demand, from classic heritage sites to popular culture and the everyday life of the places they visit. Cultural tourists, who are also relatively likely to be the relatively highly educated people who are involved with heritage in the places they live, now seek out not just the established sites of high culture, but also elements of culture reproduced through the media, including literature, TV and film. This has led to a large number of destinations framing their heritage through these media (OECD 2014), and has produced a range of new tourism products that mix elements of tangible and intangible heritage, including the use of interpretation, storytelling and curated experiences (Richards 2016).

This expanding range of cultural consumption has particularly placed a greater emphasis on intangible culture, as evidenced by the revised UN World Tourism Organisation definition of cultural tourism in 2018 to include:
... attractions/products related to a set of distinctive material, intellectual, spiritual and emotional features of a society that encompasses arts and architecture, historical and cultural heritage, culinary heritage, literature, music, creative industries and the living cultures with their lifestyles, value systems, beliefs and traditions.

This expanded definition pushes the envelope of cultural heritage far beyond the traditional ‘museums and monuments’ approach (Richards 2001). This also presents an increased challenge in terms of preserving, conserving, interpreting and consuming heritage. Governments now recognise the need to engage with a growing stock of heritage resources, which include many elements of daily life. This expanding vision of culture and heritage is also evident for the many cultural tourists who now want to ‘Live like a local’, a desire gladly fed by Airbnb, among other collaborative economy platforms. Airbnb not only supplies accommodation via its network of hosts, but also a wide range of local experiences. This type of development is driving the ‘re-invention of the local’ for tourists (Russo/Richards, 2016). This has implications for the places visited by tourists, where the ‘local’ becomes the new touchstone of authenticity rather than the museum curator. Local citizens also become increasingly involved not just as the guardians of heritage, but also as interpreter, guide, producer and accommodation provider. The curator has also moved out of the museum and onto the internet, as the growing range of companies providing curated experiences, such as Culture Trip, Sidestory and Tastemakers Africa attests.

Pier Luigi Sacco (2011) has described the changes in the nature of cultural production and consumption into three main phases: Culture 1.0, Culture 2.0 and Culture 3.0. Richards (2014) summarises these phases as follows:

- **Culture 1.0**: culture as by-product of industrial growth. Wealthy merchants and industrialists invested in culture as a means of polishing their image and/or doing good for the community.
- **Culture 2.0**: culture as industry. With industrialisation and the growth of the culture industries, culture became an economic field, invested in by the public sector to stimulate growth and jobs.
- **Culture 3.0**: culture as a source of new value(s). The diversification of cultural taste, the fragmentation of cultural production and access to new technologies and media challenges the monolithic production of culture under Culture 2.0. Alongside economic value, culture is also seen as a means of creating identity, stimulating social cohesion and supporting creativity.

These different phases of culture have been matched by a development of cultural tourism, from Cultural Tourism 1.0, centered on traditional tangible heritage, such as museums and monuments, through Cultural Tourism 2.0, linked to the rise of mass cultural tourism, often in city centres, to Cultural Tourism 3.0, a more postmodern, fragmented type of experience, more integrated with popular culture and everyday life (Figure 3).
New forms of relational tourism, such as creative tourism (Richards and Wilson 2006), are expanding to provide a meeting place for local communities and tourists. Local communities are therefore becoming involved in the relationship between heritage and tourism, in both an active and a passive role. And just as tourists are positioning themselves as locals, locals are also playing a role as ‘tourists in their own city’ (Richards 2017), rediscovering their own heritage through tourist eyes. This is a trend actively encouraged by cities such as Oslo, Melbourne, New Orleans and New York.

A recent report for the United Cities and Local Governments network (Richards and Marques 2018) highlights the need for cities to re-think their cultural and tourism policies to cope with these new developments in a proactive way. Dealing with the growing pressures on city use and heritage should stimulate us to think about the new cultures of mobility being created in cities, and how we can use cultural policy to help address the issues. At the same time as city centres are becoming more crowded, other areas of the city are often crying out for new cultural content and facilities. We should be thinking about more integrated approaches to cultural and heritage policy that can bring tangible, intangible and creative heritage together to serve an even wider population of sedentary and mobile citizens.

In Amsterdam, for example, moves have been made to develop a range of cultural programming that can appeal to local residents, international ex-pats and tourists. Amsterdam Marketing, the body in charge of ‘selling’ the city to visitors, is also responsible for the cultural agenda of the city, and is trying to develop experiences that will cater for the needs of all city users (Richards/Marques 2018).
3 Tourism, heritage and placemaking

In the Netherlands the growing tourist pressure on cities such as Amsterdam has stimulated the development of new policies to spread tourism and develop new hubs of culture and heritage beyond the capital. This provides new opportunities for cities and regions outside Amsterdam to attract more visitors, but it also creates the challenge of developing new heritage experiences in these new locations. One example of this is the small city of ’s-Hertogenbosch (population 150,000), which developed a programme of events themed on the life and works of medieval painter Hieronymus Bosch, who was born, worked and died in the city. However, for decades the city did little with his legacy. Because the paintings all left long ago, leaving the city with no physical Bosch heritage, and no apparent basis for building a link with him (Richards/Duif 2018).

In 2016 the 500th anniversary of Bosch’s death provided the catalyst to use this medieval genius as a brand for the city. The lack of Bosch artworks required the city to adopt the same kind of creative spirit that his paintings embody. By developing the international Bosch Research and Conservation Project, ’s-Hertogenbosch placed itself at the hub of an international network of cities housing his surviving works, spread across Europe and North America. The research and restoration work offered by the project became a vital tool for ensuring the paintings also returned to ’s-Hertogenbosch for a major exhibition in 2016. The buzz created around the homecoming exhibition of Bosch artworks generated headlines around the world and a scramble for tickets that saw the museum remaining open for 124 hours in the final week. A staggering 422,000 visitors came, grabbing 10th place in the Art Newspaper’s exhibition rankings, alongside cities like Paris, London and New York. The UK newspaper The Guardian said that the city had ‘achieved the impossible’ by staging ‘one of the most important exhibitions of our century’.

In addition to the blockbuster Bosch exhibition, many other new experiences were created to engage different groups. New forms of heritage and heritage consumption appeared in the city aimed at both locals and visitors. For example, a new view of the St. Jan’s Cathedral was created by erecting a staircase on the outside of the building allowing people to access the roof. This ‘Miraculous Climb’ gave visitors a close-up view of the 96 medieval gargoyles on the flying buttresses, and also raised money to pay for their restoration. A new boat cruise was developed on the Binnendieze river in the city centre, which included projections from the boat onto the walls on the medieval tunnels over the river. These featured scenes from Bosch’s paintings, showing how some of his work might have been inspired by what he saw on the river near his home. The river was also the setting for the Bosch Parade, an event that brought local cultural associations and artists together to interpret scenes from Bosch’s work through fatasmagorical costumes and floats. Bosch’s home on the market square was also one of the buildings included as part of a giant screen for a projection of images from Bosch’s paintings. This ‘Bosch
Experience’ was staged during the evenings of the main exhibition, and helped to keep visitors in the city after the exhibition closed. As visitors wandered around the city they could also encounter giant figures from the painting The Garden of Earthly Delights, perhaps Bosch’s most famous work. Because this was one of the few paintings that did not make it to the exhibition, the idea was to re-create the painting in the physical landscape of the city itself.

These creative activities helped to build the heritage of the city during the Bosch Year itself in 2016. But they also had a significant long-term effect on the economy, society and culture of the city. A study by the European Commission (2017) placed ’s-Hertogenbosch as the most culturally vibrant small city in the Netherlands, and as the third most vibrant city in Europe. The number of visitors to the city’s museum not only reached a peak in 2016, but also grew beyond pre-2016 visitor levels in subsequent years. The number of hotel overnight stays grew in 2016, and kept growing 2017 and 2018 as well. This had a significant effect on local businesses, with significant growth in employment and new businesses and a fall in the number of vacant premises in 2017 and 2018 (Richards 2019).

The basic lesson from the experience of ’s-Hertogenbosch is that a far more holistic approach is needed to the conservation and development of heritage. Rather than thinking just about the more traditional perspective of conservation or the more recent aspect of marketing, heritage needs to be viewed as a crucial element in an integrated process of ‘placemaking’ (Figure 4). In the placemaking process heritage becomes far more than just a resource to be conserved or sold. It become the essential inspiration for the creation of new meanings that can engage both residents and visitors. The sleepy, small (and for foreigners, unpronounceable) city of ’s-Hertogenbosch became a vibrant hub of creativity, which during 2016 could place itself on the global stage, topping cities many times its size in the Art Newspaper rankings in that year (Richards /Duif 2018). It also managed this because it took advantage of the underdog position to attract attention and make headlines in the world’s press.

But none of this international success would have been possible without local support. A very important part of the programme was devoted to engaging locals in the programme, and to making sure that they felt themselves to be honoured guests at the presentation of their own heritage. School children were among those invited to visit the exhibition for free, because this was also found to be an affective way of engaging their parents. A lottery was organised in which local residents could win tickets to an exclusive preview of the show before it opened to the world’s press and to visitors.

The 2016 Bosch programme was therefore far more than a blockbuster art exhibition. It also included powerful elements of social engagement in the city and beyond. It involved networking between cities and museums in ways that multiplied the impacts and resonance of the basic heritage resource. Tourism was
the element that often grabbed the headlines, but the biggest benefit for the city was securing and embedding the intangible heritage of Bosch and bringing the painter to life for the people living in the city. ’s-Hertogenbosch provides a good example of how traditional tangible heritage can be augmented with intangible heritage and contemporary creativity to engage local people and attract visitors, media attention and economic impact. Building such programmes requires new ways of thinking about heritage and the connections with contemporary society. In particular, it involves a shift away from the idea of marketing heritage to tourists, and towards a wider concept of placemaking that uses physical, intangible and symbolic heritage resources for the benefit of all.

Figure 4: The placemaking system in ’s-Hertogenbosch (Source: Richards and Duif 2018)
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Burden and Uses of Being a UNESCO World Heritage Site

The Case of Tel Aviv

Introduction

This paper shows the dilemma for destinations being a UNESCO World Heritage site and meeting the requirements for staying as such. The sample of Tel Aviv is used to demonstrate how a destination has to fight with the costs of its heritage. It analyses winners and losers and advocates the adoption of UNESCO’s strict rules and even argues the merits of resigning from the title of a World Heritage site on the example of the city of Tel Aviv.

1 Bauhaus, Touristic Tel Aviv and the White City

Bauhaus was a German art school in the early 20th century. Its style of architecture became internationally acknowledged and even outside Germany houses in that architectural style are built such as in the city of Tel Aviv (Israel). Bauhaus became a sub-brand used for destination marketing to attract tourists. One example can be the city of Dessau (Germany) where the Bauhaus school was based 1925–1933. In 2019 a new museum opened its doors in the very same place (Bingener 2018).

Tel Aviv is the biggest city in Israel, followed by Jerusalem and Haifa. It is the economic and cultural centre. Approximately 2,5 million out of Israel’s 8 million population are living in its metropolitan area. The city itself is about 100 years old and therefore a rather young city (Heck 2016, 20, 43). German travel guide books list several top sights which are typical for city destinations: markets, memorials, museums or the train station (Heck 2016, 45–48, Kunz 2018, 51–53). Besides the attractions, shopping and relaxation are of importance for visitors (Shemma 2018, 75). The internationally published guidebook The Lonely Planet of the region paints a similar picture. The introduction pages provide a ranking of the 20 most important sights. Tel Aviv’s beaches are ranked in 3rd place, following the top ranked Jerusalem’s Dome of the Rock and the Dead Sea. Scrolling down the ranking list, Tel Aviv appears a second time. The White City is ranked no. 16. The term is used for approximately 4,000 houses built in the architectural Bauhaus style (Robinson 2015, 8 et seqq.). Some German guide books describe Bauhaus-related attractions on top of their listings (e.g. Heck 2016, 45–48, Kunz 2018, 51–53), however, this seems to be because of the alphabetic order.
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Since ancient times there has been the harbour city of Jaffa. One of its suburbs was called Ahuzat Bayit which became Tel Aviv in 1909. At that time, the style of Tel Aviv’s buildings was influenced by the ideas of the immigrants from Middle and Eastern Europe. Additionally, up to date trends and some oriental elements were added. To describe this first wave of buildings, it can be said, that they are built in an eclectic style, i.e. several styles of different epochs are used in one and the same building (Stein 2016, 45).

Today’s structure of Tel Aviv was developed by the Scottish city designer Sir Patrick Geddes (Welter 2012, 299) in the mid-1920s (Nocke 2009, 107). The Geddes Master Plan for Tel Aviv, later just called Geddes-Plan, is a good example for the decentral-regional planning philosophy (Trezib 2014, 196). Obviously, it was not the idea to plan a “Bauhaus City”, as the university in Dessau and its ideas of Bauhaus were roughly developed at the same time by Walter Gropius. The influence of Bauhaus on the townscape came with the Jewish architects whose immigrations into Israel began in the 1930s. Some of them studied at the Bauhaus School of Art and Design in Weimar and the Technische Hochschule Berlin-Charlottenburg (Nocke 2009, 107). Most famous among them was Arieh Sharon, who was taught by Walter Gropius and Hannes Meyer (Fischer 1973). Their buildings represented a radical change to the outward image of the city of Tel Aviv (Nocke 2009, 107).

Today, the White City is an UNESCO World Heritage site. This brings burdens and usage. To examine the situation of Tel Aviv further, the meanings of being a UNESCO World Heritage site are discussed.

2 The meaning of being a UNESCO World Heritage site

In the 1970s UNESCO’s Convention protecting the world cultural and natural heritage came into action. The idea was that richer countries assist their poorer neighbours to protect and conserve their heritage. Since then, not only the heritage itself was needed to be recognized as a World Heritage site. In addition, a viable sustainable management plan for its perseverance must be presented – also to retain that title later (Cleere 2006, xxi-xxii).

There is no research that explains why states, countries or governments apply to list their heritage as an UNESCO World Heritage site. Maybe it is just for too obvious political reasons that can be closer described with the words esteem, pride and prestige (Leask 2006, 12). It can be assumed that also economic reasons, especially tourism related ones, might be drivers. Especially when thinking beyond: it
must be critically mentioned that the World Heritage programme may have created rather a culture of economic and political quagmires than cooperation between and inside countries and the preservation of cultural goods which it was intentionally created for (Keough 2011, 593).

Not every heritage site automatically becomes a World Heritage site on UNESCO’s list. It must fulfil at least one out of ten criteria given by UNESCO. The White City of Tel Aviv proved architectural values by fulfilling criterion 2 and 4 of UNESCO’s list or criteria (UNESCO website 20182, 3) (see chapter 3). Moreover, a one-time acceptance does not automatically mean that the title of being a World Heritage site is assigned forever. The criteria have to be fulfilled after the day of acceptance. A removal from UNESCO’s World Heritage list may cause multiple discussions among the parties. A good example is the river Elbe Valley of Dresden which was a World Heritage site since 2004. In 2009 it was removed from UNESCO’s list as a new bridge crossing the river valley was built to avoid gridlock. The justification was that the new bridge cuts through the scenic meadows and thereby destroyed the long-protected vistas and changed the city’s cultural landscape (Schoch 2014, 199).4

The numbers of World Heritage sites have continuously been rising to such a high extent that UNESCO is asking the governments to reduce their number of applications (Bambach 2016). In 2017 it was 1.073 World Heritage sites that were listed, 832 of them cultural, 206 natural and 35 otherwise categorized sites (statista)5. In a ranking of countries having most World Heritage sites, Italy scores first place with 51 sites, followed by China (50) and Spain (45) (statista)6. Countries from Africa, Southern America or Asia are underrepresented. One reason for this imbalance is that those countries have a lack of resources and know-how to process the complex and costly application (Bambach 2016). In result, the top ten countries of the ranking have one thing in common: decisively strong economic power. This can be viewed critically as other factors like number of inhabitants or size of the country itself do not play a role.

At first, the arguments in favor of applying for becoming a UNESCO World Heritage site seem to prevail. Among the stakeholders two groups support such applications. The first group argues on economic grounds. Typically, newly recognized UNESCO World Heritage sites report a rise in visitor numbers (e.g. Hoos 2009, Richter 2013). The second group of supporters is the preservationists agreeing with UNESCO’s firm guidelines (Richter 2013). However, there are also

---

2) https://whc.unesco.org/en/criteria/
3) https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1096
4) In this paper the case of the river Elbe Valley Bridge (called Waldschlößchenbrücke) is used as a vital example for a removal, due to changed adaptabilities of UNESCO’s criteria. The decision itself is no further discussed here, as this is much more a political issue. In this context, it shall only demonstrate the strictness of the criteria.
downsides. Due to the rising numbers in cruise tourism and the growing offers of low cost airlines, the numbers of tourists in scenic spots such as World Heritage sites have grown drastically and the term of overtourism has to be used. UNESCO is already supporting the World Heritage sites by consultation to cope with such problems (Roessler 2018). A second downside is: the strict lines of the preservationists lead to conflicts with the local owners as they cause financial burden for them (Richter 2013).

Especially this financial burden has effects on Tel Aviv as a touristic spot in Israel. Therefore, a closer look has to be taken at the World Heritage site White City of Tel Aviv.

3 The White City of Tel Aviv as a World Heritage site

In 2003 parts of the city of Tel Aviv became nominated as a World Heritage site by the UNESCO. It is justified under the criteria ii and iv (UNESCO Nomination 2003, 1):

“Criterion (ii): The White City of Tel Aviv is a synthesis of outstanding significance of the various trends of the Modern Movement in architecture and town planning in the early part of the 20th century. Such influences were adapted to the cultural and climatic conditions of the place, as well as being integrated with local traditions.

Criterion (iv): The new town of Tel Aviv is an outstanding example of new town planning and architecture in the early 20th century, adapted to the requirements of a particular cultural and geographic context.” (UNESCO Nomination 2003, 1)

It is not all the City of Tel Aviv that is included in the nomination. The areas of nomination are shown on a map within the nomination document. They are called zone A, B and C, which all additionally are surrounded by a buffer zone (figure 1):
It was necessary to create three zones as the houses in each zone can be looked at separately in three respective ways. First, and most obvious, the area in which they were built. Second, the time in which they were built. Third, the architects that were in charge.

The map of Tel Aviv (figure 1) shows that the White City is covering major parts of the inner city. However, living space in Tel Aviv is rare. Due to this, the houses of the White City are inhabited. Therefrom two diametrical views on the houses arise. On the one side there are the residents. For them, it is their home that must be socially and economically sustainable. That means they expect a certain standard of living for rent in terms of comfortability and affordability. On the other side there are the preservation requirements of UNESCO (Hohfeld 2015, 6).

The topic of renovation and preservation becomes a point of discussion as there are several parties involved: obviously, on the one hand it is the house owners and probably the tenants. Inhabitants themselves typically have a pragmatic approach to heritage buildings. They do not have the know-how to restore the houses and there often is only little awareness of the building’s cultural value (Yaron quoted in Achterhold 2018). Also, Hoffmann (quoted in Roessler 2013) said that Israel does not have a culture of maintaining historic buildings. There is no governmental support for preservation, not even tax reductions. On the other hand, the National Parks, Nature Reserves, Historical Sites and Monuments Law (from 1992) protects historical sites that are built from approx. 1870s and therefore are not antiquities. It gives strong power up to expropriation to local planning commissions, if privately owned houses are not preserved (Laster and Livney 2017).

An additional driver is the country of Germany and its Bauhaus organisations which are contributing. German financiers want to follow the German way of preservation. Hohfeld (2015, 8) gives a vital example of the German understanding: if an extra floor is added on top of a building, it somehow must be recognizable to the viewer, e. g. other colours must be used.

The final learning is that there is no consensus. The result is a worst-case scenario: the preservation of the houses does not happen. Houses dilapidate, especially in the areas with the strictest rules and therefore highest costs for renovation. A closer look is taken on the afore mentioned zones of the City of Tel Aviv:

The centre of the White City is located around Dizengoff-Place. It is the largest part of zone A. To do renovations in that zone, highest constraints must be followed such as the obligation to use only original materials and historic techniques for preservation. All has to be done in unison to the means of an UNESCO representative. It is easy to understand that such an undertaking is very costly and therefore either postponed or even totally avoided by the owners of this kind of buildings. In result, so far only 51 of 1630 buildings were renovated (Bauhaus Center guided tour 2017). This has a high impact on the townscape. Houses are not renovated but dilapidated. A sample is given in figure 2.
It shows that the houses are not renovated, probably as the owners cannot afford to follow UNESCO’s regulations. Obviously, such buildings as displayed are not touristic attractions at all. It can be safe to say that this kind of run-down houses will not meet the expectations that are loaded with the phrase of a “White City”. Pictures like this (figure 2) make it clear why general critics of UNESCO’s World Heritage programme say that the programme has left its original aims and – depending on the site – became incapable of protecting the world’s endangered in one way or another (Keough 2011, 599).

The difference in outcome are most dramatic by juxtaposing townscapes in zone A with zone B and C. A closer look is taken at the area of Lev Hair located in zone B. In that zone the majority of the present houses were built in the 1930s; most in an international style as a succession of 3-5 story buildings. An additional plan (called the “Lev Hayir” plan) allows for even more additional floors on houses that are fully preserved (UNESCO Nomination 2003, 56-57). This allowance of adding additional space to rent out of course results in a completely different economic calculation for the owner in a city with a shortage of flats. It can be expected to gain extra rent and therefore extra profit after the renovation. Compared with the run-down townscapes seen in figure 2 the difference in handling renovations and preservations is extraordinary (see figure 3). Such houses are eye catchers for tourists.

7) Lev Hair is at times spelled Lev Hayir depending on the transcription of Yiddish language or rather the spelling in Yiddish itself.
In result, the touristic marketing is focusing on the renovated houses. The Bauhaus Center, which is promoting this cultural heritage of Tel Aviv, describes the main tour on its website: “Our classic Bauhaus Tour will take you through the White City’s most prominent Bauhaus (International Style) buildings, built during the 1930’s and the 1940’s.” (Bauhaus Center 2018)

This quote is mentioning the international style buildings and therefore is referring to the houses of zone B. It can be expected that it mostly will take place in Lev Hair.

Such contrasts demonstrate that UNESCO’s rules for preservation and living realities plus actual touristic expectations do not fit. It can be said that the World Heritage title for Tel Aviv’s White City is on the one side a burden due to the preservation rules, on the other side it might attract extra tourists. It must be questioned how to handle these two sides of the World Heritage listing of the White City.

4 Preservation or retain UNESCO’s World Heritage title

The rules of UNESCO on preservation are rather strict. That is diametric to the need for affordable living space in Tel Aviv. Mid 2018 there was even expected an increase in Jewish immigrants to Tel Aviv due to a significant political shift towards right wing positions of nationalism including antisemitism in Europe (Reichelt 2018). More immigration from Europe leads to a greater demand in proper living space in Tel Aviv.

At the same time guided tours on Bauhaus architecture take tourists to renovated houses rather than to the non-renovated houses. This behaviour fits to
thoughts of Letzner (2014, 57). He assumes that tourist’s desire to see originals only is reducing, while at the same time an acceptance of fakes is growing. He gives the example of an Eiffel Tower in Asia, which as a copy gives tourists of that region an option to see such a top sight, even without being able to afford a trip to Paris. To transfer these considerations to Tel Aviv, it must be asked, what is authentic and what is reality from destination management and from a travellers point of view? In the following, it must be questioned, how much interest there is by tourists to see a Bauhaus building that is restored to the very strict UNESCO standards? Will tourists even pay an entrance fee to see such a building? Which significance has the “original” cultural value to the tourist?

Two additional considerations will be examined here to paint a bigger picture. The first one is looking from another touristic-architectural view: Hotel buildings are nowadays influenced by Social Media. Fankhauser (2018), by the time of statement the CEO of former Thomas Cook, as well as Moussavi (2018), an architect who is specialised in constructing hotels, separately confirm that “Instagram Moments” must be implemented into the design of a hotel (Fankhauser 2018, Moussavi 2018). This demonstrates that the creation of a well-looking sight is becoming one of the most important criteria.

The second consideration is looking at art as the umbrella term to architecture in the means of Bauhaus. It must be questioned if such strict rules of UNESCO do make sense at all. Looking at drawings (e.g. in museums). The criteria of their preservation rules are also changing as requirements are shifting over time (Krist 2010, 13). Even though, for example colours of former times today can be perfectly reproduced and the preservation therefore undertaken at highest possible standard. However, they sometimes are more expensive than gold (Olivier 2005) and it must be questioned if they are affordable to the vast majority.

5 Conclusion

From a tourism and an economic point of view it can be concluded: renovated houses in Tel Aviv are a win-win-situation for the people of Tel Aviv and the tourists. Losers are the strict preservationists. It must be politically debated, if renovations under the strictest rules especially in zone A can be regarded as sustainable. If the answer is “no”, the given rules of UNESCO should be categorized as not sustainable by the city of Tel Aviv. Renovations then could be allowed even with the result of a denial of the World Heritage title by UNESCO and thereby a delisting. At first glance, the risk from a touristic point of view should be minimal. At least the numbers in Dresden show that there was no reduction of visitors after the building of the bridge and the revocation of the World heritage title (Alexe 2010). However, as it can be seen from that same case, Dresden is still on the World Heritage site’s list, but marked as “delisted” (UNESCO website 20188). It could be a field for further research to find out more about the impacts of that.

8) https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/&order=country#alphaG
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Ben Buschfeld

Designing Projects to Activate Civil Society in a Privatised World Heritage Estate from the 1920s
The Case of Hufeisensiedlung Berlin

A personal note

In this article the author presents his own experience of living in an iconic residential estate which was originally designed as a social housing project and has now been largely turned into individual property. Although the “Hufeisensiedlung” in Berlin is a protected and listed monument, the initial political act of selling a municipal housing association and its entire high-profile portefolio, created a difficult situation for the proper maintainance and social climate of this ensemble, which owns worldwide recognition for its skillfully varied design. In order to create more awareness among the owners, tenants and other stakeholders the author, his wife and a group of neighbours started a number of awareness-raising projects and on-going initiatives that are basically successful and might be adapted to similar situations in other parts of the world.

1 The “Horseshoe Estate” – an icon of social housing in the 1920ies

Built in 1925–1930 based on designs by the architects Bruno Taut, Martin Wagner and the garden architect Leberecht Migge, the Hufeisensiedlung (Horseshoe Estate) is a key piece of reform-oriented urban housing. Its mixture of cleverly grouped terraced houses (679 in total), village-like areas and more urban looking apartment blocks (with 1,284 dwellings) invites you to take a stroll and study Bruno Taut's great mastership: the ability to achieve a maximum individual quality although the design is based on serial components, just by introducing clever and skillfull variations. The name of the estates describes the impact of its central building. Almost 2,000 residential units are grouped around an iconic 350-meter structure shaped in the form of a horseshoe. Their widely varied, but still stringent design with strong contrasting colours and many green and open spaces in the immediate surrounds marks the missing link between the two great urban planning paradigms of the early 20th century: the Garden City Movement and row-based large scale housing development that became the basic and global model for public
housing after World War II. In 1986, the estate – designed to provide healthy living conditions for ordinary workers – was enscribed as an ensemble monument in the Berlin heritage list. In 2008, together with five other housing estates from the same period, it was declared a UNESCO World Heritage Site, entitled “Berlin Modernist Housing Estates”. More protection and honor is not possible, one should think. Nevertheless, its proper preservation was acutely threatened at the beginning of the new millennium.

2 Turning into individual property led to challenging situation

To understand the background of the projects described below, one must know that the Hufeisensiedlung is the only one of the six “Berlin Modernist Housing Estates”, in which – after privatisation of the former municipal housing company GEHAG (Gemeinnützige Heimstätten, Spar- und Bau-Aktiengesellschaft) in 1998 – terraced housing stocks were transformed into individual properties. This means that the monument ensemble now belongs to more than 650 individual owners who are jointly responsible for maintaining a world heritage. This created a difficult situation for monument preservation and was the starting point for a number of civil activities: Among other things, this includes a small exhibition in the so-called “Infostation”, a former shop in the horseshoe-shaped structure. Combined with the operation of a café on voluntary basis, this spot has established as a meeting place for neighbours and a growing number of heritage tourists. In addition to that between 2009 and 2011 we realised a large-scale public-private partnership website that contains nearly 2,000 house-specific monument protection plans.

After these two initial projects two more private ones followed:

In 2010, my wife and I acquired a house that went for sale, restored, designed and furnished it meticulously according to the interior design preferences of the architect Bruno Taut. Since 2012 house and garden can be used as a holiday home that meets the scientific standards of a museum.

In 2015, I took the material from my exhibition in the “Infostation” plus the results of my wifes scientific expertise and published an architectural guide book.

In 2018, the “European Year of Cultural Heritage”, my office joined forces with other activists and applied for public funding for three more projects that extend the reach of a deeper and broader understanding of Berlin most recent World Heritage: first a modular, easy to set-up travelling exhibition plus a youth-website about all six “Berlin Modernist Housing Estates”, and the local curation of an architectural triennial linking together the German towns of Weimar, Dessau and Berlin.
Project No. 1: Foundation of an association to carry out larger projects

A formal framework for the two initial projects described above was the founding of a non-profit association in 2007 – the “Friends and Supporters of the Horseshoe Estate in Berlin-Britz”. It acts as the official operator of the café, exhibition and website. Basically one might say, that the implementation of long-time projects should be backed up by site-specific business models linking together educational interests with potential ways to generate economic income. But even if you manage to do so, more ambitious projects usually require public funding and strategic alliances. If it comes to fundraising you have to keep an permanent open eye on certain opportunities. The search for suitable public funding for the website project is a good example for that. I came up with a first draft in 2007, but to receive funding for its implementation was surprisingly difficult and time-consuming. The breakthrough was the release of a funding program named “National World Heritage Sites”, which was issued by the German Federal Ministry of Building Affairs in 2009. The program was addressing private or public owners of World Heritage sites throughout Germany who could apply for a 1/3 or 2/3 co-financing. This subsidy program had a great impact for the Horseshoe Estate. The largest amounts went into facade renovation and energetic upgrading as well as the restoration of selected green and public spaces. But two financially relatively small titles were also approved for the the colour restoration of the former shop keepers apartment, that was later turned into the “Infostation” (project no.5) and the realisation of the web database (project no. 6).
Project No. 2: Design products from the Horseshoe Estate serve as identity carrier

As a practising graphic designer I immediately started to supply the association with various design and corporate communication artefacts on a voluntary basis. Right after the association was founded in 2007 I developed a logotype that was discussed with the founding members and might be used with and without the full association’s name. This laid the visual foundation for a series of identity-carrying small merchandise items, the sale of which benefits the association’s treasury. All these small products communicate inward and outward. Outwardly they work like touristic souvenirs. From a residents perspective they are the visible expression of our local bondage and might have the potential to stimulate the pride of being a resident. We provide colouring sheets with the typical multi-coloured doors for the very little ones, postcards with some of my street and aerial view photographs plus T-Shirts. The shirts display a component of the logo, a horseshoe-shaped lettering. They exist in three colours, based on the colouring of the façades, two cuts and all available sizes.

*Photo 2 Postcard with some typical doors of the Horseshoe Estate (Photos: Ben Buschfeld, 2011)*

Project No. 3: The annual street festival as a meeting place for old and new neighbours

Since 2008 the association organises a big annual street feast in the early summer. This became a popular standard and is situated in one of the central town squares. In addition to a stage program with music, dance and theater performances, there
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Project No. 3: The annual street festival as a meeting place for old and new neighbours

Since 2008 the association organises a big annual street feast in the early summer. This became a popular standard and is situated in one of the central town squares. In addition to a stage program with music, dance and theater performances, there are also coffee-, cake-, snack- and drinking-booths, as well as numerous interactive activities for children and adolescents. The number of visitors has leveled off since 2007 at about 1,000 guests and goes across all ages and socio-demographic groups on site. Even if the focus of the festival is above all on social issues and the creation of a friendly climate among old and new neighbours, it also offers the chance to stimulate people for the necessities of monument preservation. A good example is the tombola, where residents can win young fruit trees, which used to be an important garden design element in the 1920s. They are not just nice to look at in blossoming season but also express the spirit of the garden city movement which promoted the use of gardens to grow your own fruits and vegetables. In addition, the festival is well suited to interest and attract local political representatives for the concerns of certain monument protection issues.

Photo 3 Neighborhood party with theatre performance for kids (Photo: Ben Buschfeld 2009)

Project No. 4: Fighting for the estate to become a listed garden monument

The design of the exterior spaces as well as parts of the front and tenant gardens goes back to the garden architect Leberecht Migge. His design also included the planting of individual street trees. These were to be situated in regular order and at a uniform distance from the facades, streets and paths. For the road around the horseshoe, he opted for 100 small spherically growing robinias that grow about three meters high. In the 1960s, the poor remains of these trees were replaced by 30 high growing trees of another improper species, which did not really fit with the architecture, totally covered and already damaged large parts of the facade. In her role...
as the garden monument expert my wife suggested a number of measures including a renewal of Migges original design around the horseshoe. This proposal was supported by a broad coalition of 85% of the tenants, other heritage experts as well as the owners of the ensemble. She even had organized the major part of the financial means to carry out the replanting. Nevertheless, the district authority refused the permit and blocked the project completely. It took my wife several months to convince the city councillors of all political parties that the estate should also be registered as a garden monument. This happened in 2010 and was the turning point, because now the city administration was responsible for the authorising of care and maintenance works concerning the public greens and could advise the district authority to take proper care.

Project No. 5: Running a neighbourhood café with an awareness-raising exhibition

The state-subsidized colour restoration of the already mentioned former shop keepers apartment was carried out by “Deutsche Wohnen SE”, the second largest real estate company in Germany operating on the stock market. It has bought almost all 10,000 Berlin buildings that were designed by Bruno Taut inbetween 1924–1932. For that reason they are renting all existing on-site shops in the Hufeisensiedlung too and applied for various fundings including the colour restoration of the one central shop keepers apartment. With the state co-financing, however, the condition for the real estate company was to make the place regularly accessible to the public, an obligation that usually means that additional staff costs apply permanently. In this situation, the association, me and another company (which is offering architectural walking tours) approached Deutsche Wohnen SE in 2012. Our suggestion was that the shop could be designed as a combination of neighbourhood café and exhibition, which might serve as a information spot for world heritage tourists and could be opened with the help volunteering neighbours. Authorised by the real estate company I wrote and designed a bilingual exhibition for rather small money. Since then, our association has been providing regular opening hours, but does not need to pay any rent except for the operating costs. This deal proved to be a win-win-situation.

The larger room of the exhibition is dedicated to the history and present of the Horseshoe Estate. In a smaller room we present short profile charts of the other five world heritage estates. In the hall, the biographies of planners and selected former residents are presented.

The smaller of the back rooms is occasionally used for special exhibitions. The larger room serves as a meeting room and can also be used for minor cultural events, such as readings, lectures or small concerts. Café and exhibition are open on Friday and Sunday afternoon. This is made possible by volunteers, who are also available to answer questions. In addition to coffee and drinks we always offer homemade cake. Apart from that you can also buy a few architectural books and
the souvenirs mentioned in project no. 2. The place quickly developed into a lively meeting place for neighbours. Many come here regularly bringing in their friends, relatives or children to learn about the history, role and value of the ensemble.

Project No. 6: Website with 2,000 house-specific monument care plans
As an icon of reformist housing, the Horseshoe Estate was scientifically worked up quite early. A survey done in the mid-1980s by “Architekturwerkstatt Pitz-Brenne”, today operating as “Winfried Brenne Architekten”, examined the facades, colours, materials and windows. Their great expertise was the starting point for the recovering, restoration and listing of the incredible huge work of Bruno Taut (1880–1938) in Berlin inbetween 1924–1931. In 2003 and 2009, my wife, landscape architect Katrin Lesser, followed and did the corresponding research on the gardens and open spaces of the Hufeisensiedlung plus two other estates that were co-designed by her grand-grandfather, landscape architect Ludwig Lesser (1869–1957). All of these reports were prepared as an exklusive working aid for the authorities and distributed as paper copies filling two dozens of densely packed file folders. Those ones for the Hufeisensiedlung did, however, also contain the very kind of information that was now needed to inform and educate the rapidly growing number of private owners. As a graphic and web designer I suggested to rearrange this data in such a way that obligations are also understandable for a non-specialist audience and become accessible for the inhabitants. The idea of putting up a big website, was very much welcomed at the Federal Authority of Monument Affairs (Landesdenkmalamt Berlin). It also became the ultimate reason for founding the association, since this legal construction increased the chances to acquire appropriate project funding.

In 2009–2011, Winfried Brenne, my wife and I created a large individual database for the Horseshoe Estate with the financial support from the “National World Heritage Sites” funding program. The website www.hufeisensiedlung.info is operated in a public-private partnership mode and includes almost 2,000 microsites for all 679 townhouses plus the 1,285 flats of the listed ensemble. These microsites offer inbetween 50 to 140 individually compiled detailed plans per dwelling unit. In addition to the plans the database provides all necessary specifications which are needed for the proper maintenance. This details i.e include RAL-colours, precise measurements, material declarations, latin names of plant species etc. Since especially the houses are extremely varied (out of 679 terraced houses we distinguish 285 subtypes + 340 garden variations!), the residents first enter their street and house number in a search mask.

After that they switch directly to a house-individually set of subpages. On the microsite of the specific house or apartment, they can continue to navigate to the desired type of information. Doing so, they might for example find the information on the three-winged room window on the first floor, which in turn is classified
based on eight detailed construction plans of individual wooden profiles and their exact colour specifications.

The user can now also switch to other components and topics of his residential unit. In addition to an explanatory text, there are highly schematized coloured illustrations. They are all backed up by a 300% zoom view and feature a numerical index assigned via lines to the detail, which is listed below the main figures in a tabular overview and contains concrete, dimension, material, installation and exact colour codes or planting informations.

All house-specific details, floor plans, sections, colour information, etc. can be locally saved as dynamically generated pdfs. By sending and referring to these pdf files obtaining permits and commissioning craftsmanship is significantly simplified. In addition, the database also contains proposals for energetic upgrading of individual components. In addition to the heritage details, the site comprises three more chapters, that my office developed on a 50% voluntary basis. The first chapter deals with the history and value of the ensemble, the third contains an interactive forum where neighbours might exchange tips and recommendations, the fourth chapter is dedicated to general news or events organised by the association.

All this sounds like a perfect project. But we also have to name two problems: The first one is, that after nine years a website naturally needs a number of financially substancial technical updates, which are utterly needed now. The second thing is that the recently released very strict German data security policies opposes to all publications that allow to trace back specific residential adresses to individual people by combining different publically accesible data sources. From this perspective all inventory lists published by German monument authorities or similar institutions are basically an assault on data privacy. Due to this conflict the heritage-database is password-protected and predominantly used as a working tool for the authorities. But still there are two examples (out of 1,984 micro-pages) that show the nature and depth of implemented data.

**Project No. 7: Taut’s Home – Rentable Museum for design enthuasiats**

Our personal project “Tautes Heim” (“Taut’s Home”) is a small museum-like house with garden that makes architecture and design history really tangible. It is laid out to host 2–4 persons. All rooms and facilities are completely restored and furnished in the style of the 1920s. My wife and I completed the project without any subsidies or other official support. House and garden are a homage to the architect Bruno Taut – who designed four out of six of the World Heritage Estates – and attract great interest from guests, the media and neighbours. How did that happen?

We moved to the listed Horseshoe Estate more than 20 years ago and rentend one of the terraced houses in the more urban and modern southern part of the ensemble. Two years later, in late 1998, the city owned housing association was privatised. Attempts to establish a cooperative lacked the necessary political support and failed. After a few takeovers of the entire (to large estates listed) property portfolio on the investment and stock market, the second most recent investors started selling the previously only rented row houses of the ensemble. In 2004 we were
able to buy the house we already inhabited. Another six years later, another small row end house was for sale in our immediate neighbourhood.

Friends of neighbours were interested and asked us to accompany and counsel them. The house was in a very bad condition though. For the friends a purchase was therefore totally out of the question. But we were thrilled, how much original substance was still available: built-in wardrobes, tiled stoves, typical floor coverings, doors and window fittings were still complete. We tried to get public funding to secure this rare treasure, but this time without success. Nevertheless we decided, that we need to save and restore the original substance. So we were looking for a suitable business model and developed the idea that buying the place and renting it to design and heritage lovers, might provide some kind of refunding. Once we took this decision, the program for the next months and weekends was clearly determined. In May 2010 we bought the house and started to remove all the old wallpapers, synthetic sheetings, latex paintings, damaged plaster and non-historic tiles and layers and began to restorative and substitute all damaged or missing parts. After that we consulted with two colour restoration experts. Our eye was always on the first layer dating back to 1929/30, when the house was built. After the colour experts finished their meticulous examination we started to bring back all the original colours and materials.

Among the larger projects realized by commissioned specialists was the reconstruction of the one missing tiled stove and the typical half-wooden magnesite flooring in the kitchen as well as adding a heritage-aware, thin insulation on top of the concrete pent roof, which remains completely invisible from the outside. Next, all rooms were furnished on the basis of our own research true to the original in the style of the 1920s. Most of the smaller furniture and fittings we found on various flea markets. Some of them just need cleaning, but many of the smaller pieces, especially the lamps, the electric kitchen stove, upholstered furniture and all light fittings had to be worked up technically. But we also designed a number of larger objects ourselves. These objects include the kitchen furniture, the large folding bed in the blue room and the pull-out sofa bed in the smaller yellow room. They are all in-house designs based on historic models or black and white photographs from historic publications like i.e. the tenant magazines that had been issued from 1930–1939. Since we wanted to implement a kitchen that is fully capable for self-catering we looked for ways to integrate common modern amenities – such as dishwasher, refrigerator or microwave – discreetly behind the kitchen’s furniture fronts. Based on my wife’s expertise, we also recreated the garden according to the historic blueprints. It is gratifying to see, that our little project has grown to be a kind of role model and that there are now a few examples where neighbours felt inspired to replant the historic fruit trees or to repaint a few of the typical interior colours.
In 2012, after two years of work, the restoration was completely finished. Since then, we are renting the place to Berlin visitors, who appreciate this kind of time travel experience catapulting them back in the Bauhaus era of the 1920ies. Offering real historic design pieces for daily use, might sound like a horror-scenario for historical preservators, but our personal experience is that all our guest treat all items in the house with great care. The high degree of international attention in press, media and professional public testifies that such a tribute to Bruno Taut's ideas about interior design was urgently overdue. So although we did not receive any public funding, Taut's Home closes a gap in the cities museum and heritage landscape. In 2013 our tiny – just 65 sqm sized – house received the Berlin Monument Prize, two minor local prizes plus the very rarely granted Europa Nostra Award – the highest monument award of the European Union – which only two other sites out of 9,000 listed monuments in Berlin have received so far.

Apart from that, our operation of Taut's Home has led to many international contacts. This is even more true since the house immediately became part of the Iconichouses network, where many institutions gather that take care about the international masterpieces of residential architecture from the modernist era. The network also runs conferences, which gives us a good opportunity to connect with passionate and professional caretakers worldwide and explore other architectural events and their communication strategies, i.e. in the USA, Spain or the Netherlands.
Project No. 8: Façade typography – a long neglected topic of historic preservation

*Photo 5 Rebuilt façade typography in UNESCO-listed Carl Legien Housing Estate (Photo: Ben Buschfeld, 2013)*

Anyone who knows old press photos of the situation in front of the central horseshoe structure will immediately notice the prominent use of façade typography. It was part of the original symbolic-propagandistic design of the heart of the settlement and other projects of the same housing association. All this was eventually lost in the later conversions of the two head structures. In 2009, when the operator of the prominently situated “Hufeisen-Restaurant” wanted to renew his display, a special opportunity occurred. In consultation with the leasing real estate company, I digitised the original letter shapes based on historic photographs. This digital vector-based outlines were then cut out by laserbeams, mounted slightly raised to the façade and provided with LED strips radiating from behind onto the plastered surface. This example was then applied at some other local shops. Later, another of the six world heritage estates followed and I was commissioned to create the templates for the restoration of the 25 square meter façade typography of the residential town of Carl Legien, another splendid design of Bruno Taut.

Project No. 9: Architectural guide book “Bruno Tauts Hufeisensidlung”

In 2015 I decided to publish and architectural guide book. It is based on the content developed for the exhibition and serves as an extended bilingual (German and
English) exhibition catalog. The book, takes up some typical graphic elements from the 1920s and is available in bookstores, Amazon and the like. It comprises 144 pages and contains around 150 illustrations, including many previously unreleased historical and contemporary photos, aerial views, maps and plans. By this means it guides you through the individual construction phases, draws your attention to interesting details and presents the biographies of the most important architects, planners and residents. The guide also deals with current issues and projects relating to the preservation of the largely privatized ensemble. In addition to the Hufeisensiedlung, the other five World Heritage estates are also presented on two double-spreads each gathering the most important information. Plans, pictures and public transport details encourage people to explore Berlin's most recent world heritage. Additional excursion tips for facilities Bruno Tauts complete the handy band (ISBN 978-3-89479-923-6).

Project No. 10: Lectures, Book evenings, Events and a shop for local goods

The contents of exhibition and book are aimed not only at architectural tourists, but also at the residents. In fact, the book is also bought by many neighbours. We are very lucky about this, because this knowledge strengthens the own appreciation of the immediate surrounds. For the same reason, the association, Katrin and I had already organized various lectures and readings on the subject and other related to-
The exhibition catalog. The book, takes up some typical graphic elements from the 1920s and is available in bookstores, Amazon and the like. It comprises 144 pages and contains around 150 illustrations, including many previously unreleased historical and contemporary photos, aerial views, maps and plans. By this means it guides you through the individual construction phases, draws your attention to interesting details and presents the biographies of the most important architects, planners and residents. The guide also deals with current issues and projects relating to the preservation of the largely privatized ensemble. In addition to the Hufeisensiedlung, the other five World Heritage estates are also presented on two double-spreads each gathering the most important information. Plans, pictures and public transport details encourage people to explore Berlin’s most recent World Heritage. Additional excursion tips for facilities Bruno Taut’s complete the handy band (ISBN 978-3-89479-923-6).

Project No. 10: Lectures, Book evenings, Events and a shop for local goods
The contents of exhibition and book are aimed not only at architectural tourists, but also at the residents. In fact, the book is also bought by many neighbors. We are very lucky about this, because this knowledge strengthens the own appreciation of the immediate surrounds. For the same reason, the association, Katrin and I had already organized various lectures and readings on the subject and other related topics. The prelude was, for example, a lecture by Bruno Taut’s granddaughter. Depending on the expected response, the association cooperates with the two local schools and their spatial facilities.

Book sales in the café received a new quality thanks to the commitment of two friends, a book-loving couple that also lives in the ensemble. Since 2017 they engage and offer a constantly available contingent of books around Taut’s life and work. In addition, every few months they organize a longer book presentation with titles from various genres. Taking up this trend of increased awareness for local participation and production, the association and I recently applied for minor funding to re-organize and improve the infostations’ display facilities as a general point of sale for locally generated products. A current trend that also creates a historic link to popular ideas of self-catering gardens in the 1920s. In addition to obvious products such as jams or fruit juices, also locally won honey, the sale of handcrafted merchandising articles or the development of cultural-educational offers is conceivable. Based on particularly successful postcard motifs, we also will investigate of other small publications or handicrafts for children and teenagers. For all these ideas, I engage with the producers and am currently working on a suitable brand label. Every once in a while we are also talking about our working experience or specific restoration issues.

Project No. 11: Guided tours and the creation of a Triennial of Modernism
Inspired by the exhibition venue, guided tours and historical walks are becoming more popular. This is especially true during the World Heritage Day in September. But we also guide interested visitors, university groups, professional and political delegations throughout the year.

This kind of cultural aware, decentralised tourism became a political goal, too. On the initiative of the Federal Authority of Monument Affairs, I helped to launch the “Triennale der Moderne”, a new event format in 2013. Under the umbrella of www.triennale-der-moderne.de, Berlin and the two Bauhaus cities of Weimar and Dessau have joined forces and offer a joint visit and event program every three years over a period of three weeks. A kind of festival for which my office supplies all the programm brochures, website and social media design.

But the structures in the three cities are quite different. In contrast to Weimar and Dessau with their high-profile Bauhaus institutions and tourist agencies, most of the project partners in Berlin do not have institutional funding and lack a professional backbone. This meant that managing the Berlin part 2013 and 2016, included a lot of extra work, voluntary spirit plus a huge amount of exterior project management and improvisation from my side. Anyhow the Triennale der Moderne established as an own cultural brand. To take the Berlin programme to the next level I joined forces with two other partners to apply for funding in 2019. Finally a substantial part of our request was finally granted from the German lottery foundation. This finding helps us to provide better curational and organisational support. It
was a hard piece of work, but with this help we managed to provide a program that consists of incredible 115 single events in Berlin which will be carried out and made possible by 20 individual partners. Those partners are predominantly civil organizations, which adds to the special “grass-root” character. In 2019 Berlin’s huge program offers not just guided tours, but also a number of exhibitions, seminars, lectures, speeches, performances, discussions and individual publications which are loosely entangled with the Bauhaus centennial.

In addition to that, the program also implements a number of my other projects mentioned above: The Infostation (project no. 5) will serve as one of the two festival centers which will be opened the whole weekend. The other center, a temporary glass pavilion in the heart of former West-Berlin, will open up with an exhibition about all six World Heritage estates, that is partly derived from my architectural guide books last chapter (project no. 9) and will also be available in a travel-kit version (compare project no. 12). Last not least, my wife and I will give a public lecture about the restoration works of Tautes Heim (project no. 5) that will surely attract many neighbours. For more details please see www.triennale-der-moderne.de/berlin-2019.

3 Current projects: Two publications on all six World Heritage estates and the creation of a heritage network platform

2018 was proclaimed by the European Union as the “European Cultural Heritage Year”. Parallel to this, it was also the 10th anniversary of the UNESCO World Heritage listing of the “Berlin Modernist Housing Estates”. Because of this coincidence, I had developed two project proposals on how the estates could be addressed as a European heritage of improved living conditions during the high phase of rapid industrialisation and city growth in the 1920s. I was lucky, since all of the supposed projects managed to get public funding:

The first current project is already online: www.KulturerbeNetz.Berlin – a network of civil organisations that aims to strengthen the lobby of monument issues in general, engage on a political level and to stimulate the internal knowhow transfer amongst different activists in Berlin. The website we developed earlier this year serves as a platform for the members to present their issues, share and obtain knowledge. Last year, as part of a major event at Berlin’s City Hall, we handed over a catalogue of 10 demands to politicians. Next year we are aiming to open up and publish a “red list” of endangered sites in Berlin.

The second project is a modular travelling exhibition about the six World Heritage estates. It is consists of an easily transportable set of rollup-banners and is expected to wander through the various Berlin districts, political and cultural institutions first, but can also be shown in other cities with a similar history of residential architecture. These may include i.e. Frankfurt, Stuttgart, Rotterdam, Wroclaw,
Brno, Marseille, Vienna or Tel Aviv. [Note: If your hometown or institution would be basically interested to host this exhibition, please get into contact with the author.]

The third project is mobile-friendly responsive website for the “inheritors of the heritage”: A substantial, yet handy web application with facts about the six estates designed to offer educational materials for students and young people. Responsive means that it will be compatible to smartphones and desktop systems. Contents will not only focus on the architectural and urban significance, but are also streamlined to build a bridge to today’s social housing policies or typical questions from young people, i.e. about fairness, ecology, culture and lifestyle issues.

4 Resumé

The author is highly aware that – seen from a global view – the standards of monument protection in Germany are quite high and might even feel luxurious to activists from less rich or well-governed countries. But still this does not mean that everything is perfect over here. From a social and preservation perspective the initial selling of the public housing estate, was a capital political mistake by the city administration. As a consequence of that all of the outlined projects were conceived to bridge a vacuum of official care or efficiency. Although all of these activities have been developed for specific local circumstances, they might also serve as a model for similar situations.

The Author

Ben Buschfeld is a multidisciplinary creative and owner of buschfeld.com – graphic and interface design, a studio focussing on cultural and architectural history of the 20th century. Besides he runs www.tautshome.com, a rentable museum dedicated to the work of Bruno Taut in Berlin. Being a local resident in one of the World Heritage estates, he initiated a number of awareness-raising projects and acts as a member in various networks and professional organisations. Together with his wife (www.katrin-lesser.de) he was awarded with the Monument Awards of the European Union and the city of Berlin. For more infos or potential cooperation please see https://www.linkedin.com/in/benbuschfeld
Introduction

The monumental ensemble of Loyola in Azpeitia is one of the main cultural and heritage attractions of the Basque Country, not only for its heritage and cultural value (17th century Baroque Basilica1)), but also for its religious symbolism, since the whole site is built around the birthplace of Saint Ignatius of Loyola, co-founder of the Society of Jesus (SJ, Jesuits). Loyola is a historically documented symbolic place, where Iñigo López de Loyola was born in 1491, grew up and spent some of the most important periods of this life until his spiritual conversion in 1521–22, during the peregrination to Manresa (Abad-Galzacorta et al. 2015). Ignatius of Loyola is not only a key element for religious visitors, but also for cultural ones. His figure is part of the social framework that brings together a collective memory and history to form a shared identity, as the brand image for the Ignatian Land and as one of the most universally-known Basques in History.

This chapter is the result of the Diagnosis and Action Plan of Loyola as Destination made for the Municipality of Azpeitia. The denomination 'Loyola Destination' results from the main objective of the project, which tries to give the monumental group a wider dimension, since it seeks to project an action plan which motivates the tourist development of Azpeitia based on the value of the Ignatian heritage (in general, but especially of Loyola). Therefore, the objective of this study is understanding the different behaviours and users' perceptions of this space, from a management point of view, and assuring the preservation of identity, the development and conservation of heritage, and the authenticity of Ignatian values.

Visitors' data confirms tourist interest in Loyola. The fact that the region of Urola Valley2) and Azpeitia have different data sources is a clear confirmation of


2) Urola Valley or Urola Erdia is a region (and touristic demarcation), in the centre of Gipuzkoa, traversed by the Urola river. The region has about 30,000 inhabitants and it is divided into six municipalities: Aizarnazabal, Azkoitia, Beizama, Errezil, Zestoa and Azpeitia which is the most important municipality. Official website: https://urolaturismo.eus/
Marina Abad-Galzacorta & Ion Gil-Fuentetaja

Between Market, Heritage and Spirituality

An Integrated Tourism Management Model for the Commemoration in the Monumental Ensemble of Loyola, Spain

1 Introduction
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This chapter is the result of the Diagnosis and Action Plan of Loyola as Destination made for the Municipality of Azpeitia. The denomination ‘Loyola Destination’ results from the main objective of the project, which tries to give the monumental group a wider dimension, since it seeks to project an action plan which motivates the tourist development of Azpeitia based on the value of the Ignatian heritage (in general, but especially of Loyola). Therefore, the objective of this study is understanding the different behaviours and users’ perceptions of this space, from a management point of view, and assuring the preservation of identity, the development and conservation of heritage, and the authenticity of Ignatian values.
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2) Urola Valley or Urola Erdia is a region (and touristic demarcation), in the centre of Gipuzkoa, traversed by the Urola river. The region has about 30,000 inhabitants and it is divided into six municipalities: Aizarnazabal, Azkoitia, Beizama, Errezil, Zestoa and Azpeitia which is the most important municipality. Official website: https://urolaturismo.eus/
the idiosyncrasy of its management. Taking as reference the most interesting data, there is a sustained growth during last years in the Urola Valley region, based on the more than 100,000 arrivals and overnights per year in hotels and agrotourism. The Tourism Office of Loyola, renewed and expanded four years ago with longer office hours and open all year, receives more than 30,000 visitors a year since 2015. During 2017, 34,334 people visited the birthplace of Ignatius, most of them foreigners (58%), among whom Europeans stand out followed by North Americans and Asians). In addition, the research has delimited the profile of the visitors of Loyola, identified as older adult tourists that come with specialised tour operators and show both interests in culture and religion, and those fully motivated by religious reasons and travelling in groups such as religious associations and parishes.

The timing of this reflection is not the result of chance. In 2021, both the town hall of Azpeitia and the Jesuits will celebrate the Fifth Centenary of the conversion of Ignatius. The celebration of this event and its planning is a unique opportunity to promote a shared, integrated and sustainable management model, responding to the multiple uses and meanings of the monumental ensemble for citizens as well as tourists. This work starts therefore from the premise that an event of these characteristics provides opportunities for the construction of Loyola's image and tools for the management model, and stresses the relevance of residents’ participation in the repositioning strategies of a destination image (Oom do Valles, Mendes and Guerreiro, 2012).

2 Theoretical Background

2.1 Heritage, religious and sacred/holy tourism sites

According to the last World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) estimates (2011), 300 to 330 million tourists visit the world’s key religious sites every year and around 600 million national and international religious voyages are undertaken annually, 40% taking place in Europe. In addition, the Bethlehem Declaration on Religious Tourism, based on several International Conferences focused on Religious and Spiritual Tourism and organized by the UNWTO (Spain 2007 and 2014, Vietnam 2013), concludes “that religious tourism can make an important contribution to the socio-economic development and empowerment of local communities, and that it is a market segment that is more resilient to influences of exogenous factors” (UNWTO 2015, 1).

However, ‘religious tourism’ is sometimes confusing and difficult to classify (Griffin, 2007), because tourism, cultural, religious or spiritual needs, as primary motivation are conflated, and there are different approaches to the characterisation of religious tourism and pilgrimage in terms of behaviour and motivation (Smith
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1992, 2003; Timothy and Olsen, 2006; Álvarez Sousa, 1999 cited in Abad et al., 2015). Santos, reflecting on the clarification of concepts, includes as religious tourism “all kinds of travel (voluntary, temporary and unpaid) that are motivated by religion in combination with other kinds of motivation, and which have as their destination a religious site, but for which the journey itself is not a religious practice” (2003, 27).

In the current multicultural society, where multiple faiths mingle, tourism, religion and heritage are increasingly intertwined, congregating in the same places visitors with multiple motivations (Collins-Kreiner and Wall 2015). In this sense, faith-related destinations are multiplying, with main religious centres or pilgrimage places showing their rich historic and artistic heritage. Even the UNWTO, in different events, documents and press releases, mentions this binomial relation; for example, “tourism can protect and promote religious heritage” (PR 14083, 10 Dec 14) or “religious tourism, a catalyst for cultural understanding”, when they want to underline “the potential of this segment to promote the growth of the sector while fostering cultural understanding” (PR 16090, 14 Nov 16). There are many other documents (such as UNWTO 2007), where ecumenism is highlighted as a current trend reinforcing inter-religious and intercultural dialogue.

Consequently, even religious authorities are aware of the necessity to foster tourism as a means to reinforce human and social development, through knowledge and understanding of other cultures and realities. In fact, Christian authorities emphasize the need to construct an integrated approach to the management of tourism with religious content, reflecting the particular vision of the societies in which it takes place as well as guiding its activities for the fulfilment of human existence (John Paul II, Messages World Tourism Day 2003). Therefore, religious tourism should not erode the essence of religion or the ‘sacrum’ but enforce them correctly to boost appropriate behaviours. In fact, apart from being a source of incomes for the region itself, these types of products should be carefully designed and implemented so as not to adopt a ‘spiritless’ approach that can provoke disappearance of a value-based tourism (Abad-Galzacorta and Guereño Omil 2016).

From this perspective, religious sites such as Loyola exemplify this confluence, and highlight the necessity to create a dynamic relation between values and religious and cultural heritage, with the objective to fulfil the needs of locals, tourists and the religious community.

Closely related to this point of view and to the management of any religious heritage element, it is important to note that sacred and religious space is usually labelled as a ‘contested space’, since “it is not merely discovered, or founded, or constructed, it is claimed, owned, and operated by people advancing specific interests” (Hecht 1994, 222 cited in Collins-Kreiner and Wall 2015, 694). Therefore, different managing stakeholders have to continuously negotiate their competences and establish limits to elude potential clashes of interests that can harm the shared use of these elements. In fact, there are different approaches about the conception
and use of religious spaces. From this perspective, the so-called “third space” concept of the political geographer Soja (1980) based on the perception of the social practices of religious and secular tourists at religious sites, is of utmost relevance. These two types of tourists share the same space and heritage elements, creating a shared space in which “center, periphery, other, and liminal, the process and places it embodies occupy a unique space in the imagination of religious and secular tourism alike” (Collins-Kreiner and Wall 2015, 694). This shared space, consequently, will allow the social construction of sites as simultaneously sacred and secular.

Turning to the management of these religious heritage spaces, it is important to mention the approach of Prats (2006), who analyses heritage commercialization and the relation between heritage-identity and heritage-selling/consumption coexisting in the same space. This approach reflects the multiple meanings linked to the uses foreseen by different demands, and it can generate tensions in the management of a site, since at least three types of approaches converge in them. Firstly, there is the ‘monumentalism’ vision, whose main focus is on preserving and disseminating the patrimonial value of the heritage. Secondly, the so-called commercial or touristic vision, linked to tourism exploitation, is focused on the profitability for locals and understands tourism as an economic development opportunity. Additionally, there is a complementary vision of the place as a holy/religious space, that is a space which pursues the preservation of its spiritual essence and, therefore, is not open to everyone.

Therefore, when talking about the management of a monumental ensemble like Loyola, it is essential to bear in mind the multiplicity of discourses and involved actors. On the one hand, are the local citizens, their feelings, perceptions, actions and uses as well as managing institutions; and on the other, their activation policies regarding diverse uses and their prominence to justify the need of transforming, or at least building, a coexistence among the different visions. To this complex analysis, moreover, Loyola and the Ignatian content add another complication, since there are many managing agents involved, from the local level (the City Council of Azpeitia and the monumental ensemble), to the interregional one (different regions from the province of Gipuzkoa and the Ignatian Land), and the interprovincial and inter-autonomy one (the Ignatian Way). The management and conjunction of the diverse needs, discourses and expectations of these different levels of management have, furthermore, to coexist with the current uses of local citizens in order not to create a harmful clash on the sense of belonging of the heritage ensemble.

2.2 Image construction as opportunity

For an appropriate management of any heritage site, understanding its image is fundamental. From this perspective, the so-called cognitive image, based on the perceived physical properties (Baloglu and Brinberg 1997, cited in Oom do Valles et al. 2012), and expressed as the combination of beliefs and knowledge on a destination (Pike and Ryan 2004 cited in Oom do Valles et al. 2012), is one of the most
widespread approaches to image construction. This approach can be applied not only to destinations, but also to events as a multiplicity of attributes (Oom do Valles et al. 2012).

Consequently, the celebration of events such as a Centenary can serve as an appropriate tool to work and agree on the shared (or multidimensional) image of the monumental ensemble that agents want to reinforce and spread. This shared image will condition the management model of the ensemble, understood as one destination. Oom do Valles et al. (2012) present an interesting reflection on this relation and state that there is a lack of research on how the host communities deal with events and, in particular, the image that they have both of the region where they live and spend their holidays and of the events programme itself. However, as stated by the same authors, the relationship between residents, destination image and events is very important because of the role of locals, especially by word of mouth. This importance is reflected not only on the mere process of construction of an image, but also on the design of an events program.

In fact, a study on the case of Nazareth by Uriely, Israeli and Reichel (2003) suggests that the link between tourism development and the answer by locals to this process is extremely complex. It analyses attitudes of locals toward tourism development in the context of heritage/religious tourism sites in Nazareth, and surfaces interreligious contradictions, aligned with characteristics and circumstances of the local community and the type and nature of the developed tourism. In this sense, several places share some characteristics with Nazareth in terms of heritage and religious value; but, if in the latter, differences were approached from the religious heterogeneity and the identification with the heritage element due to the religious affiliation; among citizens, heterogeneity in the identification with the main resource is linked to the spatial proximity of the ensemble, presented with respect to the problem of residents’ affiliation or identification with the locally promoted heritage (Uriely, Israeli and Reichel 2003).

From this perspective, the contribution of Jeuring and Haartsen (2017, 242) is important “when considering that citizens have different, simultaneous relations with the places they inhabit”, because they also study the role of locals in the construction of destination images, of place attachment and their translation into positive destination word-of-mouth with visitors. These authors, quoting Braun et al. (2013), analyse the different roles of locals in the commercialization of a destination, emphasizing their importance in any process of tourism development. They are considered the ambassadors of the destinations and, jointly, the ultimate legitimating agent of the meaning attributed to public spaces.

The emphasis on citizens’ engagement in place branding is crucial, since any tourism development and place branding should be constructed upon the question “for who’s benefit?”. These approaches are useful from a management perspective, since they address the assignation of responsibilities and force different stakeholders to work in a co-operative way to construct the image of the place. In some cases, as
Loyola, this implies having to take into account all the different local and regional agents: tourism enterprises, citizens, the religious community of the SJ, traders, and others. In fact, “feeling responsible for positive destination, -word of mouth appears to be related to an intrinsic sense of belonging (Self-Continuity)” (Jeuring and Haartsen 2017, 253).

Nevertheless, apart from this human approach to the development of the tourism space, another processual geographic and political planning approximation should be considered. In this sense, Lew (2017) contradicts the traditional perspective of the simple host-guest pairing in the political economy of a destination, establishing an alternative continuum from non-planned initiatives (labelled as ‘place-making’) to institutional tourism planning policies (labelled as ‘placemaking’). This innovative approach remarks that main differences between the concepts can be based on the enormous variation of results due to the use of diverse tools, and the degree of political intervention for the creation or development of a destination and the objectives these initiatives entail.

Consequently, it is important to bear in mind that, depending on the aspects they reinforce, there are multiple different approaches to the image of a tourism destination, according to the intrinsic characteristics of the agents and public institutions involved in the management.

3 Methodological Framework and Findings of the Study

3.1 The Fifth Centenary of the conversion of Ignatius of Loyola as opportunity

Loyola is an excellent example to study, since it represents a confluence of interests and, from the spirituality adopted by the co-founder of the SJ, Saint Ignatius, it presents Ignatian humanism as a dynamic and adaptive spirituality that integrates spiritual humanism in the framework of dialogue, faith and culture. Ignatius and his related content embrace diverse epochs and cultures, tradition and modernity, reason and effect, thinking and feeling, singularity and community, freedom and values, as well as co-responsibility and social transformation (Compañía de Jesús 2018), totally aligned with necessities identified by UNWTO experts (2007).

When talking about the management of a monumental ensemble like Loyola, therefore, it is essential to bear in mind the multiplicity of discourses and involved actors. On the one hand, are the local citizens, their feelings, perceptions, actions and uses as well as managing institutions; and on the other, their activation policies regarding diverse uses and their prominence to justify the need of transforming, or at least, building a coexistence among the different visions. To this complex analysis, moreover, Loyola and the Ignatian content add another complication, since there are many managing agents involved, from the local level to the interregional one, and the interprovincial and inter-autonomy one, as above.
According with Oom do Valles et al. (2012), the celebration of the Fifth Centenary of the conversion of Ignatius of Loyola is an excellent opportunity to generate one shared image as “Destination Loyola” and agree on the management model of the ensemble. In the case of Loyola, influence of the proximity to the heritage, built upon the perceived image and the current use of the ensemble, has been analysed as a potential explaining factor for the attitudes of locals towards tourism development and the celebration of the anniversary.

Consequently, before proceeding to the results of the analysis of Loyola, it is important to bear in mind that, depending on the aspects they reinforce, there are multiple different approaches to the image of Loyola. According to the intrinsic characteristics of the institutions involved in the management of Loyola, a matrix combining cultural and religious aspects was designed to identify the different potential discourses. In the intersection of these two ambitions, the matrix highlights the existence of four main domains of the discourse, reflecting four main typologies of tourism. Based on the necessities of the discourse of every typology, the categories have been labelled as recreation tourism or leisure tourism; cultural tourism; religious tourism; and humanist tourism. This categorization will be the basis for the following analysis of the use and perceived image of Loyola.

3.2 Research design

From this general perspective of a multi-layered governance of the site and of the participatory mechanisms to include citizenship in the process, the research adopted a methodology that combines both quantitative as well as qualitative approaches. This combined methodology was used to measure in a quantitative manner issues related to the perceived image, the different usages of the monumental ensemble of Loyola as well as to activities that should be implemented within the framework of the Fifth Centenary of the conversion of Saint Ignatius.

The quantitative analysis was conducted by means of questionnaires. These were handed over to local citizens, the Apostolic Platform linked to the SJ from the surroundings, and rectors from Jesuit universities worldwide. A total of 385 responses from these target groups was collected. The qualitative approach was adopted to secure a profounder knowledge on the afore-mentioned issues. Apart from local citizens and the diverse social collective, in-depth interviews were undertaken also with civil and political agents linked to the monumental ensemble and its content

The image study was taken from a twofold perspective. First, the questionnaire contained a pool of thirty-six terms that could be assigned to the monumental ensemble. Some of these terms were more culture-related, while others were more religious-oriented. Similarly, the interviews with the different groups contained open questions pertaining to the image they have of Loyola. Among these groups, the research included the Sanctuary of Loyola, the Ignatian Way and the University of Deusto as institutions pertaining to the SJ. These answers were codified following
the same logic as the pool of terms to make both approaches comparable. The selection of the terms of this pool as well as the spontaneous answers during the interviews, allowed the researchers to identify the more culture or religion-oriented perception of the image by the different surveyed groups.

Regarding the identification of the different usages of the ensemble, the research has adopted a double quantitative perspective. That is, the questionnaire identified current usage typologies, but also other potential uses that the monumental ensemble can have. All groups answered these questions.

Finally, both the questionnaire and the in-depth interviews contained questions regarding what kind of activities the different groups considered important to be included in the planning of the commemoration of the Fifth Centenary of the conversion of Saint Ignatius. Additionally, interviews allowed an understanding of some managerial issues regarding the different perceptions and usages of the monumental ensemble. The results from these questions provide an insight of the perception of the monumental ensemble, as well as key hints to better address managerial issues.

3.3 Main results

Results show that there are two main different perceptions related to the site. On the one hand, civil society tends to provide a more culture-related description to the ensemble, with a less strong emphasis on the religious content of the site such as ‘spirituality’, ‘religious tourism’ or ‘spiritual exercises’. Therefore, the City Council, local association and citizens of Azpeitia describe Loyola in their spontaneous answers during the interviews in cultural terms and they, similarly, choose the more culture-related terms from the pool of the questionnaires. In this sense, the local citizenship is the one that more clearly links the monumental site with culture and heritage perceptions. Tourism agents also pertain to this group of cultural perceptions.

On the other hand, the Apostolic Platform (PAT) related to SJ as well as rectors from the Universities, spontaneously express a more religion-related perception of the site. In this case, some of the more frequently selected terms were ‘spirituality’, ‘spiritual exercises’ or ‘hospitality’, which contrasts with the civil approach to the ensemble. The religious managers of the site, similarly, also highlighted the significance of this perception for the whole site.

Consequently, although not contradictory, the research has identified two distinctive approaches to the image perceived by the analysed different groups.

Regarding the use of the monumental ensemble, the first approach deals with current usages of the space. In this section, only local citizens and the afore-mentioned PAT were taken into consideration, due to the more extensive usage of the space they represent. Analysing the different elements of the monumental ensemble, the Basilica, the gardens and esplanade as well as the Birthplace of Saint Ignatius, were used by nearly the whole analysed sample. The main difference was identified regarding the hostel and Spirituality Centre, since the use by the PAT (78.5% and 92.4% respectively) is 30% points above the one by the local citizens.
These differences on the usage of the different elements of the space are explained relative to the typology of use expressed by the different groups. In fact, while nearly all local citizens described their use as related to leisure (93.5%), and the second most chosen one was the tourism visit (38.3%), very low values were scored by the more religion- and spirituality-linked options. The PAT, conversely, expressed a more frequent use of the site for formation purposes (77.2%), and to participate in religious celebrations (75.9%), in workshops and conferences (69.6%), or in spiritual exercises (57.0%). Therefore, the typologies expressed by the PAT require spaces to gather and accommodate people, and explain the more intensive use of the above-mentioned spaces and structures.

Lastly, considering the usage of the ensemble, a final question on potential future uses for the site was included in the questionnaire. The rectors of the universities also answered this question. In all the cases, the most popular opinion was that the ensemble should also be used for other cultural activities, followed by the possibility of opening the different elements of the site to tourism activities. The most obvious differences were detected regarding the adscription of the ensemble only to religious activities, since a third of the rectors selected this answer while no citizen chose it. This marks a clear divergent option.

Consequently, two main usage spaces and typologies were discovered by the survey. Whilst local citizens connect the site with leisure or tourism purposes and visit the spaces linked to these usages, the PAT tends to prefer formation and spiritual uses of the monumental basilica, the open-air gardens and esplanade.
Finally, taking the commemoration of the Fifth Centenary into consideration, the research analysed the different perspectives on the activities that should be programmed within this framework in both a quantitative and qualitative way. According to the answers of the questionnaire, local citizens prefer to design activities to valorise the monumental ensemble of Loyola on a national and international level, to commemorate the historical events, and to have cultural manifestations linked to the anniversary. The same vision was also highlighted during the interviews with the citizens, local civil authorities and local associations, while tourism agents also added a more touristic approach. Thus, a clear cultural component can be identified in the approach expressed by what can be labelled as the civil society. The PAT and rectors of the universities, not very surprisingly, tend to highlight the convenience of promoting the Ignatian discourse and values as well as celebrating religious and spiritual activities. This approach surfaces a more spiritual understanding of the commemoration, endorsed by the qualitative approach of the interviews with these collectives, since the religious managers of the monumental ensemble also shared the same approach.

However, all the different groups have expressed the necessity of promoting both the figure of Saint Ignatius as well as of the Ignatian Way based on his pilgrimage as core actions within the program of the anniversary. All the researched agents remark the necessity of reinforcing the cooperation between the diverse ambits in order to create a coherent and cohesive discourse and management model of the monumental ensemble.
grammed within this framework in both a quantitative and qualitative way. According to the answers of the questionnaire, local citizens prefer to design activities to valorise the monumental ensemble of Loyola on a national and international level, to commemorate the historical events, and to have cultural manifestations linked to the anniversary. The same vision was also highlighted during the interviews with the citizens, local civil authorities and local associations, while tourism agents also added a more touristic approach. Thus, a clear cultural component can be identified in the approach expressed by what can be labelled as the civil society.

The PAT and rectors of the universities, not very surprisingly, tend to highlight the convenience of promoting the Ignatian discourse and values as well as celebrating religious and spiritual activities. This approach surfaces a more spiritual understanding of the commemoration, endorsed by the qualitative approach of the interviews with these collectives, since the religious managers of the monumental ensemble also shared the same approach.

However, all the different groups have expressed the necessity of promoting both the figure of Saint Ignatius as well as of the Ignatian Way based on his pilgrimage as core actions within the program of the anniversary.

All the researched agents remark the necessity of reinforcing the cooperation between the diverse ambits in order to create a coherent and cohesive discourse and management model of the monumental ensemble.

4 Conclusions
The research on Loyola is contributing to a sound religious tourism development. Along with a secularization process, these spaces become places that respond to new and multiple expectations (UNWTO 2007). The findings can support a balancing of the shared space used by hosts and guests. Currently ‘Destination Loyola’ requires an efficient management with shared guidelines adopting a sustainable tourism development approach to the not merely religious Ignatian heritage.

Being an important focal tourism and heritage element of the town and the region, one of the main groups to be analysed was that of the local citizens, because part of the management of the space should be addressed to them due to their character of intensive users of the site. A general call to take part in the research was made by the local authorities, but the questionnaire collected only 108 responses from the citizens. This low participant number conveys a certain degree of disaffection between citizens with tourism reality as well as with the Ignatian heritage (beyond the monumental ensemble), and a lack of engagement in the construction of place attachment (Jeuring and Haartsen, 2017).

Aligned with previous studies of Loyola and, in particular, on the Ignatian Way (Abad-Galzacorta et al, 2016; Abad-Galzacorta and Guereño-Omil 2016), and considering the afore-mentioned results, the research has identified that the monumental ensemble entails diverse imageries for the different groups that visit and
make use of the different elements of the site. Cultural and spiritual perceptions coexist in the same space, attached to the varied typologies of uses related to the analysed groups. Therefore, it can be stated that there are multiple discourses attributed to the different perspectives of people.

Similarly, differences on the ‘sense of place’ have been noted, and on the imprint of values, perceptions, memories and tradition by a group on a given place, adding meaning to the space (Lew 2017). Analogous with the Tourism Place Making Continuum of Lew (2017, 3), image management by the Society of Jesus would be close to fewer tourism-oriented places which tend to be defined more by place-making processes, related to concepts such as ‘local directed’, ‘organic and incremental’ or ‘existential’. The City Council, conversely, adopts an approach closer to terms such as ‘industrial tourism’, ‘international directed’ and ‘recreational’, with placemaking processes that consider tourism primarily as an economic activity. Citizens present a mixed place making, along the middle of the continuum.

Apart from being a theoretical debate, these contradictions are determinants for the development of management and governance tools. The characteristics of these tools can determine the Loyola’s image construction, giving the opportunity to stress the relevance of residents’ participation in the repositioning strategies of the destination image.

Concerning the commemoration of the Fifth Centenary, the proposals for the activities reproduce the same scheme of the previously explained perceptions. These proposals approach the monumental ensemble from the cultural as well as the spiritual perspective, providing an integral approximation to the expected activities. Nevertheless, the figure of Saint Ignatius and the ensemble itself represent the articulating ambit of these spheres of comprehension, since it is crucial for both analysed generic groups. This shared vision could be considered the cornerstone to generate new integrative management cooperation opportunities with the commemoration centenary as a starting point.
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World Heritage Jaisalmer Fort
Living Heritage Site, Rajasthan, India

Note: This research work is an integral part of Site Management Plan of Jaisalmer Fort (inscribed a World Heritage Site in 2013 was one among six forts Nominated to UNESCO under Serial Nomination of 6 Hill Forts of Rajasthan.) Undertaken in 2013 by Sanrakshan Heritage Consultants Pvt Ltd, New Delhi. Various studies were conducted under the broad spectrum of topics like history (both textual and oral history), architecture and planning, cultural, livelihood pattern, present day tourism, physical infrastructure, management structures etc. The aim of the study was to identify the gaps in the present day management structure and propose consequent strategies/structuring to balance the functioning of different agencies. The paper would highlight few aspects from this research work.

1 About Jaisalmer

India is a land with diversified rich cultural heritage, as being one of the oldest civilization of the world. Every corner has a story to narrate, which gives a glimpse of the old historic era. Every place has its uniqueness and significance in terms of history, culture, art, architecture, people and their traditional believes which is carried in their lifestyles, which gives the place its sense of belonging and its identity. One such place in India is land of sand dunes, called Jaisalmer, located in western edge of India in dry, arid, Thar desert terrain in the state of Rajasthan, on the historical Spice Trade Route. Today the settlement is famous for its architectural vocabulary, customs, and traditional belief system. The Jaisalmer Fort, popularly known as Sonar Kila, because of its golden colour, is the only example of Living Fort in India which has sustained the testimony of time, over ages, dates back to 11th century. Jaisalmer settlement located at important trading route, resulted in confluence of several cultures, which is reflected in various aspects of local’s life, believe system, culture, art and architecture. The Jaisalmer fort was inscribed as World Heritage Site in 2013 among six UNESCO Serial Nomination of Six Hill Forts of Rajasthan. The entire settlement has yellow sandstone construction. The intricate carvings on the façade of historic buildings, depicting floral patterns, geometrical designs, and human figures manually carved reflect the great skills of local craftsmen and the prosperity of the local community.
**Uniqueness and reflection of history in architecture vocabulary**

The community of Jaisalmer quite influential and wealthy, established structures which are masterpieces. The most important thing which needs to be noted that the scale of structure whether small or large all are dotted with exemplary intricate architectural carving on these yellow sandstone structures (Bindu 2001). This also represents that almost whole community was thriving. The craftsmanship on these structures has an iconography which is influenced by everyday life stories. Aesthetics, as one of the most important dimensions paramounts all other factors at Jaisalmer. Almost all the regal structures inside and outside the fort are built of sandstone and mortar. The majestic, magnificent and elegantly carved front facade not only add aesthetic sense but also rejuvenate the memories of the golden regal era, when all the courtly nobleman resided within the fort premises. (Refer Figure 1).

*Figure 1 – Havelis with well sculpted façade and projected Jharokhas Source: Site Management Team, SHC*

The workmanship is of highest order and is difficult to comment that the carving is on stone or that on wood. The structures/havelis have well sculptured façade, the projected
The community of Jaisalmer quite influential and wealthy, established structures which are master pieces. The most important thing which needs to be noted that the scale of structure whether small or large all are dotted with exemplary intricate architectural carving on these yellow sandstone structures (Bindu 2001). This also represents that almost whole community was thriving. The craftsmanship on these structures has an iconography which is influenced by everyday life stories. Aesthetics, as one of the most important dimensions paramounts all other factors at Jaisalmer. Almost all the regal structures inside and outside the fort are built of sandstone and mortar. The majestic, magnificent and elegantly carved front facade not only add aesthetic sense but also rejuvenate the memories of the golden regal era, when all the courtly nobleman resided within the fort premises. (Refer Figure 1).

Figure 1 – Havelis with well sculpted façade and projected Jharokhas  Source: Site Management Team, SHC

Figure 2 – Jain Temple. Source: Site Management Team, SHC

The craftsmanship is of highest order and is difficult to comment that the carving is on stone or that on wood. The structures/havelis have well sculptured façade, the projected jharokhas, balustrades or latticed windows and highly decorative and ornamented porches and columns define the general characteristics of the building.

The structure has a wide range of building typologies and is an architectural marvel as well as all the structures have distinctive design vocabulary. With the coming of the Mughals, the influence was seen not only in the political milieu but also in the socio cultural aspects in the fort. This aspect is best reflected in the architectural styles that were incorporated in the later construction of the royal houses from 17th century onwards. Examples are the use of mirror work, blue tiles, intricate floral and bird motifs, various beautiful patterns of jalis work, the art of stone setting, carving and inlay work. The consequent havelis built during the 18th and the 19th century clearly show this influence. With these work being carried out by specific artisan communities, the fort also saw a demographic shift with the settlement of new communities who later shifted to the talahati (foothill) of the fort and hence the gradual evolution of the region by laying down of roads and alleys and development of regions marked by the respective occupation of the communities.

The establishment of the Jain temples also saw a significant change in the cultural milieu. With the settlement of many Jain Munis and the Oswal Jains, under whose patronage the Jain temples came up, saw a flush of new cult being practised which is a marked departure from the Vaishnavite leaning followers in the royal family. The Jain pantheon also saw its reflection in the beautiful architecture of the Jain temples, which follows the predominant Solanki and the Vaghela School of architecture and temple construction as seen in Gujarat.

Jaisalmer houses have several structures that are all in yellow sandstones and are exemplary examples of fine workmanship. The Fort has a wide range of building typologies and which are architectural marvel as well as all the structures have distinctive design vocabulary. The fort houses around 469 structures all in yellow sandstones. The scale and volume of the fort is very massive. The five to seven feet long wall which envelopes the fort is supported by 99 massive bastions, which interrupt the Fortwall at different distance. The construction technique adopted was by fixing of members in an interlocking pattern without mortar, as the area had major scarcity of water. Thus the oldest structures have dry masonry. Later wet mortar was used which consisted of lime and methi mix adhesive as fixers. To hold members tightly iron dowels are introduced at every joints whose holes are again covered with the lime and sand stone powder slurry.

The climatic conditions are extremely adverse as the temperature reaches up to 50 degree Celsius in summers and drops down to 4 degree Celsius in winters at night. The construction techniques and spatial planning helped in retaining extreme climatic conditions.

The intricate carving consisted of elements like flowers, fruits etc. which were scarce in the region due to extreme climate. Thus, the craftsman utilised their skills to create elements which were absent in the region.
Living cultural heritage

The Gangaur festival is an important festival celebrated within the precincts of the fort as well as outside. It is widely celebrated by the womenfolk, who worship Gauri, an emanation of female goddess Parvati and the consort of Lord Shiva, and stands for the celebration of spring and marital fidelity. This festival commences on the first day of Chaitra, the day following Holi, festival of colours, and continues for 16 days. Images of Gauri are made of clay for the festival which is mounted without a canopy. On the 7th day Gudhlias, which are earthen pots with numerous holes all around and lit with lamps inside them, are carried by unmarried girls on their heads. This continues for ten days. The festival reaches its climax during the last three days. The images of goddess Gauri are dressed in new garments especially made for the occasion. At an auspicious occasion in the afternoon, a procession is taken out to the Gadisar Lake. Songs are sung during the procession, which describes Gauri’s departure to her husband’s house. This tradition of procession from Fort and various other places from Jaisalmer settlement to Gadisar Lake, the only source of water in this arid region, ensures that this traditional practise would help in sustaining the water body for ages.

The cultural uniqueness of the region is not just given through the architecture but also the vibrant colourful customs, festivals, music and the dance forms. The festivals have customs and rituals which include worshipping of natural elements like water bodies as their ancestors understood the significance of these resources. The place is also famous for unique customs, like Jauhar, which is not practised anymore anywhere in India.

Thus, World Heritage Site Jaisalmer Fort, is unique in several aspects, being a Living Heritage Site with exceptional architectural vocabulary. The fort is a small city within the town of Jaisalmer. Around 450 households are found inside the fort. The houses are exclusively crafted in yellow sandstone. The craftsmanship is of highest order. It’s said, since the town of Jaisalmer is located in desert, the scarcity of flowers and fauna was always there, therefore, the craftsman used their skills and replicated beautiful flora and fauna elements in these historic structures yellow sand stone facades. The architectural vocabulary is of highest order. The articulations are detailed and precisely executed.

The spatial planning of the town is extremely interesting, being situated in an arid region of India. Because of proper spatial planning, the locals are able to sustain harsh weather. The residential quarters have specific internal layouts following a principle of usage, functionality and traditional beliefs, which is typical of this region. The variation can be seen in usage of material and size of structure. Some aspects of different community lifestyles are also reflected in the spatial planning.

The vibrant and colourful lifestyle of the local community creates a unique atmosphere to the fort. Every structure and corner of the fort narrates a story, about the inhabitants and their lives. Several communities reside within the fort, although in different areas, dedicated to different communities with hierarchy in
the social status. They manage to live in a kind of harmony within the fort. It has several community spaces where people of all age groups gather together to celebrate in joy and every community has also its individual gathering space.

2 Outstanding Universal Value and Management Plan

The site was inscribed as World Heritage Site in 2013, under the broad two criterions:
1) Cultural Criterion (ii): exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design.
2) Criterion (iii): bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared.

We started the Management Plan with the motive to conserve the outstanding universal value of the cultural Heritage assets of Jaisalmer Fort, with mandate to provide a framework to conserve and manage the cultural heritage of the Living Fort. The focus was to formulate strategies which are not monumental in approach and takes into account the local community perspective in priority. The management strategies should serve to the local community and should help in bridging the gap.

At present there exists no national policy on World Heritage Sites in India, which bind the local planning authorities to recognize the importance of WHS. The government was looking forward to provide a legislative backup to the management plan so as to ensure proper implementation and follow up of the plan and its agreed objectives.

At present town and country planning act, AMASR Act, 1958 and Amendment 2010, State Government Act and Local Government Act are the primary statutory documents for management, controlling changes and development in and around the Fort.

The scope of Management plan included a great number of tasks and activities. The framework includes policies and guidelines to create balance between various agencies. The mandate was to preserve, conserve and restore the uniqueness of Fort. This required intensive documentation in different areas which had to be carried out to formulate the architectural guidelines. Bye-laws were formulated to control any kind of incongruent additions or alterations or provided mandate for the kind of activities which can be undertaken.

One of the parameter was also to create and to promote sustainable tourism by establishing proper infrastructure facilities. Being a Living Fort tourism activities have direct impact on social life of local communities. The initial scope also emphasised the development of a livelihood plan for locals. Also a Disaster Risk Preparedness Plan for the Fort has to be developed, since, the structure is more than 1000 years old and the Fort has only one entry/exit.
3 Current protection status

The Jaisalmer Fort is protected as a Nationally Protected Monument notified under The Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Declaration of National Importance) Act, 1951 (No LXXI of 1951). Under section 3 of this Act, AMASR Amendment, 2010 as per Notified Act No. LXXI of 1951, dated 28.11.1951, cited the “Jaisalmer Fort including ancient temples”. Responsibility of construction and restoration of the protected site lies with the Archaeological Survey of India.

While working on the Site Management Plan of Jaisalmer Fort, several detailed studies were conducted.

1) Proper documentation was done that included cultural resource mapping, which highlighted the condition of the structures as well.

2) Various architectural studies were conducted and according architectural development guidelines proposed to different areas/typologies. The mandate of the exercise was to preserve the historic fabric to the maximum and an Architectural Manual was created in order to guide locals so that they conserve/restore as per the original architectural vocabulary. These guidelines were not limited to façade development but also gave proper detail of spatial planning.

3) Another important aspect was sustainable tourism, for which we understood the impact of tourism on various aspects of locals lives and also tourist’s perspective was considered. Surveys were conducted to set up proper visitor management (a sample of 500 Indian and foreign tourists) to analyze the experience of the tourists of the place. Infrastructure surveys within the site and around the fort were conducted to understand the present carrying capacity. Further studies were conducted to determine guided tours and their narratives.

4) Traffic management on regular days and also on special occasions as heavy vehicular traffic impacted the historic infrastructure to the great extent.

5) To improve opportunities for locals, livelihood pattern studies were carried out. Several meetings with local stakeholders and government agencies were organized to understand the gap in implementation of various policies. The objective of the Management Plan was also to coordinate and synchronize the requests of government agencies and local stakeholders.

6) Apart from this, Disaster Preparedness Evacuation routes were worked out.

4 Tourism impact

Being one of the most visited destinations in India, tourism played an important role in local’s life. The visitor survey helped to analyze the image of the town and the factors of attractivity. Similarly, the multiple meetings with locals helped to understand the problems faced by locals. Most of the business is dependent on tourism related activities. The code of conduct both of tourist and locals plays a crucial role in
sustaining this tourism industry. A huge number of tourists from India and abroad during the peak season August to March, impacts the local life to a great extent.

- **Tourism promoting and sustaining traditional knowledge system**
  World Heritage sites are promoting locals craft and local’s traditions. Being declared as World Heritage, Jaisalmer tourism industry reached another dimension and resulted in influx of many international designers. This led to a considerable benefit for the local craft industry. The local handicrafted cloth items as a traditional art of the region got promoted and recognized at an international level. Jaisalmer is also famous for its local music and dances. A community known as Kalbeliyas is excel in the art of dance and music. They pass on this traditional art from generation to generation. With rise in tourism, these artisans get regular employment, which helps them to sustain this art form.

- **Tourism economy is a highly dependent industry**
  Tourism provides employment to almost every household in the town in various forms. People are employed in different segments related to this industry like hotels, restaurants, local businessmen, local craftsman, and local artisans. Thus, as a monoculture, it is the most dependent segment providing employment to locals.

- **Cleanliness in the city**
  Littering of garbage, which led to unhygienic condition, is a major issue in the city. Several areas although adorned with beautiful architecture, have major cleanliness problems, making it difficult for tourists to have a satisfying experience.

- **Unorganized vehicular traffic at the fort**
  Unorganized and uncontrolled vehicular traffic (specially 2- and 3-wheelers) is a major problem inside the fort. Pedestrian movement becomes difficult and constant honking by the biker is very disturbing for the residents and visitors as well. Speeding vehicles on the ramps of the fort have caused several accidents.

- **Display of products on the historic walls/ buildings and incongruous additions**
  Shopkeepers, in order to gain maximum attention of the visitors, display their products outside the shops on the walls of the historic building. This not only can cause damage to the structure but also reduces the aesthetics of the built heritage. Similarly, sign boards, banners by the restaurants and other commercial entrepreneur blocks views and create a chaotic environment. Besides this, incongruous additions like temporary sheds obstruct proper vision and historic fabric of fort.

- **Impact on the education of youth**
  A great number of locals are dependent on tourism, which in a way is good source to generate income and easy profits. This has effected the educational system. As the youth is more inclined in making quick money by involving themselves in hospitality industry at early age, they are not interested in gaining higher education for other sectors of employment. But the hospitality
sector is only active for a few months due to the climate in Thar desert. The dependency on just one industry can create difficulties and high rates of unemployment in times of political or economic crises.

- **Commercialization impacts local lifestyles**
  Tourists in large numbers invading all corners of their private space and clicking pictures of locals create uncomfortable situations for them. Especially those families who are not associated with tourism industry react annoyed as they dislike this habit. A code of conduct for tourists is urgently needed. Apart from this, many tourists prefer to live in homestays within the fort. Several locals giving maximum part of their property for tourists homestays and they themselves are living in small portions of the property with minimum standards of living. To promote basic infrastructure standards of living, policy framework was worked out for accommodating homestay facilities in any locals residents place.

- **Involvement of local stakeholders in management of fort to promote sustainable tourism**
  The visitor studies and interaction programmes with the local stakeholders helped to understand the challenges and to find proper solutions for existing problems. The Management Plan team triggered a sense of ownership among locals. They understood the problems which if improved would help in enhancing their source of income. Beside this they also understood the heritage belongs to them, and the essence of its uniqueness can be preserved only if the people take initiative in maintaining and managing it.

  The local stakeholders came up with solutions to some of these problems. For instance, the cleanliness within the Fort and of the town was one of the major concerns of the tourists. The local stakeholders took the initiative of mass cleaning of the town with both locals and government agencies involved. Every weekend locals together with government staff and school kids clean up certain parts of the town.

  Another issue was improper display of items at local shops which impacted the visibility of the historic structures. The locals understood that it is the beautiful architecture of the place that attracted tourists from all over the world, thus it’s important to be more organized so the visitors can experience the rich heritage fabric.

  Even the immense and unorganized traffic got under a certain control by involving the local people into the traffic management. This also reduced the burden on the administration.

  The Management Plan emphasied not only on maximum participation of locals, discussing problems but also proper implementation and monitoring to achieve balanced coordination with locals.

  Being a Living World Heritage Site, locals play the leading role in implementation, management and monitoring of strategies. Involved in all solutions, the concerned regulations are better understood and more accepted. By making locals responsible and consider them decision makers along with the administration they
become integral part of implementation process, which ensures the success of the Management Plan.

Apart from improving tourism management, the preservation of the rich architectural vocabulary is of utmost importance. As heritage managers our main responsibility was to make aware of different issues like incongruous additions or change in architectural vocabulary which would affect the historic fabric of the place. The elaborated architecture manual includes all the construction details from materials to style. The management team provided the Architectural Manual after a series of studies/documentation and involved local masons who had been working in family traditions for generations in the area. The manual provided the different ratios of different architectural elements which are integral part of traditional architectural vocabulary.

5 Conclusion and Lessons learnt

The constant support and understanding of locals and administration helped us to achieve and convey the main message that “Heritage is of the people and it belongs to the people”.

The sense of ownership stimulated a sense of responsibility, as the World Heritage Site has been maintained and managed by them since ages. They will be the caretakers of this Living Heritage also in future. The management plan helped in identifying the gap and to set viable solutions to many of the problems which needed the active inclination of locals for more sustainable and proper implementation.

The strategic objective of the “Five Cs” to preserve WHS – Credibility, Conservation, Capacity-building, Communication, Communities – plays the central role in the new management plan.

Living Heritage sites have a long history being managed by local communities. Tourism industry as a relatively new and modern sector is one aspect of these Heritage sites, that can help to sustain the site.

The Jaisalmer Fort Management Plan, gave us the lesson that it’s important to document and to analyze both sides of the story, from the tourists and locals perspective, in order to find solutions which are suitable to both.
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1 Introduction
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Integration of heritage in the Urban Renewal/Regeneration framework (Fig. 1) has been the motive of various governmental organisations such as the State Departments of Archaeology, national organisations like the Archaeological Survey of India, and various non-governmental organisation such as the Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage (INTACH) and the Aga Khan Trust, for over a decade. Efforts for this have been taken by various cities such as Mumbai, Ahmedabad, Delhi and Hyderabad in order to improve heritage incentives by allowing increased access to heritage, thereby increasing the possibility of heritage tourism. An increased footfall would offer heritage incentives to the locals as well as to the State. With the World Heritage Committee conducting regular audits at the declared Sites, a heavy encumbrance is placed on the government for the conservation and upkeep of these sites.
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Local communities are by far the best stakeholders who can contribute to and benefit from the management of heritage. This is particularly true in cases where the World Heritage Site is a living heritage, with constant activities and use by the people and not merely for tourism: as in case of the Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park, Gujarat; the Victorian Gothic and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai, Maharashtra; and the Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus (formerly the Victoria Terminus), also Mumbai.

The Champaner Pavagadh Archaeological Park is set in a location on the outskirts of Vadodara, Gujarat, with two prominent historic precincts and numerous monuments. A blend of Hindu and Islamic Architecture, the temples on this site are still used and frequented for pilgrimage. In the case of the Victorian Gothic and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai, that is a precinct in one of the most populated areas and is home to various government institutions, museums, businesses and residences.
The advantage with this over individual monuments, that helps in positive and sustainable development in and around a heritage precinct, is the presence of local communities and stakeholders. Harnessing this advantage and engaging them in the decision-making process regarding conservation management and development has proved to be efficient.

3 Heritage-led regeneration

Heritage is a significant resource for urban regeneration. Successful regeneration intends to bring about changes that give social, economic and environmental life back to the context of a place. But the economic benefits of heritage-based regeneration along with its social dimensions are poorly understood and valued in the Indian context.

The phrase ‘heritage-led regeneration’ is often used by the historic environment sector to describe schemes where heritage has played a significant part in the regeneration process. The importance of regeneration work in bringing benefits to the historic environment is of great significance. It touches on people’s lives, affects the local economy, and the places it creates become familiar and hopefully enjoyed local environments.

‘Successful regeneration means bringing social, economic and environmental life back to an area. It transforms places, strengthens a community’s self-image and re-creates viable, attractive places which encourage sustained inward investment.’ (Forsyth 2007) (McCallum 2003)

4 Situating heritage within a development context

India, with its layers of heritage superimposed on and coexisting in the environment that has tremendous pressures of increasing population together with needs for housing and infrastructure, has been a testing-ground for various possibilities in conservation ranging from following institutional frameworks to creating new paradigms. It is only recently that the dynamics of heritage conservation as a driver/catalyst for sustainable development is understood. The role of heritage conservation in social and economic transformation has taken shape in recent years.

“Heritage conservation is an integral part of the civic society. Conservation shapes the society in which it is situated, and in turn, it is shaped by the needs and dynamics of that society.” (Baig and Mehrothra 2010) (Erica Avrami 2000, 3)

Heritage values, attitudes and belief systems are all manifested by material remains. Conservation of heritage in an urban context, goes beyond physical intervention with involvement of different levels of stakeholders working towards an ultimate goal – sustainable development. Urban regeneration must deal with con-
ervation of these historic built environments in harmony with the people who live in them.

Figure 2 summarises the model depicting the multiple action areas underpinning a conservation process, highlighting the need for a multidisciplinary as well as interdisciplinary approach, as proposed in The Getty Report (Erica Avrami 2000), which largely concentrates on values and its importance in heritage conservation. Starting with recognition of heritage through research, awareness and policies, the sequence of actions involves protection through notifications issued by the governing bodies to owners and custodians, museum acquisition, planning and management, finally providing suggestions for technical intervention depending on the degree of intervention required to sustain the historic fabric. It should be noted that these action areas cannot be analysed or proposed in isolation.

Figure 2 The process of heritage conservation based on the model depicting multiple action areas proposed in the Getty Report (Erica Avrami 2000, 4) (Krishna Prasad 2016, 52)

The issues of designation and management for sustainability are closely related to the evolution of the society’s self-image and the identity that the society wants to pass on to the generations to come.

Figure 3 The general queries of heritage conservation in the urban context (Krishna Prasad 2016, 53)
The recognition and designation of cultural heritage is based on its significance, and this has no formulaic solution. The values by which the site may be designated can be broadly placed under the following:

- Architectural, aesthetic or natural beauty (design, artistic merit, craftsmanship or appearance)
- Archaeological importance (the value of the historic fabric both above and below the ground and what it can reveal of the development and use of the site)
- Historic importance (associations with significant people or events)
- Scientific value (technical innovation, ecological or geological)
- Use (the value of the site owing to its historic or current functions)
- Community or social values (spiritual, commemorative, political or personal)
- Artistic or literary associations (such as references to the site in painting, literature or film)
- Public amenity values (including recreational use, views and open spaces)
- Educational value (current educational value, potential for increased understanding)

Thus, the designation of values to heritage depends on the potential it has as a public good and its capability of positively impacting the community. The table below shows the possible public benefits and the associated valuation methods that can help in designation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public benefits</th>
<th>Possible valuation methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local commercial properties</td>
<td>Net income, property value or stated preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residences</td>
<td>Property value or stated preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist visitors to the precinct a</td>
<td>Travel cost method or stated preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other visitors to the precinct b</td>
<td>Stated preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general public c</td>
<td>Stated preference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. People visiting the site or precinct primarily as tourists
b. People visiting the site or precinct for any non-tourist purpose
c. People who value the site or precinct but who do not own property in the precinct and who do not visit the site. These benefits are sometimes called non-use benefits.

5 Identifying the potential of the historic environment through Historic Area Characterisation

The Historic Area Characterisation process aids in identifying the potential of historic environments and breaks the whole process into smaller bits to enable effective functioning of the different bodies involved. This also aids in formulating an effective management plan and in identifying areas that require immediate attention in terms of conservation. Area Characterisation provides for categorised study of the potential of heritage at precinct and sub-precinct levels, that can be easily integrated into the development plan thus creating a heritage-centric development plan.
Figure 4 shows the various stakeholders who could possibly be involved in the designation of a historic area, precinct or building by identifying the potential of the historic environment. This is followed by grouping these precincts and historic areas at Master planning, local development and neighbourhood planning levels, depending on the significance and vulnerability to developmental pressures.

Figure 4 Components of Historic Area Characterisation  (Krishna Prasad 2016, 60)

6 Case studies
Following are case studies of two cities, distinct from each other in terms of location, settlement pattern, urban form, type of architecture, population and development issues. Pondicherry, located in the southeast coast of India, with dominant French and Tamil building typologies, mostly domestic in nature, is a case where the resident community participation played an important role in a successful Asia Urbs Programme1). Mumbai, famously known as the city of dreams, one of India’s most populated cities, located on the west coast of India, is a case that was recently inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List for its Victorian Gothic and Art Deco Ensemble, with prominent monumental Victorian Gothic institutional buildings and residential typologies in Art Deco style reflecting the Jazz era. It is a

1) Asia Urbs Programme - humanitarian development programme, funded by EuropeAid Cooperation Office of the European Commission. It aims at a decentralised cooperation between Europe and Asia. Established in 1998. The programme provided grants to local governments, non-governmental organizations for every aspect of urban life and municipal planning developing.
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strong case of the result of the tireless efforts of local stakeholders, architects, historians, activists, professionals, and citizens from various walks of life, and the government. In both these cases, the historic fabric is constantly exposed to pressures due to development, yet efforts from the stakeholders and widespread awareness have resulted in constant conservation and preservation efforts.

A Revitalization of urban heritage through urban renewal (Asia Urbs Programme) – a case of urban conservation at Pondicherry, India

Between 2002 and 2004, Pondicherry\(^2\) achieved economic and environmental goals through heritage preservation initiatives under the Asia Urbs Programme. This “has not only helped in addressing a multitude of prevailing urban issues through the revival and preservation of heritage but has resulted in improved quality of life for the community and the revived community interest in heritage and its preservation.” (PEARL 2015). A mutual understanding, lasting cooperation and cross-cultural association between Europe and Asia was achieved through this programme, bringing local governments, communities, and organisations to work together to improve their quality of life through regeneration and urban development. The Asia Urbs Programme was undertaken by the Pondicherry Municipality assisted by the INTACH Pondicherry Chapter, partnering with the European Commission and two European cities: the ancient hill town Urbino, Italy, recognized by UNESCO as a World Heritage City, and the historic walled city of Villeneuve-sur-Lot, France.

The main objective was to address environmental and urban issues of Pondicherry and enhance the residents’ quality of life, also encouraging an active stakeholder participation through decentralized planning (otherwise known as localized or root-level planning), management and strong exchange of information between partner cities.

Pondicherry does not have a large number of monumental buildings but is noteworthy for its domestic architecture. The architectural character is the result of hundreds of French and Tamil houses that create the ‘milieu’ or the ‘ensemble’. Pondicherry was fast losing its special character or ambience owing to factors such as increasing population and gentrification, that led to the alarming loss of old buildings due to uncontrolled reconstruction. Thus, the “sense of place” was blurred and there was a loss of the town’s cultural identity. If this is to be collectively preserved for posterity, then every old house counts. A multidisciplinary approach was required in order to achieve this task.

The revitalization process led to urban issues being addressed with a focus on heritage preservation, which ultimately led to improved quality of life and the local economy. This led to enhancement in the character of the local area with the history and significance that it holds, which resulted in the improved sense of place and ownership among stakeholders and users. Rehabilitation of listed heritage

---

\(^2\) Pondicherry, officially known as Puducherry (literally New Town in Tamil), is the capital and chief city of the Union Territory of Puducherry. The city is located in the Puducherry district and is surrounded by the state of Tamil Nadu with which it shares most of its culture and language.
buildings, one of the main objectives of the overall process and developing in a sustainable manner, meant continuous use of the buildings, aiding economy generation to facilitate maintenance and repair.

*Figure 5 Hotel De I' Orient, before and after restoration (P. INTACH 2008, 15)*

The INTACH Pondicherry Chapter, the non-governmental organisation in-charge of the project, undertook a meticulous study and analysis and proposed recommendations which is a compilation (INTACH 2015) with guidelines for authentic conservation and the design of new buildings in heritage precincts. The primary goal was to prohibit the demolition of listed buildings, which was possible through legislation and incentives. A meticulous documentation was made compulsory before and after any alteration was undertaken as the initial step to pro-

---

3) The entrance of the Tamil homes has a street veranda with a lean-to roof over wooden posts, and a masonry bench tucked in the corner. This is called the *thalvaram*, a shady place to give protection for the passers-by and to protect the building from the sun and rain. The benches are called *thinnai*, used to welcome strangers or to chat with neighbours.
tection of the historic fabric. In cases where new buildings were designed within the designated precinct, traditional patterns that melded with the surrounding buildings with unobtrusive façade finishes and colour schemes, were proposed. Monitoring building activities in the old town, including over weekends (as an action towards managing tourism and its effects on the built heritage), was important to ensure protection of the existing fabric.

In cases where the demolition of a heritage building could not be prevented, INTACH has been working with the owners to produce alternative façade designs so as to maintain harmony of the streetscape. The traditional construction methods of using brickwork with lime-cement plaster and traditional finishes with original colour scheme (yellow, green, blue, ochre, terracotta and red) were proposed for new buildings also. Integrating the concept of ‘thalvaram’

Figure 6 Examples of building new in heritage precincts – French quarters (P. INTACH 2008, 16,17)

Model street restoration project

One of the prominent projects as part of the Asia Urbs Programme was the urban streetscape conservation of Vysial Street, where the rare, continuous traditional verandas have survived. For that reason, it was chosen for the Model Street Restoration Project. The objective was to showcase a typical Tamil streetscape and to persuade the house owners to appreciate their heritage homes. The total cost was about 50,000 Euros.

3) The entrance of the Tamil homes has a street veranda with a lean-to roof over wooden posts, and a masonry bench tucked in the corner. This is called the thalvaram, a shady place to give protection for the passers-by and to protect the building from the sun and rain. The benches are called thinnai, used to welcome strangers or to chat with neighbours.
Results and impacts:

The project influenced city planning ideas and now serves as a role model for other projects in the city. The Vysial Street project has significantly lifted the feeling of ownership and pride among the residents. The project was instrumental in creating jobs related to increased restoration activity. Jobs were also created through increased tourism, retail, and hospitality that have increased several-fold since the conclusion of the Asia Urbs programme. The approach of the process, experience, and information related to the project were shared with various stakeholders and emphasis was given to strengthening public-private partnerships by involving various interest groups, both government and private, to address crucial issues and identify effective and practical solutions. The Asia Urbs programme demonstration has been an effective model to create and sustain the regeneration of heritage through an informed participatory process.
B The Victorian Gothic and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai – Nomination as a UNESCO World Heritage site and Conservation Efforts:

The urban development of Bombay was a result of its distinct location and the British seeing it as an opportunity to develop the island city into an epicenter of commerce. The development was envisaged in a way that it resulted in business opportunities for many Gujarati communities, the Parsis, the Bohras, Jews and Banias from Surat and Diu, also attracting skilled workers and traders to move to this new British holding. This continued through the 17th and 18th centuries with the power and influence of the British growing slowly, setting up the first land-use laws segregating the British parts of the island from the native parts, the “black town”. The growing prosperity and political influences, led to large urban development projects taken up, starting with the completion of the Hornby vellard at Breach Candy (1784), to the construction of the Mahim Causeway (1845), leading to the seven islands being merged into one landmass. The outbreak of American Civil War in 1861 and the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 led to an explosion in cotton trade from Bombay. This became a major contributor to the colonial economy.

With a great network of commerce and communication, great wealth accumulated and was channelled into the construction of Imperial Bombay, the Bombay that reflected power and prosperity. This led to a sociological divide determining the spatial pattern of the city. A spatial dichotomy between the city’s powerful and the native population was an outcome of this urban sociological pattern.

The ambitious wave of urban development implemented in Bombay, in the latter half of the 19th century, was initiated by the establishment of the Bombay Municipal Corporation in 1882. The first phase of this project resulted in an array of public buildings in the 1880s that bordered the eastern fringe of Oval Maidan, built in the Victorian Neo-Gothic style, with native elements to be climate responsive and to reflect a sense of indigeneity.

This was followed by an expansion leading to the Backbay reclamation scheme initiated and implemented between 1928 and 1942, which offered new opportunities to the Indian royal families, entrepreneurs and merchants of the widely travelled educated upper middle class, to expand west. The result was the introduction of Art Deco architecture with residential, commercial and entertainment buildings being constructed along the Western fringe of Oval Maidan and genesis of the Marine Drive sea front.

These works of architecture in the urban development schemes of the late 19th century and the early 20th century have stood the test of time, and are among the best examples of Colonial Architecture and Art Deco style reflecting high integrity of the historic urban development project, even to this day. This led to protection

---

4) The Hornby Vellard was a project to build a causeway uniting all seven islands of Bombay into a single island with a deep natural harbour. The project was started by the governor William Hornby in 1782 and all islands were linked by 1838. The word vellard appears to be a local corruption of the Portuguese word vallado meaning fence or embankment.
of this heritage precinct under the Heritage regulation of Greater Bombay proposed by the city’s Heritage Conservation Committee in 1995. This led to the formation of various non-profit organisations with a unified vision of preserving the
heritage of Mumbai, maintaining the co-operation of government authorities in the process and creating opportunities for the citizens and stakeholders to experience and access their heritage. The earliest among these initiatives was the formation of the Kala Ghoda Association in 1999, with the inception of the Kala Ghoda Art Festival that aimed at physically upgrading the Kala Ghoda Sub precinct and making it an Art district of Mumbai.

Participation of stakeholders at various levels became an effective solution for heritage awareness and resulted in delineation of various precincts and sub-precincts in Mumbai. The Victorian Gothic and Art Deco buildings of the Fort precinct entered the tentative list of the UNESCO World Heritage in 2012. Following this, the importance of keeping the precinct’s outstanding universal value intact was the main agenda for the city and its stakeholders, for it to be eventually inscribed in the World Heritage list.

A set of proactive citizen initiatives was set up keeping the preservation of the precinct in mind. These included the Nariman Point Churchgate Citizens Association, Art Deco Mumbai Trust, and Oval Cooperage Residents Association. Being a part of the Art Deco Mumbai Trust, a digital diary showcasing Mumbai’s Art Deco, I had a first-hand experience of how stakeholder participation can positively channel the incessant fight to preserve heritage, given the densely populated urban scenario. It was also interesting how international institutions and art deco organisations from around the world showed interest in the Art Deco palette that Mumbai had to offer.

Figure 11 Map showing precinct delineation & architectural styles of the buildings in the Ensemble (Source: Art Deco Mumbai Trust)
Organisations such as the Urban Design Research Institute, Organisation for Verdant Ambience and Land Trust along with the non-profit citizen initiative NAGAR, have been tirelessly working towards preserving the value of this marvellous precinct of architectural conglomeration. The UNESCO World Heritage status of the precinct is an outcome of these efforts. The Federation of Residents Trust was formed on 30th June, 2018, the same day that UNESCO inscribed the Victorian Gothic and Art Deco Ensemble in the World Heritage List. It works towards sensitising locals and stakeholders through social media on enticing facts of the 94 structures within the precinct. Draft planning policies and other measures were developed to ensure that the World Heritage inscription is upheld in the future. The overall process has undoubtedly allowed many more stakeholders and locals to be a part of the ongoing process. Amidst all the development pressures from the ongoing projects such as the Mumbai Metro Rail Project, citizen participation has proved to be an effective tool to support and protect heritage.

Following this, in June 2019, a proposal to demolish the Watson’s Hotel, the first and the oldest surviving cast iron structure in India and an integral part of the ‘Victorian Gothic and Art Deco Ensemble’, was submitted to the government. This brought about a lot of debate, and the issue demonstrated a lack of coherence between government agencies. Issues of structural stability were cited by a report produced by the Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, which led the Mumbai Building Repairs and Reconstruction Board of the Maharashtra Housing and Area Development Authority to seek the court’s permission to demolish the building. The argument put forward by the Heritage Conservation Committee and many other enthusiasts is that the building needs assessment and recommendations from experts in order to arrive at any decision, preservation or otherwise. The building, being a part of the UNESCO site, has to be assessed with great care, failing which Mumbai might be stripped of its UNESCO status.

According to Dr. Christopher London, the ‘Esplanade’s abused state is testament of its strength’ (OS3). He also pointed out that the building being prefabricated in the UK and assembled on site, the replacement of the parts would be easier. A sustainable approach would be to preserve and rehabilitate the building. The building, its context and its setting in an area of high heritage value, deserves a sensitive approach of conservation. After going through a strenuous process of assessment and a positive ruling by the Mumbai High Court, the 150-year-old bul-

5) Watson’s Hotel, now known as the Esplanade Mansion, is India’s oldest surviving cast iron building. It is located in the Kala Ghoda area of Mumbai. Named after its original owner, John Watson, the building was fabricated in England and constructed on site between 1860 and 1863.

6) The Maharashtra Housing and Area Development Authority is a body created to deal with the problems faced by tenants residing in dilapidated buildings in the Island City of Mumbai, and undertake their structural repairs and reconstruction so as to make them structurally sound and safe for habitation.

building is now ready to be conserved. It is noteworthy that the citizen initiatives and the city’s conservation architects have worked hard to lay out plans that were instrumental in the decision.

Another project of conservation in the same precinct was the restoration of the Mumbai University Library building, the Rajabai towers and the Ruttonsee Mulji Jetha Fountain, all belonging to the colonial era. The restoration of the Rajabai tower and the Library Building were funded by Tata Consultancy Services and restored by the Indian Heritage Society. The overall project is a great example of public-private partnership model, between the Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai and the Kala Ghoda Association, that jointly worked to restore the neglected urban landscape. The Ruttonsee Mulji Jetha Fountain was funded and restored by the Kala Ghoda Association, one of its major challenges being the restoration of water engineering among restoration of other architectural values. The fountain and the urban scape are in constant protection of the Kala Ghoda Association.

Figure 12 & 13 Archival Image and a recent picture of Watson's Hotel (Source: Wikimedia Commons)

Last year, the conservation of the Mumbai university library building and the Rajabai tower received the prestigious UNESCO Asia-Pacific award for the cultural heritage conservation and the overall project also received an honourable mention at the UNESCO Asia Pacific Awards for Cultural Heritage Conservation. A strong public-private-partnership and involvement of stakeholders in the conservation process has proved to be effective in case of Mumbai. UNESCO also mentioned that such projects initiate a decisive impact on the local economy. They also become favourable for a sustainable process of conservation.

8 Conclusion

The case studies of Pondicherry and Mumbai, the latter of which is under the purview of UNESCO, have one thing in common: the involvement of stakeholders, the efforts to educate and sensitize local communities, thereby instilling a sense of ownership to tackle heritage and developmental issues. We see that there are insti-
tutions and individuals who strive to preserve the rich heritage; the impact, though, can be aptly named as pockets of excellence. Sustaining these initiatives will require a collective effort by the Government and general public. It is imperative to sensitise the need for conservation, starting with reiterating the values of heritage around us. In order to preserve the heritage around us, we need to look at having stringent norms that will augment the realm around the heritage structures with minimal and sensitive development strategies. The experience that these reforms can offer to heritage tourism and sustainable development is invaluable.
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Leveraging World Heritage and Culture for Sustainable Development: San Antonio

1 Introduction
The San Antonio Missions, World Heritage site, is a serial inscription that refers collectively to five frontier mission complexes and a ranch located to the south of the city. All were founded during the early 18th century by Franciscan missionaries along the San Antonio River (OS1). Located in the United States of America in the State of Texas, the site reveals the tangible remnants of the interweaving of the Spanish colonial and indigenous cultures that can be seen in the decorative elements of the churches, the architecture, and the substantial remains of the water distribution systems (acequias) that remain in operation today (OS2). These mission complexes formed the foundation of the modern city of San Antonio. Now a city with a population of 1.5 million people, San Antonio is the second largest in the State of Texas and the seventh largest city in the United States.

The missions continue to be a nexus for forging partnerships, no matter how unlikely. In 1978, it was the uncommon collaboration of the Archdiocese of San Antonio (the Church) and the National Park Service (United States Government) that allowed four of the five missions to become a National Park (OS3). The fifth mission, The Alamo, is owned and operated by the State of Texas. Then in 2006, a nine-year community-led effort to secure inscription onto the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage list began, involving the State of Texas, City of San Antonio (the City), National Park Service, Archdiocese of San Antonio, Bexar County, Conservation Society of San Antonio, San Antonio River Authority, and others from the community. As a result of this effort, on July 5, 2015, San Antonio’s five Spanish colonial missions were inscribed onto the prestigious World Heritage List by UNESCO. The San Antonio Missions – Missions San José y San Miguel de Aguayo, San Juan Capistrano, Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción de Acuña, San Francisco de la Espada, and San Antonio de Valero (more commonly known as The Alamo) represent the only World Heritage Site in Texas and as of 2019, one of only 24 in the United States. The effort to achieve World Heritage status was a multi-faceted, collaborative community process. This process that seeks to leverage heritage and culture for
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San Antonio is one of the fastest growing cities in the United States, driven by a favorable business climate, financial incentives, and affordable land and energy that attract new and relocating businesses. Despite this, one in five residents live in poverty and the geographic distribution of that poverty makes San Antonio one of the most economically segregated cities in the country. While the economic impact of World Heritage Status is anticipated to be citywide, four of the five missions are located in San Antonio City Council District 3, a district with one of the highest concentration of Latinos (82.6%) and poverty rates (36.1%), and an area classified by the Distressed Communities Index (DCI) as distressed (OS4).

Achieving UNESCO World Heritage status is expected to be a catalyst for socio-economic change, according to an economic impact study completed in 2013, with anticipated increased visitation and tourist spending (OS5). According to US Travel & Tourism, tourism is one of the largest economic generators in the U.S., spurring an additional $1.62 trillion in other industries (OS6). Travel is also an important industry in Texas. The gross domestic product (GDP) of the Texas travel industry is second only to oil and gas production in Texas (OS7). For San Antonio, the impact is anticipated to be even more significant as tourism is one of the city’s top five industries, providing one in seven jobs and more than $15.2 billion annually11 (OS12). Currently, the San Antonio area is visited by 37 million visitors each year and the City of San Antonio anticipates increased visitation and tourism to all five missions (OS8). By 2025, the World Heritage Site economic impact on San Antonio and Bexar County is predicted to generate up to $105 million in additional economic activity, growth of 500 to 1,000 extra jobs, and up to $2 million in local hotel tax revenue, even if no additional action is taken (OS9).

In order to prepare for this increased activity and to maximize the benefits of the designation, District 3 City Councilwoman Rebecca J. Viagran, an elected official, hosted three World Heritage symposia in 2015 and 2016 to solicit input from the community to develop the World Heritage Work Plan. The first symposium was held to explain what world heritage is, the second was to identify what was required to improve the overall experience, and the last one was to review and update existing land use policy. The series of symposia resulted in the development of a Work Plan, which identifies specific tasks and deliverables, and includes the following categories: management and oversight; infrastructure; wayfinding; transportation; beautification; economic development; land use; and marketing and outreach. The work plan is a dynamic document and items may be added to the plan as a result of additional public input.

11 This information is according to The Economic Impact of San Antonio’s Hospitality Industry prepared by Richard V. Butler, Ph.D. and Mary E. Stefel, Ph.D., Trinity University for the San Antonio Tourism Council now called San Antonio Visitor Alliance. This is the overall economic impact of the hospitality industry within the San Antonio Metropolitan Statistical Area. The businesses that make up the hospitality industry, fall into four sectors: Transportation and Travel Arrangements, Lodging and other Traveler Accommodations, Restaurants and other eating and drinking establishments, and Entertainment and Recreation activities, ranging from golfing establishments to cultural events to amusement parks and spectator sports.
outreach. The work plan is a dynamic document and items may be added to the plan as a result of additional public input.

This effort to ensure coordinated management and oversight, resulted in the City establishing a World Heritage Office in April 2016. The Office is responsible for promoting the San Antonio Missions, maximizing the economic impact of the designation and enhancing the experience through the implementation of the World Heritage Work Plan and related projects within the buffer zone. The zone the office works within spans almost 12 miles (19.3 kilometers) from downtown San Antonio to the southern portion of the city and encompasses a total area of approximately 5,775 acres (2329 hectares).

As a result of this level of commitment by the City of San Antonio, a great amount of work has been completed in a short period of time. While working to promote the San Antonio Missions, all investments made throughout the World Heritage Site must accomplish two things: (1) First and foremost, improve the quality of life for residents, and (2) Enhance the visitor experience for tourists and residents who come to the missions, all while remaining authentic to San Antonio’s heritage and culture.

As part of this case study, we will provide information on the inventories and assessments that have been used as baselines to guide the development and implementation of some key projects within the categories mentioned previously and demonstrate how these investments will lead to sustainable development.

2 Infrastructure

The southern area of San Antonio, where four of the five missions are located, has previously seen unequitable investment in its infrastructure. An infrastructure assessment and improvement plan was completed in 2016, by the City of San Antonio’s Transportation & Capital Improvements Department (TCI) and identified an overall need of $46.5 million in infrastructure improvements throughout the World Heritage Buffer Zone. This assessment includes the $14.8 million for street improvements for 70 miles of roadway, $23.5 million for 50 miles of sidewalk gaps, and $8.2 million to bury utility lines. (City of San Antonio, World Heritage Infrastructure Improvement Plan)

In May 2017, voters passed an $850 million General Obligation Bond Program of which $37 million is specifically for World Heritage related projects to support pedestrian, bike and vehicular connectivity between the missions. The majority of this work, $25 million, is for key corridor streets, bridges, and sidewalks. There is also $5 million for a comprehensive signage & wayfinding program, $5 million for a World Heritage facility, and $2.1 million for park improvements and land acquisition.
3 Transportation

Not only is it necessary to improve the driving and pedestrian experience, but it is also important to ensure that there are several modes of transportation available to the public to access the missions. The City and its partners have worked together to streamline transportation options for residents and guests visiting the missions. Swell Cycle is a municipal bike sharing system with its third most used station located on the World Heritage Trail. VIA Metropolitan Transit, the city’s public transportation authority, launched a new service line called VIVA Missions with daily service to all five missions. A day pass, available for $2.75, gives passengers unlimited rides all day. Additionally, the City has developed a brochure that is distributed locally and statewide at key visitor centers to promote the World Heritage Trail for vehicular, bike, pedestrian options, free internet and a comprehensive visitor information website.

During initial community input, residents and stakeholders voiced the need for improved signage and wayfinding, both in clarity and uniformity, in order to guide vehicular traffic to each mission. The public stated that existing signage is confusing and online directions needed improvement (CP&Y).

The San Antonio River Authority, the City, The National Park Service and its partners, conducted a comprehensive inventory of signage and made short and long-term recommendations to improve existing signage and wayfinding. These included implementing uniformity with an approved basemap to promote the designation and trail, and creating a unified brand and logo identity. The bond provides $5 million for a comprehensive signage and wayfinding program, which will allow the City to implement the recommended improvements and work to improve the visual character of the trail. In 2018, the City installed smart kiosks at Mission San Jose and Concepcion for visitors to find local events, send directions to their phones, and identify local businesses.

4 Beautification

In addition to signage, the World Heritage Beautification Assessment (Bender Wells Clark Design), completed in 2016, identified potential strategies and opportunities to improve the visual character and perceived safety, comfort, and function of spaces within the World Heritage Trail corridor (OS10).

The assessment identified developing standard banner graphics for use along the vehicular route to mount on existing light poles as a way to reinforce wayfinding. In 2016, more than 300 branded banners were installed along the World Heritage Trail. Photo banners were also installed on the chain-link fencing and vacant buildings, not only to exhibit the rich cultural heritage, but also to serve as wayfinding, beautification, and reinforce a sense of place. Photo banners were installed in 2016 and 2017 and an online exhibit shows the locations of the banners along with photos.
Public art was another of the physical improvements recommended along the trail. As a result, in 2017 the World Heritage Office and the City’s Department of Arts & Culture worked in collaborative partnerships with local arts organizations to create a series of public art installations. The functional murals are placed along the route, in order to reinforce and enhance the visitor experience, while also providing an aesthetic vision that reflects the rich history and culture of the missions, people and neighborhoods within area. The locations for the placement of 10 installations were determined through a community process, as was the context or theme for each location. The resulting murals, all by San Antonio artists, celebrate achievements, provide historical and cultural information, feature portraits and pictorials of neighborhood history, and include scenes from everyday life, buildings and places, key figures, and neighborhood people. A print and online guide for residents and visitors is in development to share and preserve the heritage and culture of the area.

5 Economic Development

While the City is working to improve the visual character and infrastructure, a need to preserve existing businesses that have become part of the cultural fabric of the area is a critical component of the Work Plan. It is anticipated that the greatest economic impact will come from increased visitation and tourism spending. The localization of this impact is key and can be achieved by increasing dwell time of visitors to the area around the four southern missions.

In order to increase dwell time, often longstanding business can use some assistance with exterior improvements and capacity building. So in order to highlight and preserve our legacy businesses, the City developed a citywide Legacy Business Program through the Office of Historic Preservation. The Office of Historic Preservation’s program acknowledges that long-lived San Antonio businesses are an important historic asset to the city and aims to sustain the longevity of heritage businesses that contribute to San Antonio’s authenticity. The Office maintains a registry open to businesses that are 20 years or older and contribute to the history, culture and genuine identity of San Antonio. Any business on the registry can qualify for a City of San Antonio Fee Waiver program which provides financial assistance in the form of City and water utility fee waivers and staff support in navigating regulatory processes (OS11).

Additionally, any business on the City-wide Legacy Business Registry and located within the Buffer Zone or a two-mile radius of Missions Concepción, San Jose, San Juan, or Espada, is eligible for a matching grant program established by the World Heritage Office. The program provides matching grants up to $10,000 for façade, parking, landscaping or signage improvements up to $30,000 per business. All grant funds must be matched dollar for dollar by the applicant. Prior to receiving the grant, businesses are required to complete three business development
courses. The educational requirement assists the businesses in sustaining their longevity and enables them to maintain a competitive skill set within an evolving market place.

The strategy to localize economic impact and connect visitors to area businesses also includes the development of a website (www.worldheritagesa.com) that enhances visitor understanding and sharing of an authentic experience. The website provides clear transportation options and navigation, historic insights, current activities, and nearby places of interest, and connects visitors to area restaurants, lodging, shopping, transportation, trails and tours. In order to further advance the use of the website, the City worked with the National Park Service to install and maintain free Wi-Fi at the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, as well as install smart kiosks at two of the missions.

6 Land Use

Due to the increased interest in investment in the area, the community provided input and feedback about land use, with the goal of sensitive development throughout the World Heritage area. The community indicated the need to balance the reverence of the San Antonio Missions with various opportunities for growth and development that come with the designation. As a result, a critical component of the Work Plan was to update relevant neighborhood plans to reflect the desired and appropriate development goals for the areas surrounding the missions.

In the United States, neighborhood and community plans establish the policy for land use. In December 2016, the process began to update and eventually align zoning with existing land use for overlays and corridor plans such as the Mission Protection Overlay District (MPOD), River Improvement Overlay District (RIO), and key corridors. Throughout the 2016 public input process, three major corridors were identified as central elements to increase and improve economic activity and opportunities within the Buffer Zone. This open and public input process engaged the community through various meetings and presentations to discuss possible changes and preferred land development patterns that met physical, cultural, economic, preservation, and community needs.

In August 2018, the San Antonio City Council unanimously approved zoning changes that aligned with existing neighborhood plans surrounding the four southernmost missions along the San Antonio River and major corridors. Ultimately, the zoning changes responded to community feedback and input received throughout the initial symposium on land use.

District-specific design guidelines were also developed through an effort involving the City of San Antonio’s Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and World Heritage Office (WHO). The design manual for the Mission Historic District articulates the unique and character-defining features of the district, and demonstrate best-practices concerning land development in sensitive areas. The district specific
7 Marketing and Outreach

Ensuring that local residents, partners and stakeholders are aware and informed about the designation is one component of the outreach plan, however national and international promotion of the designation is critical to leveraging the designation. The San Antonio Convention and Visitors Bureau, now Visit San Antonio (VSA), began their marketing efforts as soon as the designation was announced\(^2\). The key target international markets are Japan, China, UK, Germany, Spain and Canada. They have integrated the designation into marketing efforts and as a result, since the designation, this has led to more than 2,000 stories promoting the Missions in 11 countries, which equates to $21 million in advertising equivalency. VSA has also developed specific marketing targeted to international visitors and worked to launch special tours, such as one in partnership with American Indians in Texas at 11 countries, which equates to $21 million in advertising equivalency. VSA has also developed specific marketing targeted to international visitors and worked to launch special tours, such as one in partnership with American Indians in Texas at the Spanish Colonial Missions (AITSCM). The tours, now hosted on a regular basis, were featured on a national television travel program and serve as a source of income for the local group.

To encourage awareness of area businesses and to be able to provide the best experience, the City has also developed a World Heritage Ambassador Program for residents, tour guides, concierges and other frontline staff. The ambassadors are offered special tours and events that improve their knowledge of the sites and local businesses. Previous tours and events have included an evening lantern tour, a farm tour and acequia demo, and a behind-the-scenes tour with a curator, archeologist and fresco expert. All events feature food and beverages from area businesses,

\(^2\) According to a study Building on a Strong Foundation: Potential Economic Impacts of World Heritage Site Designation for the San Antonio Missions completed in 2013, by The Harbinger Consulting Group, the World Heritage Site designation is expected to increase visitation and tourism spending in San Antonio, if leveraged with increased promotion and collaboration.
as a way to promote them. World Heritage Ambassadors receive a certificate, lapel pin and become part of a distinguished group of local residents, who play a key role in promoting the area while ensuring a consistent portrayal of facts.

To celebrate and promote the missions, a five-day World Heritage Festival was organized by City of San Antonio, in coordination with Bexar County, San Antonio River Authority (SARA), National Park Service, The Alamo, Mission Heritage Partners, and Las Misiones in 2016. The festival, now an annual event in its fourth year, overlaps with the Organization of World Heritage Cities Solidarity Day on September 8. The celebration occurs throughout the San Antonio missions and surrounding area has something for everyone, while providing funding for nonprofit organizations and projects that preserve, maintain, promote, and connect our historical and cultural assets. It serves as a mechanism for local residents to reconnect and experience the missions and the river in new ways.

And finally, in order to benchmark and measure the visitor experience (both tourist and residents), the City of San Antonio, San Antonio River Authority, Bexar County, and Visit San Antonio partnered together in 2018 to hire a firm to conduct a survey in 2019. The design of the survey is one that can be consistently applied and used to identify trends and gather statistical data related to visitation and assess the experience in a variety of aspects. The information obtained during the first full year of surveys, will be used to compare with subsequent years for analysis and as a means to continue to improve the experience. The final survey results have informed us that overall excluding the Alamo, 58% of visits are made by people who have been to the missions in the last 12 months and of those 69% live in San Antonio and made an average of 5.9 visits in 2019. This is not surprising as these four missions are still active parishes. Almost a quarter (24%) of visitors are first time visitors of which 59% have come from somewhere in the U.S. outside the State of Texas and 50% are international visitors. Currently three quarters (74%) of all visits are day trips.

8 Conclusion

This ongoing collaborative community effort and, under the leadership of District 3 Councilwoman Rebecca J. Viagran, is anticipated to lead to sustainable tourism and economic growth. This will be measured not only through the visitor experience and the economic impact surveys, but also by the quality of life for residents, while maintaining and celebrating the authenticity of the heritage and culture of the neighborhoods.

Definitions

Archdiocese of San Antonio: The Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Antonio includes the city of San Antonio as well as other properties totaling 27,841 square
miles (72,110 km²) in the U.S. state of Texas. An archdiocese also is called a metropolitan see or the “head” diocese of an ecclesiastical province.

Bexar County: The county in which the City of San Antonio resides. A county is a political and administrative division of the State of Texas, providing certain local governmental services. Synonyms: shire, province, parish.

Bond or (Municipal Bond): Debt securities issued by the city to finance capital projects such as streets, parks, or drainage. A bond issuer (the municipality) sells the bond to the bond holder (the investor). The bond holder lends the issuer a fixed amount of money for a certain amount of time in exchange for regularly scheduled interest payments. The City of San Antonio hosts a public process every five years to determine projects and voters must approve the projects before bonds are issued.

City Council: The legislative body that governs San Antonio. This body has authority to pass ordinances and appropriate funds. San Antonio has a Council-Manager form of city government. The city council is composed of 10 members elected by districts and a mayor elected at-large.

Historic Districts: According to the City of San Antonio’s Unified Development Code, is “an area, urban or rural, defined as an historic district by city council, state, or federal authority and which may contain within definable geographic boundaries one or more buildings, objects, sites or structures designated as exceptional or significant historic landmarks or clusters, as defined herein, including their accessory buildings, fences and other appurtenances, and natural resources having historical, architectural, archaeological, and cultural significance, and which may have within its boundaries other buildings, objects, sites, or structures, that, while not of such historical, architectural, archaeological or cultural significance as to be designated landmarks, nevertheless contribute to the overall visual setting of or characteristics of the landmark or landmarks located within the district.”

Las Misiones: The non-profit fundraising organization in charge of preserving the church buildings of the San Antonio Missions.

Metropolitan Statistical Area: The United States Office of Management and Budget (OMB) delineates metropolitan statistical areas according to published standards that are applied to Census Bureau data. The general concept of a metropolitan statistical area is that of a core area containing a substantial population nucleus, together with adjacent communities having a high degree of economic and social integration with that core.

Mission Heritage Partners (formerly Los Compadres): The official chartered “friends” group committed to filling the funding and advocacy gap for the four Missions (excluding the churches) within the National Park.

Mission Protection Overlay District (MPOD): Administered by the Office of Historic Preservation and approved by City Council in the summer of 2015, this overlay was essential for the World Heritage Site designation by UNESCO.
The MPOD protects the overall environment and setting within a 1,500 foot radius around each of the missions. The overlay restricts development around the Missions and prevents unwanted encroachment of buildings or businesses incompatible with the Mission structure and surrounding area. Overall, the MPOD provides a buffer for encroachment into the mission sites by offering more stringent height controls based on proximity to Missions.

National Park Service: The National Park Service (NPS) is an agency of the United States federal government that manages all national parks, many national monuments, and other conservation and historical properties with various title designations.

River Improvement Overlay District (RIO): Created and administered by the Office of Historic Preservation, the River Improvement Overlay acts as a tool to protect, preserve, and enhance the river and its improvements by establishing design standards and guidelines for properties located near the river. There are four different RIOs within the World Heritage Buffer Zone that contain design standards and guidelines for properties adjacent to the San Antonio River.

The Conservation Society of San Antonio: Founded in 1924, the Conservation Society of San Antonio is one of the first community preservation groups in the United States. They are responsible for saving many of the historic attractions that make San Antonio the top tourist destination in Texas, such as the city’s Spanish Colonial missions.

San Antonio Convention and Visitor Bureau (now called Visit San Antonio): A not-for-profit organization charged with promoting the City of San Antonio and largely funded by hotel occupancy taxes.

San Antonio River Authority (SARA): A special purpose political subdivision of the State of Texas to serve regional areas, generally coincidental with river basins and to be generally known as river authorities. SARA has the statutory authority to impose an ad valorem tax for use in planning, operations and maintenance activities only. Its jurisdiction covers 3,658 square miles—all of Bexar, Wilson, Karnes and Goliad Counties and is responsible for the management of the San Antonio River.

VIA Metropolitan Transit: A metropolitan transit authority created to provide public transportation services within the designated boundaries.
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Choosing a National Heritage
A Short Discourse on Brazilian Architecture

In recent years in Brazil, the concept of education for heritage has become increasingly widespread. A closer look at this concept, however, displays two sides: whereas the concept of education itself has been thoroughly and exhaustively discussed, on the other hand there is still a lack of recent discussion about the very definition and characterization of Brazilian architectural heritage. This is a new issue in Brazil in many aspects, especially considering non-Baroque and non-Modernist 20th century architecture. So: which heritage should we promote?

The Modernist movement in Brazil established itself around 1922. For a number of reasons, Modernism overshadowed its immediate predecessors – including Art Deco and Art Nouveau; – and even today, a century later, Modernism is still a mainstream focus in Brazilian artistic culture of the early 20th century. Nevertheless, in recent years, the Art Deco production in Brazil is finding its way into national art history and official heritage. Having been listed in 2003, by the National Office for Historic and Artistic Heritage (Iphan) as the first Art Deco ensemble in the country, the city of Goiânia and its Art Deco architecture played a major role in this recognition, even though Art Deco was used in the 1930s as an attempt to deny the indigenous architecture of the former mining areas of Goiás.

As we shall see, the reason for this denial of traditional architecture in the backlands of Goiás aimed at trying to change the view of that area. The paradox is simple: an alien style, chosen specifically to deny local architectural tradition, ended up becoming a national architectural heritage. Almost a century after these choices were made, new meanings have been constructed, and what one generation saw as revolutionary, the next may view as nothing but the establishment.

Brazilian architectural heritage
In 1924, a group of intellectuals from São Paulo gathered to welcome a Swiss visitor, the poet Blaise Cendrars. In order to show him the country and its culture, the group organized an expedition around the State of Minas Gerais and its gold rush towns. Mário de Andrade was one of the members of the group, himself a writer and a cultural researcher, and major influencer of the Brazilian artistic scene in the early 20th century. The reason for the choice of Minas Gerais Baroque was deeply rooted among that group, and was then starting to emerge as the ideal of national architectural and artistic heritage.
A few years later, 1927–29, Andrade would tackle a new round of so-called “ethnographic” discovery voyages around the Brazilian Northeast and the Amazon. This time, he did not only show his country to a foreign visitor, but sought to discover it for himself. Later, he would gather his notes – drawings, songs and lyrics – from these trips in his book O Turista Aprendiz (The Apprentice Tourist), written in 1943. Andrade would later become one of the supporters for the creation of the National Office for Historic and Artistic Heritage (Serviço do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional – Sphan, today renamed Iphan), especially on behalf of immaterial culture and landscape. Nevertheless, upon the creation of Sphan, in 1937, the office was entirely dedicated to architectural and urban heritage.

Some years before that, a São Paulo artist went on a discovery trip through the Brazilian backlands. José Wasth Rodrigues, an accomplished illustrator, set out in 1918 for Minas Gerais in search of buildings, houses, windows, doors, latches, knockers, fountains, and any detail which caught his attention, everything carefully depicted in a huge collection which he called Documentário Arquitetônico (Architectonic Documentary, originally published in 1944). His declared intention was to supply “authentic details and suggestions”, or rather, “plain bearers of suggestion for future copies (a hypothesis not necessarily despicable)” (Pinheiro, 2013, p. 47). The project of Wasth Rodrigues, thus, followed precisely this script, and he travelled the country registering everything that attracted his attention, no matter who built it, the authorship, or consecrated artworks. The result is a catalogue of social architecture, of anonymous building practice.

A strong feeling at that time, and a common factor in both these discovery trips as well as in the foundations of Sphan, was the search for the roots of an idealistic Brazilian culture in the Colonial period and Baroque. And the reasons for this view are to be found a few years earlier.

Since the time of the former Emperor Pedro II (who was overthrown in 1889), the general feeling in the country was for a search for national identity. The Wasth and the Andrade expeditions were directly triggered by the Portuguese engineer, Ricardo Severo, who, settled in the city of São Paulo from 1910, was commissioned with the building of the new São Paulo Theatre, a huge building inspired by its Beaux-Arts French and Italian counterparts. From the beginning of his stay, Severo became interested in local popular architecture and started researching the influence of Portuguese traditional housing in Brazil. As he became acquainted with local architecture, Severo’s project developed into trying to understand the social phenomenon of Portuguese heritage in Brazilian architecture. He was not interested in great works and buildings, famous names, since for him architecture was “the most social of all arts” (Sociedade de Cultura Artística, 1916). His search was thus for the “humble folk artists” and the way they reproduced the Portuguese building tradition, as he stated in a prestigious conference in São Paulo in 1914.

Among the audience of this conference, “A Arte Tradicional no Brasil: a Casa e o Tempo” (Traditional art in Brazil: house and time), was the young Mário de
Andrade. Severo’s call for a “Brazilian Renaissance”, starting with the research and knowledge of traditional building practice, resonated within Andrade and Wasth Rodrigues.

Later, the practical recollection of examples throughout the country gathered by the two would offer a substantial source of building practice in the country, and was fundamental to the construction of the concept of an architectural national heritage. Thus, when a group of intellectuals gathered in 1937 to start the National Office for Historic and Artistic Heritage (Sphan), these were among the main sources. It is not surprising, therefore, that the beginning of cultural heritage in Brazil followed the path of architecture and cities in vernacular and Baroque Minas Gerais (and, to a lesser extent in coastal areas of the Northeast). All else was neglected, since it would not be genuine, according to the understanding of the group following Severo’s call for a Brazilian Renaissance, which consisted of an attempt to look at those models as a so-called genuine Brazilian architecture. Everything not following that tradition was thus banned and of secondary or no interest: Eclecticism, Beaux-Arts, Art Nouveau, as well as, of course, Art Deco.

This short story about the outset of the Brazilian formal heritage office provides a perspective on the present-day situation of national heritage and the official writing of art history in the country. During the whole of the 20th century, Brazilian architectural heritage was exclusively Baroque and Colonial. The discovery of Brazilian Art Deco heritage – beginning 2003 with the formal recognition by Iphan of 23 buildings in the city of Goiânia – is an important part on the rewriting of this story.

Even today, we remain overshadowed by the myth created after the research of Severo, Andrade and Wasth Rodrigues: notable national architectural memory (and in many artistic fields as a whole) and the only noteworthy production is that from the so-called Baroque or Colonial. This myth leads further to the general belief that there would be no other style in national artistic-architectural production worthy of consideration. The sole exception to this view would be that of Modernism itself, a movement that arose precisely upon the rediscovery of colonial past – an exception that serves more to confirm the rule. “Paradoxically as it may seem, Modernism in architecture was immediately taken as a heritage, as well as Baroque; everything else was treated as mere old stuff, with no right to preservation”, writes Fischer (2013). Not coincidentally, the same architects that praised the Baroque were at the same time planning modernistic buildings.

At the same time, in the 20th century the country experienced a great economical and settlement shift as well as an extreme growth in population, which combined to greatly change the country as a whole. These changes led to a very large demand for new cities and dwellings. The great quantitative changes of the 1960s were preceded by a qualitative shift between the two world wars, changes that would make possible future growth. Therefore, though today numerically small as it may be, the architectural production of the period 1920 to 1940 – strongly cha-
racterized by Art Deco influence – is fundamental to the construction of contemporary Brazil. It is thus important to take a closer look at the changes that took place in such a small space of time, before proceeding to look at the architecture of the period.

From agrarian to urban country

At the end of the 1910s, Brazil was not only a country with a fundamentally agricultural economy, but was also export-centred. Coffee played the major role in the country’s economy; the rubber economic boom a few years before had not been as long-lasting, but it also fitted into the logic of primary products’ export. Other products added up to this narrow list of exports, but always keeping the same agrarian character. In 1929, the year of the great capitalist world crisis, eight primary products amounted to 90% of the country’s exports (Abreu, 1996), and one product alone (coffee) was responsible for 70%; this is a case of dependency typical of colonial economies.

With the fast population growth in the country after the beginning of the century, there was the start of a timid internal market, which enabled Southern States to fill up the demand for cattle, tobacco, and other products for this emerging market. Therefore, the country’s economy – in 1929, 79% of GDP was concentrated in agriculture and a mere 21% in industry – grew with coffee export (from São Paulo) and livestock production (in the South). In the 1920s, the agricultural economic growth amounted to an average of 4.1% yearly, while industry reached only 2.8%.

Table 1: Economic growth per year (average)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920–1929</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930–1939</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Abreu, 1986

In the 1930s, with President Getúlio Vargas and his national industrialization plan, the industrial growth soared to an average of 11.7% yearly, whereas agriculture staggered with an annual average of 1.7%. So, by the end of the decade, the profile of the national economy had virtually experienced an inversion in figures.

Table 2: Economic participation by sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Campos, 1994

In the first years of Vargas’s administration (he would remain in office until 1945), the foundations of national life changed to include new regulations and codes, as
well as political institutions – the Ministry of Education was created in 1930, and the National Office for Historic and Artistic Heritage (Sphan) in 1936. As for architecture and urbanism, one of the most important events of this period was the Marcha para o Oeste (Call to the West), an occupation policy which aimed at the large uninhabited portions of the Brazilian hinterland. Among many other, the construction of Goiânia, a city built to house the new State capital of Goiás, is a direct result of this policy.

In the decade of the 1930s, the Brazilian population increased from 37 million to 41 million (70% of which was in rural areas), but the qualitative changes had a far greater impact and the country would emerge totally different. These changes from a rural to an urban country, would prepare the ground for the enormous population growth that occurred in the next years.

Art Deco

Art Deco was the most widespread architectural style worldwide during the greatest quantitative as well as qualitative urban growth in Brazil during the period between 1920 and 1940. This timely coincidence is responsible for the style being to this day the most widespread in the whole country.

On the other hand, this coincidence in time brings along other characteristics concerning the meaning of Art Deco. While some authors see a political intention behind Art Deco architecture, associating it with fascism, it was also the object of other kinds of associations. Indeed, it is a central issue of the arts the study of the attribution of significance to artistic languages a priori deprived of meaning, as is the case of music and, of course, architecture. The construction of meaning in Art Deco followed different paths in different places in the world and, if it was appropriated by fascists such as Mussolini, Stalin or Vargas, it also played a central role with Roosevelt and Churchill in the US and England respectively.

The construction of meaning in art works can vary in time and place as well as with the observer. Therefore, while an Italian might be reminded of his fascist past by a Mussolini era futurist building, due to his own history and that of his country, the renewal of architectonic language in Brazil brought by Art Deco might have caused a Brazilian from the hinterland to become enthusiastic about the future and to forget his own misery and the drought in his field, by looking at a single roof concealed by straight brick borders atop a square building. While this statement might seem an exaggeration, it may well explain the widespread use of Art Deco facades in Brazilian hinterland. Hence, since each viewer or user will perceive a specific meaning, particular to his own history and that of his community, for a Brazilian of the period, Art Deco was in many cases the chance to leap into a new time, an echo to the desire of participation in a global world, a ticket to the future.

It is not the aim here to discuss or present Art Deco architecture along with its characteristics and origins. What is interesting here is the role of its rediscovery in
Brazil and the changes that accompanied this new perception. Before moving on to this, we should take a more detailed look at the social and cultural changes in the country.

Brazilian Art Deco heritage

It has been suggested that an object “is a work of art only in the conscience of a viewer who would receive and judge it as such” (Argan 1992, 29). This statement shares its view with the semiotic concept of significance, by which an object is meaningful only to those knowing its signification. Therefore, in order to be considered an artwork, a given object must be perceived and judged as one. Or, as Bacher (1996, 21) puts it: “we recognize and accept only those monuments from the past which we are programmed to accept as so, only those we are through the present prepared to recognize”. Thus, when we recognize a building or an object as an artwork, we do so because we were taught to recognize that object as an artwork. History of Art, consequently, is the record of works of art recognized as landmarks, the history of the artistic canon. As an extension, the collection of these works presents us with the History of Art but also with the History of Art Criticism.

Taking a closer look at the Art Deco architectural production in Brazil, it is notable that it has been ignored as a heritage since the general ban of non-Baroque past by the Modernists. Architectural studies, historians and scholars are only now, in the last 15 years, beginning to pay more attention to this period, which, due to its presence and quality, has a fundamental role in Brazilian historic and artistic memory.

Beginning with the formal recognition of Goiânia in 2003, other Art Deco buildings and monuments have been listed or are under consideration. The small spa town of Cipó (in Bahia), the city centre of Aracaju (in Sergipe), among many others, are pleading formal recognition, not to mention the Art Deco movements in the cities of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. Also worth mentioning is the case of at least two emblematic national monuments, the Lacerda Lift in Salvador (also in Bahia, listed by Iphan in 2006), and the Christ the Redeemer statue in Rio de Janeiro (listed by Iphan in 2008), whose official descriptions were recently changed to characterize them as Art Deco monuments. In the case of Rio de Janeiro, the statue is now presented in sites and brochures as “the world’s largest Art Deco sculpture”. And at least one controversy has arisen within Iphan, concerning a skyscraper in Rio whose listing was denied in 2010 on the grounds of “lack of necessary characteristics to justify the listing” (Conselho Consultivo do Patrimônio Cultural, Ata da 64ª Reunião, 2010); this is currently under reconsideration.

These examples show that while in Brazil Art Deco has begun its path to formal recognition, there is still a long way to go. Worldwide, there are various examples of great collections of Art Deco cities, monuments and buildings: Miami Beach (USA), Napier (New Zealand), Durban (South Africa), as well as individual
buildings in Paris, New York, Buenos Aires, among many others. These cities have long established the value of their assets both historically and artistic. Why, therefore, should we insist on the Art Deco heritage in Brazil?

As recorded above, Art Deco architecture was adopted in Brazil at a time of huge economic growth. A small and sparsely occupied country at the beginning of the 20th century, with huge unoccupied portions of national territory and with its population concentrated along the coastal regions (Wilhelm, 1993), the country echoed the call of former President Vargas from the 1930s, the Marcha para o Oeste (Call to the West) (Vargas, 1942). From this period, there was a boom in city building across Brazilian hinterland, and the construction of Goiânia is part of this movement (Delson, 1979) along with dozens, maybe hundreds, of new towns and many more buildings.

Bearing that in mind, the revival of Brazilian Art Deco architecture is an opportunity to recall that period of national history, a moment when the country used architecture as a means to modify its own image, creating a modern face and presenting itself as a cultural part of the Western world. By building modern and cosmopolitan building and towns, the country had the opportunity to be side by side with the most advanced nations. Art Deco architecture presented itself as an ideal means to achieve this goal, since it was perceived as a cosmopolitan and modern building style while simultaneously referring to its own national vernacular elements (Mariano Filho, 1943).

These factors combine to explain why Art Deco is today one of the most widespread individual architectural styles in the country: to this day, Art Deco buildings are present in the whole country, in every region, as well as in in park benches, posts, squares, clock towers, rail stations, and many other pieces of urban furniture, in a number that surpasses any other style.

Considering this situation, the city of Goiânia presents itself as a sort of national capital of the Art Deco. Of course we should not compare the small centre of Goiânia with the rich collection of Art Deco buildings in Copacabana (Rio de Janeiro), or in São Paulo and Belo Horizonte city centres; nor should we compare the humble buildings of Goiânia with the true national monuments in small towns such as Iraí (Rio Grande do Sul) or Cipó (Bahia). Even if taken individually, there is in Goiânia barely an extraordinary building as found in many other cities in the country.

The listing of the Art Deco of Goiânia must be evaluated nevertheless as the first attempt to call national attention to the style, on presenting the first and only city built in Brazil in the heyday of the Art Deco movement (1933–42). The listing of Goiânia is therefore exemplary of the political and public use of architecture to modify a whole portion of the country, forgotten and abandoned by the rest of the country. Goiânia Art Deco as a national heritage must be seen thus as a token for Brazilian Art Deco heritage.

If Art Deco is only beginning its way into artistic heritage in Brazil, worldwide there is also a long way to go. UNESCO for instance recognizes as Art Deco only
one single entry in its world heritage list, wrapped up along with other architectural language in a package known as the “Victorian Gothic and Art Deco Ensembles” in Mumbai, India. Apparently, Art Deco wouldn’t incorporate on its own the “outstanding universal value” required by the international organisation, a criterion which other 20th century styles met with excellence, given the number of Modernistic works and ensembles listed by UNESCO (from 17 individual works by Le Corbusier alone and others by Frank Lloyd Wright, to urban ensembles in Belo Horizonte and Berlin).

There are of course important Art Deco ensembles in the UNESCO list, but systematically disguised as “modern”: Cities like Rabat (Morocco) or Asmara (Eritrea) are respectively described by UNESCO in its documents as “modern capital” and “modernist African city” (https://whc.unesco.org/en/list).

Here again, the lack of proper nomination contributes to the obscurity of Art Deco, especially in the face of its close companions in terms of Gesamtkunstwerk, the German Bauhaus, Futurism, or Austrian Jugendstil, all more firmly established in the artistic imagery. In fact, the presence of an artistic object, or its image, in the Western Canon is a condition to raise public interest, as in the case of cultural tourism and architectural heritage, a subject that is discussed earlier (Unes & Sáfadi 2008). If we are not even able to establish a proper and uniform designation for the style, it will be even harder to present Art Deco heritage as an object of cultural interest.

Further, on suggesting a homological origin for these early 20th century styles, the historical period of incipient industrialization of the artistic object, which made possible its mass reproduction, must be borne in mind. In this time of increasing demand for artistic objects, the Bauhaus School attempted an answer to this demand offering formal education, while Jugendstil, Futurism or Art Deco went on to gather artists offering objects and concepts which ultimately aimed at a total design of every available item, from objects to musical pieces and poems. Thus, these early 20th century styles are homological in their aim at fulfilling a public urge for art (or perhaps an urge for decoration) as well as the pursuit for total art. In the Brazilian case, though these other styles have found some level of influence in the country, it was Art Deco which made its way to being appropriate for the country as a whole.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the beginning of the discovery of Brazilian Art Deco architectural heritage, departing from the first listed ensemble in the country in 2003. This shows that this recognition opened up the national canon to the plethora of artistic possibilities of early 20th century. In this Brazilian case, the national heritage office started looking at artistic production other than Baroque and Modernist. Nevertheless, while Art Deco is not the only style of the period, it is undoubtedly the one which was mostly integrated in national life and lifestyles for decades.
On the other hand, Art Deco still needs international recognition, despite the efforts of a couple of organizations dedicated to the subject. This lack of recognition starts with the absence of a common designation, since this production is many times included among Modernistic works or presented as Proto-Modernistic.

Last but not least, this chapter recalls the fact that official national heritage is the product of active selection and choice, very often with a political bias, more than that of a plain recognition of specific aesthetic value. In the case of Brazilian Art Deco, choosing Art Deco promotes it as a testimony of the great social and demographic changes of last century as well as of the popular craving for modernity.
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Otto Wagner’s Postal Savings Bank building is considered a key work of European modernism and Viennese architecture at the turn of the 20th century. (© Kurt Luger)
C. Valorizing World Heritage through Sustainable Tourism
Introduction

The Hanseatic Town of Visby is a medieval town located on the island of Gotland in the Baltic Sea approximately 100 km off the mainland of Sweden. It was inscribed by UNESCO on the World Heritage List in 1995 as 'an outstanding example of a north European medieval walled trading town' (UNESCO 1995).

While the medieval legacy of Visby was a key factor in establishing the outstanding universal value for Visby, the living town element was also important in the nomination process. Like many other attractive historic towns across Europe the urban structure of Visby has become vulnerable to the loss of functions associated with the town as a living entity. Instead, there has been a significant expansion of hotels and restaurants. Managing Visby as a sustainable tourism destination is becoming increasingly important and this requires recognition that a balance has to be struck between the needs of Visby as a tourist destination and the town as living space.

World Heritage sites are increasingly promoted as platforms for sustainable development. Ongoing work to produce a new management plan for the Hanseatic Town of Visby seeks to draw on both the goals of the United Nations Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development and the UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. The latter referred to mass tourism as one of the key challenges facing cities in the 21st century, stressing the importance of tourism related functions contributing to the well-being of local communities by ensuring economic and social diversity in cities (UNESCO 2011). Thus, equally important as preserving the physical layers of heritage significance is maintaining cities as multifunctional and diverse living spaces.

While tourism on Gotland has been growing over the past 100 years, the building of a new cruise pier in 2018 has reinforced the need for sustainable tourism strategies to avoid overtourism and to safeguard the World Heritage site as a living town. In Visby, strategies relating to carrying capacity and visitor management from the perspective of both World Heritage conservation and destination development have so far been absent. Hence, a working group on sustainable tourism was formed within the framework of developing a holistic World Heritage management plan. Utilizing the UNESCO World Heritage Sustainable Tourism tool -
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Introduction

The Hanseatic Town of Visby is a medieval town located on the island of Gotland in the Baltic Sea approximately 100 km off the mainland of Sweden. It was inscribed by UNESCO on the World Heritage List in 1995 as ‘an outstanding example of a north European medieval walled trading town’ (UNESCO 1995). While the medieval legacy of Visby was a key factor in establishing the outstanding universal value for Visby, the living town element was also important in the nomination process. Like many other attractive historic towns across Europe the urban structure of Visby has become vulnerable to the loss of functions associated with the town as a living entity. Instead, there has been a significant expansion of hotels and restaurants. Managing Visby as a sustainable tourism destination is becoming increasingly important and this requires recognition that a balance has to be struck between the needs of Visby as a tourist destination and the town as living space.

World Heritage sites are increasingly promoted as platforms for sustainable development. Ongoing work to produce a new management plan for the Hanseatic Town of Visby seeks to draw on both the goals of the United Nations Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development and the UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. The latter referred to mass tourism as one of the key challenges facing cities in the 21st century, stressing the importance of tourism related functions contributing to the well-being of local communities by ensuring economic and social diversity in cities (UNESCO 2011). Thus, equally important as preserving the physical layers of heritage significance is maintaining cities as multifunctional and diverse living spaces.

While tourism on Gotland has been growing over the past 100 years, the building of a new cruise pier in 2018 has reinforced the need for sustainable tourism strategies to avoid overtourism and to safeguard the World Heritage site as a living town. In Visby, strategies relating to carrying capacity and visitor management from the perspective of both World Heritage conservation and destination development have so far been absent. Hence, a working group on sustainable tourism was formed within the framework of developing a holistic World Heritage management plan. Utilizing the UNESCO World Heritage Sustainable Tourism tool-
kit constituted an important starting point. It promotes the fusion of competences from the tourism and heritage sectors, which is essential to achieving a shared vision for how to make tourism more sustainable in urban heritage contexts. This chapter seeks to demonstrate the first steps taken to formulate a sustainable visitor policy for the Hanseatic Town of Visby. It draws on a paper presented by the authors at the 15th World Congress of the Organization of World Heritage Cities held in Krakow in 2019 on the theme Heritage and Tourism: Local Communities and Visitors – Sharing Responsibilities.

1 Visby’s World Heritage significance

Visby owes its World Heritage status to its golden age in the 12th and 13th centuries when the town played a strategic role in the Hanseatic League as a commercial hub within the Baltic Sea region. During its heyday in the Middle Ages the town was a cultural melting pot and a focal point for trade between east and west. The medieval layout still dominates the scale and form of the town, and, as phrased by Linnaeus on his visit to Visby in 1741: ‘A model of Rome’ (Linnean Society of London 1973, 140). However, equally important is the fact that Visby has remained a living town with approximately 2,400 people living within the walled town. Greater Visby counts nearly 24,300 people and the population of the island as a whole is 58,000 (Region Gotland 2017).

Dating from the Viking Age, Visby was formed on a shore with a natural harbour, sheltered by steep limestone cliff formations. A stunning topography with dramatic height differences has shaped the urban form. The largely intact town wall – with gates and towers – extends 3.5km and was first built in the mid-13th century. Ramparts, trenches and open spaces surrounding the wall testify that this was once a defensive utility (fig. 1). Curiously, the wall was built to defend the town and its trade privileges against the tribes of the rural hinterland as much as against foreign invaders. Still today, the wall has a strong symbolic value and the historic division between the town and rural areas can still be traced in political discourse.

The medieval street plan survives both above and below ground. Over 200 warehouses and dwellings from the medieval period remain, built in limestone by German, Russian and Danish merchants (UNESCO 2017) (fig. 2). However, Visby is also largely a wooden town. The Gotlandic bulhus are small traditional wooden houses, often covered in lime render (fig. 3). Medieval Visby had more churches than any other town in Sweden. Only St Mary’s Cathedral is still intact and in ecclesiastical use. The others fell into decay and were abandoned during the Reformation, although today, these are impressive iconic ruins with Romanesque and Gothic features (fig. 4).

The fact that Visby has survived as a living town through continuous adaptation to the medieval form and function forms part of its World Heritage sig-
nificance. As described in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, it ‘has prevailed under the influence of socio-economic and cultural change’ and ‘resulted in a townscape in which the medieval walled trading town has been retained with distinctive layers over time until the present day’ (UNESCO 2017). While Visby lost its function as a commercial metropolis during the 14th century, its urban continuity is still reflected in a living town with retail, business, residential, educational, cultural and tourist uses. However, the relocation of public authorities outside of the walled town has transformed its spirit of place as a vibrant office-based core into a largely seasonal residential area. Visby is often rated the most beautiful town of Sweden and has become a major Swedish tourism destination and a gate to discovering Gotland. At the time of nomination, ICOMOS urged local authorities to take measures against unregulated tourism: ‘Whilst ICOMOS sympathizes with the understandable wish of the Municipality to derive maximum economic advantage from Visby's tourist potential, it hopes that it will be vigilant in ensuring that the realization of this potential does not inflict permanent damage on the qualities for which the town is recommended for inclusion on the World Heritage List’ (ICOMOS 1994).

2 The role of tourism on Gotland

Modern day tourists came to Gotland in the 19th century, although the importance of tourism can be traced further back in time. In 1896, the Gotland Tourist Association was founded, only a year after the Swedish Tourist Association was formed (Johansson 2015). Gotland attracts over one million visitors annually and tourism constitutes the most important economic sector together with the agricultural sector. In 2016, which was a peak year, 2,236,589 passengers travelled to Gotland (ferry and airplane) and there were approximately 1,030,000 bed nights. Tourism provides many jobs and has had a positive impact on development within the service sector, e.g. food and retail, transportation, hotels and restaurants, and the supply-chain connected to the tourism-sector. The high season occurs during the summer for a period of ten weeks, although efforts are made to extend the season during spring and fall, for which international visitors comprise an important target group. The foreign visitors are mainly from Germany, Norway and Denmark and there has been a slight increase in visitors from the Netherlands and the UK in recent years (Region Gotland 2017).

Business tourism (individual business travel, congresses, conferences, incentives) represents another important segment for which the success factors are strong given a growing capacity in meeting facilities in unique environments. This could contribute to a more sustainable growth as it operates throughout the year and hence creates better opportunities for local companies to invest, develop and become more accessible to the market. Gotland Convention Bureau plays an important role in marketing the island as a venue for congresses and conferences.
Sweden is presently the main target market for this segment although there is significant potential in targeting international markets in the future which could contribute to a greater economic impact on the shoulder seasons.

Gotland has a vibrant arts scene which draws on its rich cultural heritage. The cultural and creative sectors play an important role in tourism development and also contribute to social development and quality of life for residents. Gotland offers a variety of experiences throughout the year. The medieval legacy of Visby evokes a sense of history and the church ruins are fascinating venues for weddings and other events (fig. 5). Beyond Visby, there are 92 medieval churches across the rural landscape and the island has become a magnet for contemporary design and architecture. The County Theatre and Gotlands Musiken tour the island with theatre and music productions. Other cultural activities contribute to the enrichment of the island’s cultural scene, e.g. the Baltic Art Centre, the Baltic Centre for Writers and Translators, the Visby International Centre for Composers and Bergman Centre. The latter is located on Fårö, a secluded island with a rugged landscape closely associated with film director Ingmar Bergman who settled and shot several films here. There is a considerable number of annual events during the summer season. Medieval Week, an historical enactment festival, attracts 40 000 thousand visitors, as does Almedalen Week, a national political event. Gotland also has a multitude of nature reserves and along the coastline are miles of meandering beaches along the coastline.

While cruise tourism plays an important role historically, modern cruise traffic has grown significantly over the past 30 years. However, since 2000 a clear decline in number of calls at the Port of Visby was noted. As ships grew larger in size Visby’s limited port facilities made it difficult to accommodate the bigger vessels and hence put Gotland in a less attractive position for the cruise industry. In 2013, Region Gotland and Copenhagen Malmö Port (CMP) began discussions on how to strengthen the marketing positions of their respective ports in the Baltic region. This led to a lease agreement signed in 2014 which implied that Region Gotland would invest nearly 24 million euro in building a new cruise ship quay through a loan, while CMP would rent the quay for 20 years for a price equal to the building cost. This set up makes the commercial context different from other more traditional arrangements where the city owns the port and local authorities can assert influence on number of calls and any income generated from the calls. This reinforces the need for ethics based work in order to balance the interests of an external commercial stakeholder with the common good. The new cruise quay was completed in 2018 and can dock two large ships simultaneously (fig. 6). CMP’s strong position as one of the biggest cruise ship ports in the Baltic Sea region has led to a rise of almost 50 per cent in calls since the building of the new quay. In 2019, there were 105 calls and 120,000 cruise guests scheduled, with an expected rise of another 10 per cent in 2020.
The substantial increase in number of cruise calls within a short period of time puts more focus on how to handle cruise development in a balanced and sustainable way, especially considering that Visby is already an attractive destination with a steady increase of both domestic and international visitors. Some major challenges ahead are adapting existing infrastructure in the port area and managing visitor flows between the port and the town (fig. 7). Another pressing need is developing overall tourism infrastructure and services such as buses and other means of transportation, guides and managing increased congestion at tourist sites. Resolving these issues is imperative to sustain Gotland’s future position as an attractive and sustainable tourism destination.

3 Utilizing the HUL approach in heritage management to address sustainability

The link between World Heritage conservation and sustainable development is reflected in the gradual insertion of reference to sustainable development in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, e.g. ‘sustainable use’ of World Heritage sites in 2005 (Cave & Negussie 2017). Ultimately, in 2012, the World Heritage Committee decided that sustainable development policy should be developed within the framework of the World Heritage Convention. Before that, UNESCO introduced its World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme in 2011 to create an international framework for addressing sustainability at World Heritage sites. It resulted in a toolkit outlining a methodology for merging conservation thinking with destination development based on ten guides consisting of practical steps (e.g. gaining understanding of tourism at a given destination; developing a strategy for progressive change; developing effective governance; and engaging local communities and businesses).

Since the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in 2015 by the United Nations, World Heritage management has become increasingly linked to its realization. It established 17 sustainable development goals and 169 associated targets to ‘stimulate action over the next 15 years in areas of critical importance for humanity and the planet’ (UN 2015). For example, goal 11 proposes to ‘make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable’. Target 11.4 seeks to ‘strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage’. Furthermore, several goals and targets can be linked to the need to realize sustainable tourism. While the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) suggests that tourism has the potential to contribute, directly or indirectly, to all of the goals, it notes that goals 8, 12 and 14 are particularly related to sustainable tourism (UNWTO 2019). Goal 8 is about decent work and economic growth and target 8.9 calls for ‘policies to promote sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products’. Goal 12 on re-
sponsible consumption and production highlights the need to ‘develop and implement tools to monitor sustainable development impacts for sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products’ (target 12.b). Goal 14 concerns the conservation and sustainable use of oceans, seas and marine resources, and links this to sustainable management of tourism (target 14.7).

The Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape was adopted in 2011 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in response to the numerous challenges facing cities in the 21st century: demographic shifts with unprecedented migration and urbanization; social and spatial fragmentation; economic liberalization and market exploitation of heritage; and, mass tourism. Furthermore, a general deterioration of the urban environment is reflected in excessive building density, standardized and monotonous buildings, loss of public space and amenities and climate-change-related disasters (UNESCO 2011). It proposed a holistic view on urban conservation through the historic urban landscape (HUL) approach. Firstly, it defined HULs as ‘the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of “historic centre” or “ensemble” to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting’ (UNESCO 2011, para8). This includes everything from natural features and the built environment, both historic and contemporary, to land use patterns, cultural practices and intangible dimensions of heritage (ibid. para9). Secondly, it proposed an operational framework for managing change by ‘preserving the quality of the human environment, enhancing the productive and sustainable use of urban spaces while recognizing their dynamic character, and promoting social and functional diversity’ (ibid., para11).

Visby faces similar challenges to many other towns that are popular tourism destinations. In particular, the multifunctional character of the town core as a diverse living entity is vulnerable. Like in Venice and Dubrovnik everyday life and services such as offices and conventional retail are diminishing while hotels, restaurants and tourism-related activities are growing in number. The move of public administrative functions to the outskirts of town and privatization of previously public properties have contributed to breaking up the multifunctional structure. In addition, the current town plan lacks teeth to address regulation of uses which will need adjustment in the future. However, sound urban planning and HUL thinking can mitigate the effects of these global trends and create a more resilient urban environment to retain a living town (fig. 8). For example, the retention of landmark buildings still in public ownership will help assert better control of vital functions. A recent decision to maintain public ownership and repurpose the former cultural school (kulturskolan) into a creative cluster hub for businesses and artists will help curb ‘hotelification’ which is turning Visby into a sleeping beauty at winter. Political will is needed to resist the selling off of public assets in favour of short term economic gains (Negussie 2019).
Gentrification, which affects social diversity, is more difficult to tackle in the context of economic liberalization. Property prices within the walled town have escalated in recent years to levels matching Stockholm. For example, in 2016, a domestic house the size of 178 square metres was sold at nearly 2 million €. While the ownership profile of the walled town, except for a small number of publicly-owned buildings, constitutes a mix of permanent residents, summer residents and investors, exact statistics on the proportion of these are lacking. The inner-city residents’ association has a membership of some 400 households, which suggests a stable but proportionally small permanent population. However, with mounting property prices the latter two groups have grown in importance.

4 Merging tourism and World Heritage strategies
Management plans are mandatory for World Heritage sites under the World Heritage Convention to create a long-term vision for their conservation. This provides an opportunity for linking heritage and tourism considerations. State parties are advised that new World Heritage site nominations should demonstrate how sustainable development principles are integrated into the management system (UNESCO 2015, para132). In 2018, a new management plan process was initiated for the Hanseatic Town of Visby based on integrated site management and broad stakeholder engagement. The project included an interdisciplinary project group and seven thematic working groups with the task of defining goals and actions (e.g. conservation and management; living town and planning; sustainable tourism; managing disaster risks). Principles of sustainable development and the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) approach were used as a blue print in the management plan process.

A sustainable tourism working group was formed with expertise from the tourism and heritage sectors with the view to producing a sustainable visitor policy drawing on the UNESCO toolkit for sustainable tourism. The group considered various challenges related to increased tourism at the World Heritage Site and identified issues for the living town and planning working group to tackle. Building a strong relationship with the research community and a new Masters Programme in Sustainable Destination Development at Uppsala University Campus Gotland was essential. A partnership was also developed with the Mining Area of the Great Copper Mountain in Falun as a leading example on World Heritage destination development in Sweden. Furthermore, it was essential to synchronize the work with strategies for regional development and tourism.

A new tourism strategy for Gotland was adopted in 2019, which clearly points to sustainability. However, it is particularly concerned with bettering the opportunities for tourism businesses to extend their operation by one or two months. With a steady growth in tourism development, operations have tended to be reactive rather than proactive. Exceptionally high profits during the high season creates a situation in which companies are able to survive until the next season without
having to focus on pro-active measures and costly marketing. Increasing year-round offers of sustainable products and services would make Gotland more attractive and accessible to different markets prioritized within the strategy. Another important factor in securing sustainable tourism development on Gotland is long term financial investment from both private and public sectors in order to create a common platform or organization for coherent destination development.

5 Formulating a sustainable visitor policy for Visby

While the UNESCO toolkit for sustainable tourism is essential in achieving a heritage perspective on tourism, implementing the guides has been considered complicated. Hence, the first step was to find a way of simplifying the methodology and to prioritize those areas that were most urgent. After an extensive process with meetings, workshops and seminars the working group on sustainable tourism identified the need to focus on the following: 1. establishing a code of conduct; 2. identifying carrying capacities and steering visitor flows; 3. contributing to climate leadership; 4. creating local economic gain; 5. engagement of local communities; and 6. collaboration with other cruise destinations.

Establishing a code of conduct was deemed necessary to address aspired behaviour amongst both visitors and locals. Firstly, a visitor code based on the notion of ‘respect and enjoy’ is essential to help visitors make more sustainable choices and to engage them in the World Heritage site and its conservation. Secondly, creating an ambassadorship and sense of pride and responsibility amongst local residents and businesses is key to develop a good host culture. The term ‘code of conduct’ was discussed extensively as it was first perceived as something negative and restrictive by some. However, successful water conservation campaigns to tackle water shortages have already been achieved on Gotland which can be built upon.

Identifying carrying capacities and steering visitor flows were considered crucial and learning from other urban destinations to avoid overtourism. The goal is to identify capacities comprehensively in order to set limits for tourism within the World Heritage site if necessary in the future. This requires impact assessments in order to establish limits for the site as a whole and for specific and more vulnerable parts. For example, since the new cruise pier opened in 2018 there has been a notable increase of tourists at St Mary’s Cathedral which could lead to both visual congestion, physical deterioration and overuse of facilities such as toilets. The notion of carrying capacity as something indepth which goes beyond capacities within transport and number of hotel beds is sensitive given the special role of tourism on Gotland. The challenge is to put in place evidence-based research with indications of tipping levels. In terms of steering visitor flows, the goal is to achieve optimal visitor flows through integrated planning considering economic, ecological, social and cultural aspects. By creating tools for optimal steering of visitor flows additional burden on more vulnerable parts of the town will be avoided.
and at the same time create a better visitor experience. Also, creating trails using maps and apps within the town can help improve the sales opportunities of restaurants and shops. With increasing cruise tourism it is also important to ensure that visitors are spread across Gotland to avoid overfocus on Visby.

Climate leadership was considered particularly important since mitigating climate change is important on every single level, from transportation to hotel management. The goal is to seek solutions for climate leadership amongst businesses and the local community. Actions to be taken include the promotion of green excursions and experiences, regulating and creating smart and attractive transportation solutions and promoting greening of tourism companies. The new cruise pier was built with an electric grid to allow ships to turn off their engines and be powered with electricity while at dock, which is crucial to make cruise tourism more sustainable. Ports are increasingly providing facilities to allow for cruise ships to turn off their engines while docked by plugging into the local electric power system. This would reduce pollutant emissions from diesel engines in the host environment. To date, there is no requirement for using the electric grid. However, this is not only a local debate but requires national and international action and co-operation. In Norway, environmental regulations have been proposed by Central Government to achieve a zero-emission policy for the World Heritage-protected fjords by 2026 (Maritime Impact, 2019).

Achieving local economic gain is essential and the goal is to create a model for fair business relations and finding ways of collecting economic return for heritage resources and investment in conservation. Firstly, the discussion on fair business relations emerged from the concern that cruise visitors consume tourism products and services on the cruise boat and that local providers gain little from this segment. Information and promotion of the local offer is important. Secondly, it was recognized that visits to heritage sites should contribute financially to their long-term conservation. The goal is to find ways to engage the visitor by creating a ‘call-to-action’ by providing opportunities to contribute to conservation actions, e.g. help save the wall and the ruins. This can increase awareness and engagement in the visitor who becomes part of the World Heritage conservation mission. The medieval town wall has been subject to several rescue campaigns in the past and there are existing foundations to which financial contributions can be directed.

Engagement of local communities and prioritizing the welfare of local residents above the needs of the global tourism supply chain is vital. Close co-operation with the Inner-City Residents’ Association was considered key to success. Any tourism planning should be in close affiliation with the residents within the walled town. Meetings and workshops were implemented for dialogue and discussion on residents’ views on how to adapt tourism to the needs of the residential community. The residents’ association has expressed that “party tourism” is considered to have greater impact on the local community, for example in terms of noise pollution, compared to cruise tourism. It has also been recognized that any attempts at estab-
lishing a code of conduct to achieve a clean, sustainable and welcoming environment must be spearheaded by local actors, be it residents, businesses or local government.

Collaboration with the cruise industry will be a key to success given the global scale of cruise tourism and this will be achieved through collaboration with Cruise Baltic, a regional network of partner destinations within the Baltic region connecting 29 cruise destinations. The cultural tourism working group contributed to the Cruise Baltic Sustainability Manifesto, presented in Copenhagen in April 2019 by the Cruise Baltic Association. The vision statement is ‘making cruising a sustainable vacation offer in 2030’ by addressing economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development (Cruise Baltic 2019). Dubrovnik’s Respect the City campaign, presented by the Mayor of Dubrovnik, Mr Mato Frankovic, at the 15th World Congress of the Organization of World Heritage Cities highlighted the importance of communicating problems of overtourism directly with the Cruise Lines International Association (CLIA). Growing perceptions and a negative image of Dubrovnik as a ‘dead city’ due to overtourism ultimately affects the town’s attractiveness as a tourist destination.

6 Conclusion
There is a significant potential in using World Heritage sites as platforms for sustainable development and in addressing urban heritage and tourism issues in an increasingly complex and fragile existence of humanity. A guiding principle to achieve more sustainable forms of tourism in urban areas is defending the city as a multifunctional and diverse living entity. This requires people-centred conservation and community-based tourism. Developing sustainable tourism policy within the management plan for the Hanseatic Town of Visby through the lens of the HUL approach required interaction with several other fields and working groups during the management plan process. Equally important was integrating World Heritage perspectives into the broader destination management on Gotland as a whole and strategies for regional development.

Whether World Heritage status creates positive spin-off effects for World Heritage towns or reinforces overfocus on tourism and real-estate at the cost of living cities is debatable. However, with shifts in focus on sustainable development and community-based approaches, World Heritage sites are potential platforms for conservation and sound use of cultural and natural resources. The compulsory management plan, requiring the formulation of a long-term vision and conservation-based actions, can be used as a tool to make cities more inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable.
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Figure 1: Visby town wall: eastern section of the wall with towers and surrounding trenches (Photo: Mats Jansson ©Region Gotland).

Figure 2: Gamla Apoteket (Old Pharmacy), a medieval warehouse building with a distinctive stepped gable at Strandgatan, built in local limestone in the 13th century. It was used as a pharmacy in the 19th century (Photo: Sara Appelgren, ©Region Gotland and Gotlands Museum).
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Figure 4: S:ta Katarina, church ruin with Gothic and Romanesque features. It was built by monks of the Franciscan Order erected c. 1250 (Photo: Sara Appelgren ©Region Gotland and Gotlands Museum).
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Figure 4: S:ta Katarina, church ruin with Gothic and Romanesque features. It was built by monks of the Franciscan Order erected c. 1250 (Photo: Sara Appelgren ©Region Gotland and Gotlands Museum).

Figure 5: St Nicolai: one of 15 church ruins within the walled town often used for concerts, weddings and other functions (Photo: Sara Appelgren ©Region Gotland and Gotlands Museum).

Figure 6: AIDA Cruises at the new cruise pier in Visby which opened in 2018. It was built to improve cruise access to Gotland (Photo: Frida Nehro ©Gotland Excursion).

Figure 7: Busses lined up on the cruise pier waiting to transport cruisers to Visby and other parts of Gotland (Photo: Malin Vinblad ©Gotland Excursion).

Figure 8: Visby as a living town is characterized by a sharp contrast between summer and winter seasons in terms of number of residents and visitors (Photo: Sara Appelgren ©Region Gotland and Gotlands Museum).
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Social Media and ICT Tools to Manage Tourism in Heritage Destinations

In recent years, ICT and social media have greatly influenced visitors’ behavior and consequently this has resulted in negative impacts on the natural and cultural heritage sites. Tourist destinations seek to attract even more visitors using ICT tools, commercial internet platforms and social media.

The investigations undertaken in 2019 included examples of overtourism heritage sites which exceed permanently or periodically their Carrying Capacity and show impacts from fast growing visitor numbers. Key tourism spots of selected destinations in the World Heritage sites such as the Dolomites and Venice in Italy, Swiss Alps Jungfrau-Aletsch in Switzerland, were analyzed on social media and commercial travel websites. Studies of small destinations endangered by overtourism concerned the Verzasca valley in Switzerland, Trolltunga in Norway, and Scala dei Turchi in Sicily, Italy.

The investigations show that the role of visual and social media in destination marketing has gained enormous influence on traveler behavior in just one decade. Especially in small heritage sites with insufficient or no tourism infrastructure and business, the booming visitors flow results in overtourism and consequently in impacts to natural and cultural heritage, local economy and population. The combination of visual media (television, movies, short films or music clips on YouTube) and social media presence can boost little or unknown sites periodically or seasonally.

The steadily growing tourism sector together with improved transportation and decreasing travel costs have made Venice a top tourist destination. The increase of visitors is in contrast to the decreasing number of residents. The exponentially growing social media presence corresponds to the rise of visitor numbers in just one decade.

A social media analysis of the destinations in the Natural World Heritage site in the Swiss Alps Jungfrau-Aletsch shows that numbers of hashtags, posts, and reviews are excellent indicators and tools to visualize over- and undertourism areas. Communication through social media is especially useful for “undertourism” destinations with the need for tourism enhancement.

Media and ICT applications will have significant roles in new governance and management models, supporting the distribution of tourist flows, balancing over- and undertourism, in space and time. Measures to improve visitor management...
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Tourism has to be considered in relation to the infrastructure, capacities and the ordinary heritage sites and tourism destinations (Ali 2016). However, mass tourism – perhaps in overtourism – permanently or periodically – without gaining substantial pictures of tourism destinations for a worldwide audience. Good accessibility is online commercial services like TripAdvisor, Airbnb, Expedia draw colourful social media like Facebook, Instagram, Twitter. Influencers from show business or newspapers, glossy travel journals and especially cinema, television and recently new media have influenced increasingly visitors’ behavior and consequently resulting in negative impacts on the natural and cultural heritage sites. The average and social media have influenced increasingly visitors’ behavior and consequently single sites getting exponentially more visibility and attraction, often without and boosting revenues of investors. Recent studies show the consequences of tourism which creates added values for local people and visitors, offers opportunities to jointly engage in the conservation of their heritage, to improve their own living standards and experience, and to share equally costs and benefits. A changed tourism paradigm for heritage destinations has to respect local evidences and involve all actors in the decision processes.

1 Background and Definitions
Tourism is about satisfaction, curiosity, need for discovery, risk etc. It has been changing and growing quite rapidly while often generating negative effects. The main reason for overtourism is the growth rate of travelers: in 1950 – in total 25 million international arrivals were registered, in 2017 – in total 1.3 billion, until 2030 with a forecast 3.3% annual growth of around 1.8 billion tourists will cross borders in 2030 (UNWTO 2011). It is expected that the most visited region in 2030 will be North-East Asia. Here, as well as across the other regions, it will be necessary to support the need for traveling in a responsible and resilient way. Looking even further, in 2050, the tourism sector will need to take care of domestic tourism arrivals with major growth in China and India (6 billion domestic trips). Moreover, further changes in the potential of the world population anticipating in tourism will result in traveling becoming a daily routine rather than tourism.

Some major changes have caused tourism to expand, such as growth of the global middle class, which can afford traveling, characterized by the income, which is higher than the one necessary to cover basic needs. Distribution of the middle class is dominating in China and India where the biggest changes can be expected in the future. Transformation processes will be caused by the desire of the middle class to participate in consumption and production. Some other major changes have caused tourism growth such as increasing business and leisure travels, new mobility and travel behavior (e.g. cruise travel, low cost flights, fast trains), ‘Hit and run’ tourism thanks to improved transportation infrastructures. Tourism has been recently boosted by communication and marketing means, such as word of mouth, newspapers, glossy travel journals and especially cinema, television and recently social media like Facebook, Instagram, Twitter. Influencers from show business or online commercial services like TripAdvisor, Airbnb, Expedia draw colourful pictures of tourism destinations for a worldwide audience. Good accessibility is a major reason to become a so-called ‘Hit and run tourism’ destination, resulting perhaps in overtourism – permanently or periodically – without gaining substantial revenues (Ruoss/Alfaré 2013a).

Overtourism is seen as a dramatic scenario of mass tourism, endangering extraordinary heritage sites and tourism destinations (Ali 2016). However, mass tourism has to be considered in relation to the infrastructure, capacities and the
vulnerability of the sites. Frequently the number of visitors is exceeding the Carrying Capacity, attracting far more visitors it would allow. Tourism Carrying Capacity refers to the number of individuals a given area can absorb within natural and cultural heritage resource limits and without degrading the natural, social, cultural and economic environment for present and future generations. The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) is furthermore underlining that the number of visitors should not cause unacceptable decrease in visitor satisfaction (Ruoss/Alfarë 2013b).

Sustainable tourism strategies seek to optimize, not maximize, tourism, fostering conservation and protection of heritage and avoiding negative impacts. Re-thinking product design while satisfying the same needs responsibly and sustainably and using the tools of promotion by tourism entities to promote the local evidences and values will be crucial issues for tourism organisations. Limiting and optimizing all tourism related business and creating benefit for local people will be key, instead of increasing infrastructure and services, attracting even more tourists and boosting revenues of investors. Recent studies show the consequences of single sites getting exponentially more visibility and attraction, often without having adequate infrastructures available. Over- and undertourism consequently reflect human ambiguity between quantity and quality in tourism.

In the case of natural heritage sites or heritage cities, Carrying Capacity may differ – some places might be overloaded while some other places need tourism development. Negative impacts by tourism on heritage sites have to be avoided, by regulating hit and run tourism, or to better balance visits geographically. Destinations increasingly focus on better balancing visitor flows to ensure sustainable development, to reduce pressure on heritage and to avoid negative impact in overloaded places as well as to help “undertourism” areas to benefit from tourism.

The Role of Communication Tools
Communication has always played a key role in promoting tourism. Traditionally word of mouth recommendations, printed media and books, radio, television and films have been key elements for the destination marketing. In recent years, ICT and social media have influenced increasingly visitors’ behavior and consequently resulted in negative impacts on the natural and cultural heritage sites. The average number of pages travelers browse before travelling is 182. Tourist destinations seek to attract even more visitors using ICT tools, commercial internet platforms and social media. To create expectations about a destination and reduce the uncertainty – tourists look for sources which they trust most. Modern tourists have more trust in other travelers’ opinions using social media rather than official marketing advice (Zivkovic et al. 2014).

What travelers look for when scrolling through Instagram feeds is how ‘Instgrammable’ the destination is, which nowadays is decisive of their decision-making. Instagrammable means “a picture which is worth posting on Instagram” (Urban
Dictionary 2019). In terms of destination marketing, they are attractive from an outside view such as a colorful landscape, wild nature, cultural heritage or an impressive cityscape or correspond to mainstream values like freedom, joyfulness or wealth. These posts are eye-catching on Instagram and attract the attention of Instagram users and potential tourists to the destination. In just one decade, they have become the most important features Destination Marketing Organizations (DMO) consider when creating their destination strategy.

**Social Media and Travel Platforms**

People share their travel experiences posting pictures and textual content online through different social media platforms. Instagram, TripAdvisor and increasingly Airbnb are getting leading roles as interactive travel platforms. The content of the platforms is user-generated and public – using hashtags on Instagram, providing reviews on TripAdvisor or owner–visitor interactions on Airbnb. Instagram is an open source for visual visitors’ experience, instead TripAdvisor and Airbnb are commercial providers, offering travel information and products by private business or public.

Instagram is a web platform operating since October 2010 and enables its users to share pictures or Instagram stories. More than 70% of the overall content on Instagram is travel-related (O’Connor 2008). In February 2019, Instagram Info Centre delivered statistics showing that Instagram has one billion active monthly users and 500 million daily users. Instagram reported that 71% of its users are under the age of 35.

TripAdvisor was launched in 2000 as travel guide and tourism related business. A button with a call-for-action: “Visitors, add your own review”, was key for growth of the world’s largest travel site (according to Jumpshot for TripAdvisor Sites). Recently, TripAdvisor relaunched its website as a social network enabling users to share their experiences by posting travel-related content on their own ‘Activity Feeds’ that are similar to the ‘News Feeds’ on Facebook. Moreover, a new option – Follow – gives a possibility to connect with other travelers, to see their preferences and to share experiences from the places they have visited. Creating a two-way communication generates more interest in sharing experiences online.

Travelers want to have relevant information before making their holiday decisions. TripAdvisor is seen as a trusted source of information, where 74% of travelers visit TripAdvisor prior to booking. Four out of five people say that TripAdvisor makes them feel more confident in their booking decisions (TripAdvisor 2019). It often happens that tourists do not have clear ideas on where to go before entering the platform. Therefore, TripAdvisor works closely with destinations offering them a possibility to add sponsored content which will then appear on users’ homepage or to appear as the first suggestion when users click on the search section (at present e.g. Abu Dhabi, Dublin).
TripAdvisor relates to the reviews on accommodations, restaurants and local attractions and thus narrows the users circle in contrast to Instagram. According to the Insider Picks Team, TripAdvisor is the most experience-driven travel site and a strongly user-generated review community. In 2018, it generated approximately 730 million user reviews and opinions covering over eight million listings for restaurants, hotels, vacation rentals and attractions (Statista 2019). TripAdvisor Investor statistics showed that on an average there are 490 million monthly users of this platform.

Airbnb is an online marketplace launched as web platform “AirBedandBreakfast.com” in August 2008, offering one-of-a-kind activities hosted by locals. It acts as a broker, arranges or offers lodging, primarily homestays, or host experiences, receiving commissions from each booking. Hosts provide details for their rental or event listings such as prices, allowed number of guests, home type, rules, and amenities. The online marketplace is today in competition with the traditional hospitality industry and facilitates not only accommodation but also adventures, experiences, restaurants, and interactions with the hosts. Guests receive information regarding things to do or accessibility and may book activities with local guides, including cooking classes, guided tours, and meetups. Hosts and guests have the ability to leave reviews about their experience and to chat through a secure messaging system. The truthfulness and impartiality of reviews is guaranteed through a divided review system of host and guest, linked after completion by both of them, which aims to enhance accuracy and objectivity (Wikipedia 2019).

Investigations on Social Media Impacts
The impact of communication tools, especially visual and short information are increasingly determinant for the tourism development. Sharing visual content has never been easier. Here the ICT tools and the increase of visual communication and social media play an important role. Social media are the most important platforms where visual communication takes place and where it becomes influential. Visual communication encourages emotions while emotions, coming from travelers’ past experiences or those they expect to be part of, are widely known drivers of travel decision-making process.

This type of communication can motivate and inspire, and in terms of tourism, it can boost well-known as well as unknown and badly developed destinations. However, this visual influence does not always bring positive results to destinations – especially regarding tourist flows. In heritage destinations, this unforeseen and exponential growth of tourist flow has an increasingly negative impact on natural and cultural assets in a short period.
2 Case Studies on Social Media and Tourism

Some well-known large and small heritage destinations affected by overtourism have been studied based on their presence in social media and on travel platforms.

A follow-up study aimed at investigating the relation between social media presence and distribution of tourists over a larger territory has been undertaken. It is important for the management of heritage sites to be aware of the maximal number of visitors, which these assets can support in order to preserve their Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). The Swiss Alps Jungfrau-Aletsch World Heritage Region (SAJA) has been chosen to study opportunities to use ICT to improve tourist management. The WHS covers 824 km² and includes 23 municipalities with 35,000 residents and five million visitors per year. The site is requested to elaborate a tourism management strategy in order to better balance visitors flow within the area around the World Heritage perimeter (SAJA 2019).

The investigations undertaken in 2019 included examples of overtourism heritage sites which exceed permanently or periodically their carrying capacity and shows impacts from increasing numbers of visitors. The selected small heritage sites and Venice were investigated in April and updated October 2019 on internet, in the relevant social media and on commercial travel websites. The posts, pictures, videos, reviews or comments in social media had to be collected within a short period, favorably within a few hours, since the numbers are changing permanently, often the figures differ from page to page of the same website, e.g. due to different cultural zones or time differences.

For the study of the destinations inside SAJA WHS the list of key tourism spots of the region were provided by the SAJA Management Centre. In addition, 22 hiking trails – five on the east, five on the west, seven on the north and five on the south of the region – recommended through the website myswissalps.ch, were analyzed in April 2019. The list of highlights and key tourism spots has been used for Instagram and TripAdvisor content analysis, together with the list of spots on the hiking trails.

Instagram Analysis: By using different hashtags, people express opinions related to their travel experiences in a public way, which is not the case with other social media platforms (e.g. Facebook). Each tourism spot along the trails was analyzed and then sorted depending on trails’ position and added to the nearest destination. Double mentions and multiple meanings have been sorted out. 185 spots were examined, sorted into 13 geographical destinations: Kandersteg, Schilthorn, Jungfrau, Lauterbrunnen, Grindelwald, Rosenlau, Gutannen, Goms, Eggishorn, Bettmeralp, Aletschbord-Belalp, Raron-Niedergesteln and Fafleralp.

TripAdvisor Analyses were focused on the most important features, tourism business and services, and cultural offers of the destinations of the World Heritage Region mainly the number of reviews for all tourism spots on the list. The number of posts, including pictures and videos, reviews in different languages and other
details regarding tourist offers were collected. After the information on Number of Reviews, Languages, Number of Posts and Demand for each spot was collected, all the places were sorted into 13 destinations.

Findings

Increasingly less known heritage destinations are getting trendy and “Instagrammable”, and tourism is flourishing without having adequate infrastructures and tourism services in place. The sites overrun without being prepared are usually extraordinary places like landscapes, cultural or religious heritage sites promoted by media and consequently boosted by social media.

Small Overtourism Sites in Europe

The Dolomites area is a fascinating alpine landscape with rugged geological features, encompassing multiple tourism destinations in three regions in Italy. It is well known for its scenery and highly promoted in numerous books and journals as well in documentaries on television or on numerous websites. UNESCO recognized the geological landscape due to its outstanding universal value as serial Natural WHS. Thanks to its ‘Instagammable’ it is well represented in Social Media. Some of the sites are (as of 30 September 2019).

- Cortina d’Ampezzo (place of the Olympic Games 2026) #cortinadampezzo: 228,024 posts
- The Lago Misurina #misurina: 43,070 posts,

Lago di Bries is a fascinating valley with an extraordinary scenery, encircled by an alpine landscape with a romantic lake in the middle. It is a very small destination bordering the Dolomites World Heritage perimeter in the Val Pusteria (Province Bolzano, Italy). It became famous as the show place of the Italian Television Rai 1 fiction series “Un passo dal cielo”. During high season in the summer, the valley is practically non accessible due to intensive traffic; the limited parking spaces (even though costly) and also the few hotels and restaurants in the vicinity become overcrowded. Lago di Bries is a typical hit and run place with a low carrying capacity, invaded by holiday tourists from the entire region.

- Lago di Bries/Pragser Wildsee: #lagodibraies: 247,052 posts and #pragserwildsee 66,533 posts, Trip Advisor: 4049 reviews

The Scala dei Turchi is an attractive white coastal geological formation on the South Coast of Sicily and has been included on the tentative list for World Heritage by Italy. During high season the Scala dei Turchi has become crowded by visitors and represents a typical hit and run place. It became increasingly famous due to Rai 1 fiction written by the Italian writer Andrea Camilleri: Commissario Montalbano. Due to its celebrity it became a fascinating ‘Instagrammable’ feature.
- Scala dei Turchi: #scaladeiturchi: 144,719 posts, TripAdvisor >4000 posts and pictures (22 June 2019)

Valle Verzasca, a valley in Southern Switzerland, is known for its raging river with emerald green water, flowing through rock outcrops within a fascinating alpine landscape and with a small lake. Thanks to the river’s good visibility, it became famous as a river diving destination. A bungy jump from the Verzasca dam was the initial sequence of James Bond’s “Golden Eye”. Since the tourism infrastructure is insufficient and the valley reachable only by car or bus (postbus every two hours), it has become a popular hit and run destination during high season and weekends. Due to low carrying capacity, difficult accessibility and limited parking spaces, Valle Verzasca has become periodically an overtourism site. In recent years it was promoted on social media by young people from the Milan metropolitan area and has consequently seen a rush of visitors and consequently caused resistance by resident people.

- Valle Verzasca: #verzasca: 28,290 posts, #valleverzasca: 30,381 posts + 742 posts related to other notions and languages (2 October 2019)

Trolltunga (Troll tongue) is part of the Precambrian bedrock situated about 1,100 metres above sea level in the municipality of Odda in Hordaland county, Norway. The cliff juts horizontally out from the mountain, about 700 metres above the north side of the lake Ringedalsvatnet. Until 2010, less than 800 people hiked to Trolltunga each year. In 2016, there were already more than 80,000 people, making it one of Norway's most popular hikes without adequate tourist infrastructure in place. During high season long queues of hikers wait in front of the cliff to take a picture of the amazing view from the trolls tongue to the lake (Wikipedia 2019).

- Trolltunga: #trolltunga 160,597 posts, #trolltunganorway 5,686 posts (2 October 2019)

Venice – Comparison of Media and Visitors Presences

Venice is present in all kind of media and recently the increasing visitor numbers and exceeding carrying capacity are issues of public dispute. As a WHS, Venice and its lagoon represents a rich natural and cultural heritage exposed to impacts from climate change, deterioration of architectural heritage and lagoon ecosystems as well as mass tourism.

The fame of Venice began in ancient times. Famous for its cultural tangible and intangible heritage, historic buildings, numerous famous cultural and traditional events such as, Art and Architecture Biennale, concerts at the La Fenice Theater and other churches and historic places, outstanding museums and exhibitions, film festival and other activities regularly attract hundreds of thousands of visitors. Most of the attractions in Venice are non-reproducible, considering that they are authentic for a specific environment, and many of them are public goods which are often not regulated by market mechanisms. Thousands of articles, films, books testify the enchanting beauty of the ancient lagoon city. The presence of Venice in social media and high numbers of influencers from show business finally boosted its worldwide reputation exponentially. The exponential growth of the presence on
social media is certainly one reason for the increase of unsustainable activities and consequently for a negative impact of tourism on the local environment. This is especially the case of hotspots (e.g. St Mark's Square) which are repeatedly shown. However, there are still many parts of Venice undiscovered by tourists.

Its recent promotion through media is traceable only partially. Nevertheless, some selected figures available regarding presence in media and social media give an impression of the tourism development and the potential impact on natural and cultural heritage in past decades.

Thousands of books on Venice have been published; a selection of volumes worth reading is listed on the website www.italiannotes.com. The website www.goodreads.com recommends 249 books worth reading. A recent boost were the novels of Donna Leon who has been writing since 1992 about 30 novels, among them 29 episodes in the series of Commissario Brunetti, translated in over 35 languages and with over 2 million books sold. The German television has produced 22 episodes of Commissario Brunetti for the broadcast, which gives the location a permanent presence in the enormous German tourism market (Wikipedia 2019).

Around 700 films were produced or were located in Venice (Prasso 2016) and 151 web pages are listed in the category “Films set in Venice” (Wikipedia 2019).

Thousands of Hashtags are listed on Instagram, only #venice exceeded 13 million posts and #venezia 8 million posts end of September 2019.

On TripAdvisor, in total 819 activities were offered in Venice; the City of Venice is mentioned in 1,510,309 reviews and opinions and 614,668 photos and 102 videos are available. St Mark’s Square (Piazza San Marco) is presented by 25,000 photos and received 35,910 reviews (6 October 2019). The City of Venice Travel Forum contains 48,456 recommendations and topics from its community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>435,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Flats, B&amp;B)</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>7,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>345,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>631,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Venice the conversion of rented homes to second houses and short-term accommodation especially of residents moving to the mainland, contributes to raising house prices, eroding of local communities, and consequently decrease of social services. In Venice, more than 60 % of the houses are Airbnb offers. This is an increase of 13 % in only one year (Fig 1). The city of Venice was home to a total of 8907 Airbnb listings for either rooms or entire apartments (Fig. 2). Of all listings, 75% advertise an entire home or apartment, not a room. Of the total listings, at least 6832 are considered active, having received a review – and thus a booking – in the last six months. “In comparison to population and housing stock, the total number of listings, there are approximately 3 listings every 100 residents in the
city, and 6 listings for every 100 houses.” (Inside Airbnb 2019) There were 550,000 guest reviews available (Airbnb 2 October 2019).

Figure 1: Trend line of Airbnb listings in Venice from July 2015 to August 2019 (Source: Inside Airbnb 2019)

Figure 2: The distribution of Airbnb offers in Venice, 11 May 2019: red – entire home/apt; green – private room; blue – shared room (Source: http://insideairbnb.com/venice/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of “City Users”</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents Venice and islands</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>Municipal registry office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University students and other members non resident</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars non resident</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers and commuters</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Venetian Mobility Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second house owners including family members</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Estimation based on second house tax (IMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total persons with frequent presence</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight guests (daily average)</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>Estimation based on tourism directory 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total daily “City Users”</td>
<td>182,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Comparison of the development of visitors and residents in Venice from 1951 – 2018 (Source: Statistics of the Municipality (residents) and estimation based on ISTAT data (visitors)
The presence of the City of Venice on social media websites can be compared with the development of the visitors and its residents. The carrying capacity (daily guests – residents relation) as defined in the nomination files for the World Heritage property, was previously exceeded in the 1990’s seasonally or periodically (e.g. during events). Since around 2011, the carrying capacity is exceeding almost daily. The regular “City Users” already reached 182,000 persons (Tab. 2). In addition, there are day tourists arriving by car, bus, train from the mainland areas or by cruise ships (1.56 million passengers/year). Furthermore, there are 32,000 overnight guests whereas the carrying capacity can absorb not more than 60,000 persons/day.
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Figure 3: Comparison of the development of visitors and residents in Venice from 1951 – 2018 (Source: Statistics of the Municipality (residents) and estimation based on ISTAT data (visitors)
The figures and numbers show that there are many more visitors than residents in Venice (Fig. 3). The carrying capacity has been exceeded during the last 10 years, all year round. The number of tourists constantly grows exponentially while the residential population on the island is constantly decreasing and reached 53,976 in 2018. Beside the promotion effect of media and social media, the tourism infrastructure and services are continuously further enhanced. The Venice Airport System, that includes Venice and Treviso, registered almost 13.4 million passengers in 2017 (2016: 12.3 million; 2014: 10.7 million). The increase of public transport, airport, cruise ship ports, new transport means (e.g. tramway), indicate that new hospitality infrastructures on the island as well as on the mainland, and new online travel marketplaces are contributing to the uncontrolled and exponential tourism development.

Destinations of the World Heritage Region Jungfrau-Aletsch
The analysis of the presence on Instagram (Tab. 3, Fig. 4) and TripAdvisor (Tab. 4, Fig. 5) of the World Heritage site Swiss Alps Jungfrau-Aletsch (SAJA) show considerable differences between over- and undertourism among the destinations in and around the World Heritage territory (Sormaz/Ruoss 2020). The differences are due to geographic situation, history of tourism, accessibility, marketing, destination management, fame of the tourist attractions and target groups. Today the main destinations are facing overtourism, the destinations with undertourism are still less popular, even though attractiveness and clustering of tourism highlights might be higher.

Table 3: Number of posts on Instagram of the destinations and trails of the SAJA Region in March 2019 (Sormaz/Ruoss 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Number of posts (A)</th>
<th>Number of posts on trails (B)</th>
<th>Total number of posts (ΣA+B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jungfrau</td>
<td>317,133</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>317,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauterbrunnen</td>
<td>143,824</td>
<td>128,799</td>
<td>272,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grindelwald</td>
<td>202,660</td>
<td>27,715</td>
<td>230,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schilthorn</td>
<td>94,507</td>
<td>28,657</td>
<td>123,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandersteg</td>
<td>108,731</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>117,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggishorn</td>
<td>22,332</td>
<td>14,850</td>
<td>37,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutmanns</td>
<td>22,123</td>
<td>5,924</td>
<td>28,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettmeralp</td>
<td>27,724</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>27,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenlau</td>
<td>22,234</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>23,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aletschbord-Belalp</td>
<td>12,137</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>13,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goms</td>
<td>3,361</td>
<td>8,699</td>
<td>12,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fafleralp</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>3,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raron-Niedergesteln</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Number of posts on Instagram of the destinations and trails of the SAJA Region in March 2019 (Sormaz/Ruoss 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Number of posts (A)</th>
<th>Number of posts on trails (B)</th>
<th>Total number of posts (ΣA+B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jungfrau</td>
<td>317,133</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>317,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauterbrunnen</td>
<td>143,824</td>
<td>272,623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grindelwald</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>4,197</td>
<td>4,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schilthorn</td>
<td>4,084</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandersteg</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggishorn</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttannen</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettmeralp</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenlau</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fafleralp</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aletschbord-Belalp</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goms</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raron-Niedergesteln</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tourism spots in the area of the Jungfrau – such as: Jungfrau, Jungfraujoch, Jungfraubahn, Konkordiaplatz, Sphinx, Ice Palace, Alpine Sensation and Jungfrau Eiger Walk – hold the first position on Instagram with more than 317,000 posts (on 22 March 2019). Lauterbrunnen follows with more than 270,000, Grindelwald with more than 230,000 and then, Schilthorn and Kandersteg with around 120,000 posts.

Figure 4: The Instagram presence of 13 destination around the SAJA World Heritage site in March 2019 (Sormaz/Ruoss 2020; map source: SAJA Management Centre)
The TripAdvisor map (Fig. 5) shows that the northern destinations of the World Heritage Region are much better represented. The destination on the first position on TripAdvisor is Jungfrau with more than 4,400 reviews (4 April 2019) which corresponds to the results of Instagram. Fafleralp and Raron-Niedergesteln are the destinations with the lowest presence – 123 and 14 reviews (4 April 2019), while spots of Goms have not been reviewed on TripAdvisor.

Compared to Instagram, the TripAdvisor analysis produced much lower numbers. This is due to different platform concepts and targets. The analysis of reviews on TripAdvisor shows the absence of many tourism spots. The number of analyzed spots is 185 out of which visitors reviewed 57. This corresponds to 30.81% of analysed key tourism spots. In particular, high demand has been mentioned for two out of 185 analyzed spots, which are Jungfraujoch and the Sphinx Observatory.

Figure 5: The TripAdvisor presence of 13 destination around the SAJA World Heritage site in April 2019 (Source: Sormaz/Ruoss 2020, map source SAJA Management Centre)

3 Impact of Social Media on Heritage Sites
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Impact of Social Media on Heritage Sites

Communication is traditionally a main tool in destination marketing of heritage sites. In recent years social media have become a key driver in tourism development. The information is available as a worldwide open source and in all major languages. The information from the social media websites is considered by the users as reliable and thanks to the traveler contributions as well as host-guest-guest interactions credible. The visualization is a major criteria and fits to the view from outside, eye-catching for visitors from all over the world.

The power of pictures is well working in destination marketing and has reached its maximum with today’s ICT and social media development. It has been shown that the perspective from inside and outside is highly different. A study on pictures in media communication in the Swiss Alps Jungfrau-Aletsch World Heritage and the Entlebuch Biosphere Reserve has shown that media select photos according to the target groups. Media addressed to local people use pictures with high identification meanwhile those promoting destinations use pictures attracting visitors (Müller 2006, Müller and Backhaus 2007). Hence, the pictures in social media are a very effective instrument to attract visitors.

Especially Instagram focuses on visualization and aims at sharing travel experiences, which is attractive to travelers. Visual content from an outsider’s perspective shared by visitors is mainly about nature, landscapes, mountains, beaches, monuments and cultural heritage. In contrast, an insider’s perspective given by the locals and businesses of the place (e.g. destination marketing organizations – DMOs, hotels, restaurants) is dominating the “activity feeds” on TripAdvisor and Airbnb. The visual content shared by them shows local values such as festivities, traditional events and local food, crafts, as well as indigenous people, and houses.

The investigations show that the role of visual and social media in destination marketing has gained enormous influence on traveler behavior in just one decade. Especially in small heritage sites the booming visitors flow results in impacts to natural and cultural heritage, local economy and population. The targeted or even passive and unexpected publicity through social media or by influencers are almost predestined to launch a mass tourism in short time. Formerly little or unknown sites with insufficient or no tourism infrastructure and business can be overrun by visitors periodically or seasonally, such as Valle Verzasca or Trolltunga. The combination of visual media presence (television, movies, short films or music clips on YouTube) and social media presence can boost sites such as Lago di Bries or Scala dei Turchi.

A series of heritage sites, especially World Heritage sites, have already limited access for tourists or introduced measures improving visitor management. Examples discussed in the world’s media are Hallstatt in Austria, Ibiza in Spain, Machu Picchu in Peru, Maya Bay known from the movie “The Beach” of the Phi Phi islands in Thailand, Komodo islands in Indonesia, Petra in Jordan, Boracay Island in the Philippines or the canyon Fjaðrárgljúfur in Island, famous from the Justin Bieber music video “I’ll Show You”. The risk of becoming famous in a short time or the impacts on natural and cultural heritage from visitors crowds are mostly unpredictable and heritage destination strategies or management plans are often in-existent or badly implemented. Furthermore, benefit for the local population is mostly limited due to the missing tourism business and professional competences, so intercultural conflicts may arise.
In contrast, Venice is a traditional historic city, where fame and tourism increased simultaneously during centuries. Media, books and movies situated in Venice have for a long time created a “must have seen/been” for travelers. The steadily growing tourism sector together with improved transportation and decreasing travel costs have made Venice a top tourist destination attracting tourists from all over the world. In parallel cultural events and cultural institutions have settled in the city on the lagoon island. The increase of visitors is in contrast to the resident numbers, since young people and families are more and more moving to the mainland. In the last ten years the social media presence e.g. on Instagram, TripAdvisor and other travel platforms has boosted tourism even more. Permanent residence houses were smoothly transformed to guesthouses, as made evident on the Airbnb platform. The combination of permanent “City Users” and hit and run tourists have finally resulted in exceeding carrying capacity daily, almost all year (UNESCO Venice Office 2010).

The present development is a continuous upscaling upon a helix. The planned and implemented measures such as tourist tax, people counter, alternative routes, and redistribution of tourists, or fees for day visitors are little effective and have not lead to an improvement and will do so in future. A tourism destination strategy is non-existent, and an updated World Heritage management plan is still under elaboration and will undoubtedly not be effective. They were not shared among political authorities, residents and stakeholders, and responsible governing bodies show little willingness to implement radical decisions (Somers Cocks 2014, 2015). For years, UNESCO has been dealing with the request by its advisory bodies to include the site on the list of World Heritage in danger. Political interference has successfully hindered such a step up to date (Somers Cocks 2016). “Tourism is killing Venice, but it's also the only key to survival” titled an article the situation (Edwards 2017). It looks like a self-organization within a chaotic system is needed to get out of the dilemma. The devastating floods in Venice mid November 2019 will boost again the media presence and consequently the visitor crowds extremely.

The circumstances in Venice nowadays can be a scenario of many other tourism destinations since the phenomena of overtourism or hit and run tourism are matter of long lasting inappropriate management strategies (Heuser Huerta 2017). After opposition from their residents, some have already envisaged measures against mass tourism e.g. Dubrovnik, Amsterdam, Barcelona, Mallorca, Quebec. There is no solution fitting for all, but destinations playing a proactive role in an early stage will certainly be capable to better manage tourist flows.

4 Social Media and Tourism Management in Heritage Destinations
The Instagram and TripAdvisor analyses show the big difference between the northern part and the other slopes of the SAJA World Heritage Region. The World He-
heritage perimeter is almost inhabited. Jungfraujoch and its Sphinx Observatory – an international research station – is a particular spot within the World Heritage property, receiving posts from visitors as well as from scientific professionals.

Good connections of transport make the northern destinations easily accessible and prone to ‘hit and run tourism’. Thanks to the good connectivity, it is possible to visit these destinations in one day from almost any part of Switzerland. Due to high visitor numbers in short periods, the areas of the northern side of the World Heritage property might face negative impacts. Tourism management strategies have been elaborated in the framework of the SAJA management plan to prevent negative impacts on the natural World Heritage site and the local population.

The study showed that social media analysis are effective instruments in visitor management strategies. Numbers of hashtags, posts and reviews are excellent indicators and tools to visualize over- and undertourism destinations in large areas. Due to the continuously changing numbers of hashtags and posts within hashtags, short term visitor flows can be observed. They can be considered as fast and cost-effective and therefore ideal to monitor and forecast tourism developments.

Information regarding crowded places, best visiting hours, availability of parking spaces, closure of restaurants and hotels, or other obstacles can be disseminated on the spot with ICT applications. Considering that 85% of leisure travelers decide about their activities and the tourism spots after arriving at the destination (Think With Google 2019), it is likely that many travelers will choose proposed alternatives in case their first choice is highlighted on the map as crowded at that specific time. Suggestions are offered immediately to the traveler and it will be up to the visitor’s decision whether to visit the place at that particular time or to choose proposed alternative.

Communication through social media is especially useful for undertourism destinations with the need for tourism enhancement. Without social media communication, destinations are running a risk of not reaching their audience and tourism segments. It is crucial to know the target groups to interact with this audience properly. There is no single product to be successful in every destination. Therefore, it is necessary to design and offer products according to the audience destinations want to attract (localization, customization).

There are many destinations without official social media pages. It would be necessary first to create official pages on both Instagram and TripAdvisor (and possibly Facebook) as well as to create hashtags and geotags and to communicate the destinations to potential visitors. Generally, decision on which social media platform to use depends on which segment the destination wants to attract. Instagram is the most used social media platform by Generation Z (Business insider 2019). Reviews posted on TripAdvisor can be used preferably for branding since they give a clear picture on what visitors like the most about a specific destination. Hashtags have to be communicated and destinations should invite visitors to use them. The application of signs, made by artists or artisans, at less visited spots and
viewpoints could be an appropriate way to facilitate the use of the hashtags. To avoid overcrowding at those viewpoints, marks should be moved to other places periodically.

Emotions and experiences are fundamental for travel decisions. Creativity, as an emotional element, can be very successful when applied to destination marketing. Application of different objects can be used to promote less visited spots as well as to increase appreciation of the natural environment. An example is the set-up of a typewriter for three days at a spot with scenic view at the Grand Canyon National Park (2019), which is a very powerful connection between visitors and the environment.

Connecting with social media influencers might be useful for both over- and under-visited areas. These are the people with thousands of followers with a potential to influence their decision-making processes by promoting and/or recommending different products and services.

Storytelling is part of tourism interpretation and could be especially useful for less visited parts of the region. Locals can be involved by telling their story or a legend about the place they live in, to be shared on social media platforms, while at the same time creating sentiment.

The hiking tours in and around the SAJA World Heritage site, are promoted mainly on www.myswissalps.ch. Social Media platforms could be used to spread the tourism activities and to raise awareness on nature preservation simultaneously.

5 Communication and ICT Tools in Heritage Destination Management

ICTs – in particular, mobile technologies – have been considered a good form of assistance to World Heritage sites’ managers in promoting responsible and sustainable tourism. Therefore, ICT solutions are getting instruments to balance visitor flows within the area. In future, more and more travelers will use exclusively smartphones and applications together with social media sources to travel “pre-trip, on-trip and post-trip”. Visualization of travel destinations will increasingly determine the travel behavior and visually oriented travel planning applications will help to choose the most ‘Instagrammable’ places for our trips (e.g. 8xplorer app 2019).

ICT tools and their applications and social media could be used more frequently and effectively to manage both, overloaded and less visited areas and to promote a responsible, sustainable tourism. They could be used to

- raise awareness regarding heritage values and respect towards residents
- improve education and behavior of tourists visiting a heritage site
- promote alternative visits or events in periods of high pressure
- increase communication among local actors and stakeholders from conservation and tourism
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- provide ICT platforms and community WIFI networks to facilitate the interaction among indigenous people, actors, visitors and destination management.

GISs (Geographic Information Systems) offer great opportunities for the development of modern tourism applications planning based on data collections and analysis and especially using maps (Ruoss/Alfarè 2013b; Jovanovic/Njegus 2008). The Carrying Capacity may differ within the territory of heritage sites. GIS-based mobile applications could provide visualizations on contemporary situation on tourism spots, highlighting those in conflict with the Carrying Capacity and offering tourists alternatives. Maps are considered ‘easy-to-read’ and therefore effective and quick tools to interpret the situation.

Overtourism is directly linked to overcapacity in tourism business. Infrastructure fostering quantitative tourism growth should be strictly limited, the quality of visitor experience guaranteed and the benefit of local population assured. Visiting communities, groups and individuals (CGIs) foster social cohesion, which has positive effects on the well-being of people, both residents and visitors (Zagato 2015). Therefore, all actors have to be involved in co-developing of heritage and tourism leading to the creation of a corporate and positive image of destinations.

Strategies should focus on bridging the “destination management perception gap” and create a new paradigm, introducing a “stewardship approach” (CREST 2018). The target of tourism strategies has to seek optimizing tourism, not maximizing it. Responsible tourism has to focus on conservation and protection of tangible and intangible heritage and avoiding negative impacts instead of increasing infrastructure and business attracting even more tourists and boost revenues of investors (Responsible Tourism 2019). New destination evidence based Governance and Management systems should be established. UNWTO (2019) published therefore “Guidelines for Institutional Strengthening of Destination Management Organizations (DMOs)” to facilitate the change processes of destinations with regard to the future challenges of tourism.

UNWTO (2018a, b) elaborated strategic frameworks to better use culture tourism synergies and to fight overtourism, and to improve travel experiences and hospitality in tourism destinations:

- Time-based and geographic dispersal of visitors
- Visitors’ segmentation and alternative visitor itineraries and attractions
- Create experiences that benefit both residents and visitors
- Improve site infrastructure and facilities
- Communicate with and engage local stakeholders and visitors
- Review and adapt regulations, and set monitoring and response measures
- Ensure local communities benefit from tourism

In a Webinar organized by the International Institute of Tourism Studies of the George Washington University, Jonathan Tourtellot presented strategic recommendations for stewardship destinations (GWU 2018):
• Recognize the tipping point: More is not always better. Determine max capacity and monitor social media to determine traveler hot lists.
• Plan ahead: Make tourism part of comprehensive urban, regional and destination planning.
• Stay flexible and adaptable: What works for historic sites does not necessarily work for beach destinations. Needs differ and change over time.
• Rethink good governance and management: DMOs have a vital role to play and need to participate in the sustainable management of destinations.
• Redirect visitors: travel smarter, seek out hidden gems and contribute to the protection of the places.

6 Conclusions
People have never been educated on how to participate in visiting heritage destinations – either natural or cultural. Social media create a platform to educate potential visitors and to promote a picturesque landscape of destinations while at the same time, raise awareness regarding heritage values, preservation and threats to education, and thus delegating responsibility to visitors.

ICT and social media will increasingly play a key role in further boosting tourism, but they should also take a decisive role in changing the paradigm, defining and implementing new destination concepts focused on local evidences as well as quality instead of quantity. Such new “heritage stewardship destination” strategies have to focus on quality tourism and involve all actors in entire decision processes.

Communication can and has to provide tools to lower impact on heritage and to increase the visitors experience simultaneously. The targets of communication should be to improve communication among local actors and stakeholders from conservation and tourism, to increase awareness regarding heritage values and respect towards residents, to improve behavior of tourists visiting a heritage site, and to promote alternative visits or events in periods of high pressure. Communication and ICT tools could provide instruments to improve travel quality, especially with regard to interactions among actors, visitors and destination management.

Media and ICT applications will have significant roles in new governance and management models, supporting the distribution of tourist flows, balancing overtourism, in space and time. It will further help to improve communication among local actors and stakeholders as well as contribute to awareness raising, dissemination of information, and influence tourist behavior. ICT tools may include online platforms for information exchange among actors, smartphone applications or GPS-based and GIS systems for tracking tourism movements and simultaneously informing visitors about limits, obstacles and alternatives before and during their visits.

Over tourism needs to be prevented at an early stage and numbers should be limited at the roots. Technological or smart solutions are important, however they
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will not solve the problem of tourism congestion alone. Social media analyses are effective instruments to balance over- and undertourism. The number of hashtags, posts and reviews are excellent indicators and tools to visualize tourism development. Observing social media presence can be considered as fast and cost-effective, and therefore ideal instrument to monitor and forecast tourism developments.

A changed tourism paradigm has to be based on local evidences, giving priority to those services respecting the values of the place. A “heritage stewardship destination” model, focusing on quality tourism which involves all actors in the decision processes creates added value for locals and visitors, offers opportunities to jointly engage in the conservation of their heritage, to improve their own living standards and experience, and to share equally costs and benefits.
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Can the experience be predictable?

Tourism is a fast-growing industry with an average annual growth of international tourist arrivals of 4.2% (UNWTO 2018). It is expected that tourism flows will grow providing opportunities for cultural heritage development, however, tourism flows also present a risk especially for World Heritage Sites (WHS).

Overtourism is daily life in many WHS leaving negative consequences on all sides involved: on tourists and the quality of their experience, on residents and the quality of their everyday lives, and lastly on culture heritage and its basic existence. The search for meaningful experiences while travelling and discovering new places is a polygon of tourism and leisure practices. Creating a unique ‘spirit of the place’ is a crucial element for tourism destination development. Understanding the heterogeneity and complexities of place-induced experiences and place-creating efforts is vital for understanding the phenomenon of tourism.

The tourist experience has been a research issue since the 1960s (Boorstin 1964, MacCanell 1973) and is still the focus of attention from both sides, tourist supply and tourism demand. Ritchie et al. (2009) consider that the essential publication around the tourism experience was the book by Csikszentmihalyi (1975) which paved the way for research on leisure experience, while Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) brought the experiential aspects of consumption to the study of marketing and consumer behaviour. They moved the marketing community away from the ‘world of products’ into the ‘world of experience’. Different visitors desire different kinds of experiences, and Cohen (1979, 181) defined experience as ‘the individual’s spiritual centre, which for the individual symbolizes ultimate meaning’. For Ryan (1997) tourism experience is a multifunctional leisure activity, involving either entertainment or learning, or both, for an individual.

Pine and Gilmore (1999) made a step forward in the theory of the experience setting up a model of the experience economy which is defined as the fourth phase of the development of economy based on the exchange of experiences. They have upgraded the theory of tourism and travelling assuming that travellers are no longer satisfied with just a visit but wish to consume experiences rather than products, to feel the ‘spirit of the place’. This model influenced the appearance of the Memorable Tourism Experience (MTE). In the last two decades tourism experience thoughts have developed in a few science directions, mostly connected with travel...
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1 Can the experience be predictable?

Tourism is a fast-growing industry with an average annual growth of international tourist arrivals of 4.2% (UNWTO 2018). It is expected that tourism flows will grow providing opportunities for cultural heritage development, however, tourism flows also present a risk especially for World Heritage Sites (WHS). Overtourism is daily life in many WHS leaving negative consequences on all sides involved: on tourists and the quality of their experience, on residents and the quality of their everyday lives, and lastly on culture heritage and its basic existence. The search for meaningful experiences while travelling and discovering new places is a polygon of tourism and leisure practices. Creating a unique ‘spirit of the place’ is a crucial element for tourism destination development. Understanding the heterogeneity and complexities of place-induced experiences and place-creating efforts is vital for understanding the phenomenon of tourism.

The tourist experience has been a research issue since the 1960s (Boorstin 1964, MacCanell 1973) and is still the focus of attention from both sides, tourist supply and tourism demand. Ritchie et al. (2009) consider that the essential publication around the tourism experience was the book by Csikszentmihalyi (1975) which paved the way for research on leisure experience, while Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) brought the experiential aspects of consumption to the study of marketing and consumer behaviour. They moved the marketing community away from the ‘world of products’ into the ‘world of experience’. Different visitors desire different kinds of experiences, and Cohen (1979, 181) defined experience as ‘the individual's spiritual centre, which for the individual symbolizes ultimate meaning’. For Ryan (1997) tourism experience is a multifunctional leisure activity, involving either entertainment or learning, or both, for an individual.

Pine and Gilmore (1999) made a step forward in the theory of the experience setting up a model of the experience economy which is defined as the fourth phase of the development of economy based on the exchange of experiences. They have upgraded the theory of tourism and travelling assuming that travellers are no longer satisfied with just a visit but wish to consume experiences rather than products, to feel the ‘spirit of the place’. This model influenced the appearance of the Memorable Tourism Experience (MTE). In the last two decades tourism experience thoughts have developed in a few science directions, mostly connected with travel...
and tourism *per se*, but also in the field of social studies (behavioural theories) and in psychology, with a view on understanding the cognitive processes that impede individuals from paying attention to their experiences, as well as the conceptual processes of memory formation and retention (Tung/Ritchie 2011). For Li (2000) it is a psychological issue, and the understanding of the experience is connected with intrinsic aspects such as perception, memory, learning and previous experiences. Achieved experiences in tourism are individual and subjective, highly personal and intangible phenomena (O’Dell/Billing 2005) and can be comprised at a cognitive and emotional level. Craig (2009) considers the tourism experience from a sensory level, and Volo (2009) from perceptive and action levels.

The conceptual model of a tourism experience is connected with five phases of travel: anticipation (planning the travel), travel to site, on-site activity, return travel, and recollection influenced by physical and social aspects and products/services (Cutler/Carmichael 2010). Tourism is about the total experience which is the ‘result of a series of specific experience activities’ (Yang 2016, 6) and, as such, the service providers in the destination (tourist and travel agencies, hotels, private initiatives etc.) should recognise this concept. They have to be focused on all phases of travel/experience: before selling in the process of creating the emotions, provocation of the senses and inspire to purchase; after purchase with extra information which can strengthen the expected experience; during the phase of consuming in the form of extra surprise/experience; at the end in the form of emails, birthday cards, invitations to join their websites and social networks, and/or announcing future events/activities/experiences.

The main nucleus for tourist activities is the destination, and nowadays it is generally accepted that tourism destinations present an integrated tourist experience (Leiper 1995, Buhalis 2000, Elbe et al. 2009). It is a concept based on the assumption that visitors are not just bystanders, but that they are looking for enhanced experiences by interacting with local people, cultures and communities; authenticity that speaks of the cultural traditions; emotional connections and cultural merchandise that communicate a *sense of place* (UNWTO 2013). From a supplier’s perspective, a destination is a total product which is the answer to the tourist’s expectations of a total experience (Framke 2002). From the consumer’s perspective, a destination is a comprehensive experience (Buhalis 2000). For Kim and Stepchenkova (2017) destination personality, as an essential element of destination brands, is closely connected to visitors’ experiences and emotions at the destination.

Tourists, especially those involved in special interest tourism, are co-creators of their own experience. They absorb the tourist products and services which they are offered, but they also design their own experiences, adding new values and meaningfulness important for their satisfaction. This coproduction reflects the active participation of the tourist in the final design of the tourist offerings (Frochot/Batat 2013). Zatori et al. (2018, 112) even mentioned experience-involvement as a concept which is defined as ‘personal, real-time involvement in the consump-
tion of a given experience and it is important in the process of the formation of an experience with the service provider. The creation of the experience has to be planned in all details, put into action with trained staff, monitored and evaluated. All mentioned issues have to be a part of the heritage management and destination marketing management.

Experiences are ‘a steady flow of fantasies, feelings and fun’ (Holbrook/Hirschman 1982, 132). It may assume distinct formats or modes, namely ‘amusement’ (something fun and temporary; entertainment in a familiar context), ‘change’ (relax and escape from daily life, monotony or stress), ‘interest’ (search for knowledge, novelty and variety), ‘rapture’ (enchantment/ecstasy, self-discovery, challenge, the unexpected) and ‘dedication’ (search for the authentic, devotion, merge/being absorbed in a ‘back-stage’ world, timelessness) (Elands/Lengkeek 2000 cited in Kastenholz/Lima 2014). Zhang and Xu (2019) introduced a liminal experience which consists of four sub-dimensions: romance and relaxation, chance encounter, sense of loss, and aberration.

Creating a quality visitor experience is a challenging process, requiring cooperation, coordination, communication, and synergy between all stakeholders in the destination, and the whole local community. Tourists nowadays are actively co-creating their own memorable experience with the help of the service provider, who offers a designed experience or tailor-made experience completely dedicated to the customer. Tour guides/leaders are usually the most important providers and creators of the tourist experience, choosing heritage/attractions/events to visit, communicating their values and their meanings for society, for past and present, performing and acting, educating and even entertaining the visitors in real-time. Guides are in direct contact with visitors, face-to-face, helping with any requirements the visitor may have, and as with all good hosts, trying to make the visitor feel that they are not just guests in the city but that they are in a home away from home.

The 21st century is a digital era and an improvement in the presentation and the experience of the history, could also potentially be seen in the form of light shows on the built heritage facades and monuments, including background sound, in the tools and techniques used to propose a new kind of sharing and diffusion of historical heritage. The last touch of the technology and the experience of heritage lies in the development of an immersive device which really gives the sensation of ‘being there’, feeling the ‘spirit of the place’. This can be achieved with anamorphic projections of a historical hypothesis based on 3D scans and documentary sources and using ‘lasergrammetry and photogrammetry to acquire accurate geometry of the building reconstructing of its current volumes’ (Favre-Brun et al. 2012). Digital technology provides inconceivable opportunities to overlay the existing environment into digital context (Jung et al. 2016) and support research in the areas of heritage preservation, allowing windows into the past which enables storytelling of the past (Little et al. 2012).
The tourism experience can be conceptualised as a series of meaningful *chunks* of activity-based events that form the units of perception, action planning, and memory (Zacks/Swallow 2007). Intending to improve the effective management of the MTE in destination Kim et al. (2012) developed a 24-item MTE scale which is comprised of seven domains: hedonism, refreshment, local culture, meaningfulness, knowledge, novelty, and involvement, and can be applicable in every destination. Sthapit (2013) presented the first empirical examination of Kim et al. model, and Coelho et al. (2018) defined three dimensions (personal, relational, and environmental) which appear to be crucial to the MTE. Speaking about creating the MTE for heritage tourism Little et al. (2019, 117) see the potential in ‘immersive technology, such as augmented and virtual reality’.

The new millennium is the era of smartphones, tablets and the internet being a relevant part of daily life. Using the internet, tourists prolong their emotions/experience creating memories and sharing them with others. Therefore, the World Wide Web is a powerful tool which can be used in all phases of the travel experience: the planning phase, travelling, being there, returning, and the recollecting phase.

People have different experiences with the same issues due to objective and subjective reasons. Some people might include the experience as one of the tourist components, but no product can provide an experience, only an opportunity to have an experience. Only the visitor can create the experience based on certain factors. Tourism provides a personal experience, not *only as a touch of the past* but also of the contemporary life and society of others. Experiences are argued to be subjective, intangible, continuous and highly personal phenomena (O’Dell 2007), and typically involve multiple sensations. So, it can be concluded that, at the present time, experience cannot be predicted, but it can be explored which is a very important part of the communication process.

2 Heritage communication

Heritage management at WHS was one of the main topics at conventions and in international legislation during the 20th century, especially in the last decades of the century, due to mass tourism. This certainly does not mean that sites were not managed, but they had to change management tasks in harmony with the new conditions in the environment. The heritage experience is the core of cultural tourism, therefore in WHS the two main aims of heritage management are to ensure the high quality of protection and maintenance of the main heritage attractions, and the high quality of communication of heritage values. The only way to keep culture and heritage alive is through communication (UNESCO 2006).

Nowadays ‘the question is not whether to communicate but rather what to say, how and when to say it, to whom, and how often’ (Kotler/Keller 2012, 475). In the communication process two circles can be identified: internal and external. The internal circle of communication involves all stakeholders directly connected with
the heritage. They can be found in the huge spectrum of different domains of protection and maintenance, tourism, urban planning, in the arts and culture, and similar. The external circle represents the communication of the internal circle with an external environment such as the media and the general public; business partners and suppliers; visitors, travel and tourism intermediaries; donors and sponsors, as well as the other interested parties in the already mentioned issues.

The public policies, the national and local authorities as a part of the internal circle, should include the communication plan in the process of the heritage management. Also, this plan has to include governing with a human potential in destination: visitors of the heritage and an audience on the events; guides, representatives of the local agencies, hotels, restaurants/bars, shops; drivers of the local tourist buses, taxi drivers, and captains/skippers of boats; local media and other presenters/mediators of the image of the destination and its offer.

Heritage communication enables tourists to experience a richer appreciation of the places they visit and they will have a better understanding and acceptance of the conservation of the heritage once they are in the destination. The polygon of heritage communication is education, innovation and creativity, which, in the process of interpreting cultural heritage, produces and enhances tourism as a memorable experience. Visitors to cultural heritage sites are in different age groups, they have different cultural and educational backgrounds, different learning styles, hobbies, living environments and their own specific habitus. Communication with visitors includes primary interpretation of the heritage and also research of the tourist demand so that destination/heritage marketing managers can receive feedback which is needed as a platform for creating the destination development strategies/plans.

Heritage interpretation can be presented in many forms such as physical, digital and documented forms, and can be located *in situ* (on-site) or *ex situ* (off-site) (Bedford 2014). Interpretation of heritage implies the content and the way/methods of presentation depend on the general condition (place, time, object of presentation, target group), and of the knowledge and/or possibilities of the interpreter/presenter/guide to transform tangible heritage in the story/intangible experience. Heritage is often contested and subsequently some element of fiction or storytelling can be essential to articulate both sides of a story to generate a memorable experience. Tourism experiences based on facts are important to heritage education among visitors.

Interpretation *breaths life* to the tangible cultural heritage and has to provide a UNIQUE experience (uncommon, novelty, informative, quality, understanding and emotions (Schouten 2002) as well as ‘emotainment (emotion+entertainment)’ (Klarić/Vince-Pallua 2006, 210). Visitors will feel more related to hosts if they can share the same parts of the past/present, if they feel like they belong to the place, and if they can identify themselves with the place. The experience created in the process of interpretation connecting a local heritage/culture with the visitor’s *habitus* is the main characteristic of modern tourism. The interpretation plan for a cultural heritage
site must be sensitive to its natural and cultural environment, with social, financial, and environmental sustainability among its central goals (ICOMOS 2008, 11).

The second important part of heritage communications is visitor information. Studies on tourist demands are a part of general tourism research. Fields which have to be explored as a priority in the WHS are motives to travel, culture as a motive to travel, socio-demographic profiles of the visitors, as well as tourists’ attitudes, perceptions, motivation, expectations, satisfaction, experience and behaviour, as much as it is available and possible. Tourist demand stimulates and determines the quantity and quality of tourist supply as well as prices on the tourism market. The importance of the received information can be seen in the process of creating the tourist/destination/heritage product, its promotion, its quality, and its placement on the global tourism market.

Part of the visitor’s experience and pleasure of visiting the heritage is education/connection made in the processes of learning about local culture and customs, meeting the residents, being involved in the everyday life of the place, activities, and in cultural events that improve one’s own knowledge and culture capital. ‘Tell me and I will forget, show me and I may remember; involve me and I will understand’ said Confucius (China, 551–479 BC). Whilst travelling to and from the destination and being in the destination, visitors get an overall impression of the place, and what might influence their intention to visit the destination again, or even to become a loyal visitor. It can be a general impression about the experience of visiting, congestion and overcrowding, about the people and the ‘spirit of the place’. It is possible that someone had a motive to visit a destination, had a good experience with everything included in travelling, and even being satisfied, but the impression could be bad or sad, or just not good enough to want to revisit the destination (e.g. there is no shelter for dogs in the destination or the destination does not cater for people with disabilities or similar).

In the 1980s Christian Norberg-Schulz explored the character of places and their meanings to the local residents, stressing that a place means more than merely a location, as there exists a ‘spirit’ which cannot be described by analytical and/or scientific methods (Norberg-Schulz cited in Rifaioğlu/Güçhan 2013). The ‘spirit of the place’ is a historical memory about the atmosphere of the authentic place, uniqueness of the place and ambience, feeling at home, and connecting with residents. It depends on the features of the place and the relationships gained, and the place and its inhabitants, and it is very important for the tourist experience.

Satisfaction is an important attribute which has almost a central position in the marketing issues of consumer behaviour and is associated with the expectations of the visitors/customers. Understanding the satisfaction is useful in improving tourism offerings at a destination in order to sustain destination competitiveness (Yoon/Uysal, 2005). The tourist experience can be considered as a sum of satisfaction of the attributes of the individual services. From that perspective, the tourists who have a special interest to travel and/or a specific motive to visit a particular
destination will probably be more satisfied. It is believed that higher levels of satisfaction with the quality of the experience leads to re-visiting and destination recommendations (Kozak/Rimmington 2000, Moon/Han 2018). Nonetheless the core of the heritage destination marketing is the preservation and maintenance of the heritage but, certainly, the visitor’s satisfaction should not be neglected.

All destinations which intend to attract and pull in visitors and to achieve and/or maintain their high position in the global tourist market have to explore and to hear what their visitors have to say. Without doubt, they are the most relevant source providing information which can be used to create, innovate, enhance and differentiate all products and services; to enhance the value and the quality of the destination product. The two main factors of the quality and success of the modern destination product are quality of all its segments (items and people), and quality of the communication, and the visitor’s satisfaction is the main indicator of its quality and success. (Karamemadovic 2017).

3 Case study – The Old City of Dubrovnik

Dubrovnik, on the Dalmatian Coast, is an important Mediterranean destination, also known as the Pearl of the Adriatic, and is the best-known heritage site and upmarket destination in Croatia. Dubrovnik was an important Mediterranean Sea power from the 13th century to the beginning of the 19th century known as the Dubrovnik Republic (Ragusa), and today is the centre of Dubrovnik-Neretva County. Its breathtaking scenery, the rich cultural and historical heritage, and its outstanding cultural and artistic life attracts millions of visitors each year. The main attractions of Dubrovnik are concentrated inside its medieval walls called the Old City. Dubrovnik celebrated in 2019 40 years since its inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List, and the 10th anniversary of inscribing the Festivity of Saint Blaise, the Patron Saint of Dubrovnik, on the List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. ‘Klapa multipart singing of Dalmatia’, which is also a part of Dubrovnik culture, is also on the List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, as well as the Mediterranean diet, however, this is shared with a few other countries in the Mediterranean basin.

The main event, and for locals the most important, is the celebration of the Day of St. Blaise on February 3rd, and 2019 marked 1,047 consecutive years of celebrating since the year 972. The second most popular event is the Dubrovnik Summer Festival with the living spirit of drama and music. It is held from July 10th to August 25th, and in 2020 the Festival celebrated its 50th anniversary. According to Vtiprhal/Sentić (2018), in third place, as the most popular event, is Night of Museums, followed by concerts of ‘klapa’ and traditional folklore, the Mediterranean fair, New Year’s Eve, the Good Food Festival, the Christmas fair, the Dubrovnik Winter Festival, the Dubrovnik FestiWine Festival, the Dubrovnik carnival etc. Eighty percent of these events do not take place in summer, they are mostly and
deliberately created to attract visitors to come in the low season or even in winter. Also, almost 200 entrepreneurs in the private sector and over one hundred non-profit governmental organisations are active in the sector of culture (Institute for Development and International Relations 2014).

Dubrovnik is perceived as a historic place, full of tangible and intangible heritage, a city of culture, romantic and mystic, exciting and seductive: The narrow streets invite you to discover them, restaurants and little café-bars to be visited, with the aroma of food and drinks waiting to be tasted. But in spite of all its natural and cultural beauty, fantastic atmosphere and ambience, friendly inhabitants, and very long list of famous people who have visited Dubrovnik over the centuries, in the 21st century Dubrovnik has become famous worldwide as King’s Landing from the TV show *Game of Thrones*.

The high rising cliffs and stunning ancient city walls overlooking the Adriatic Sea were the main filming locations in Croatia for King’s Landing, the capital of the Seven Kingdoms in the TV show *Game of Thrones*. During the last few years Dubrovnik and its streets, old port and fortresses have become a popular filming location appearing in the films *Star Wars, The Last Jedi*, and *Robin Hood – Origins*. Although the rising popularity of Dubrovnik is *out of the question* in the present time, the question of the image of Dubrovnik in the future is self-imposed, especially when it is already known that many (younger) visitors have a perception of Dubrovnik as King’s Landing instead of the UNESCO World Heritage Site with its long and respectable history.

The history of hospitality in Dubrovnik can be found in the time of the Dubrovnik Republic when several private restaurants were opened and travellers, merchants, adventurers and many others visitors were settled in private rooms and hosted. The second part of the 19th century brought a more significant number of visitors to Dubrovnik, the first hotels opened their doors, and before World War II Dubrovnik was developed as a relevant touristic place. After this war tourism became a polygon for the economic development achieving high numbers of visitors and high income until the late 1980s. The Croatian War of Independence during the 1990s left terrible consequences on the people, heritage, economy, and of course, tourism. It took more than fifteen years to achieve the same number of arrivals and overnight stays as in the record year of 1986.

In 2017 over 2.8 million visitors were counted in total. In more than 30,000 beds in hotels and private accommodation 1.18 million visitors created over 4.2 million overnight stays. Nautical tourism realised 36,000 arrivals (Dubrovnik Tourist Board 2018). There were almost 760,000 daily visitors from cruisers and charters (Dubrovnik Port Authority 2018) and over 830,000 daily visitors arriving by bus and minibus (Sanitat 2018). Dubrovnik is already facing *Hit and Run* tourism exceeding its carrying capacity during the summer months. Reasons can be found in the number of day visitors (transit visitors, cruise visitors) which very often exceeds 10,000 per day and during the summer months the crowds in Dubrovnik are unbearable.
Dubrovnik is *breaking news* in the summer time in the context of *overtourism* and the traffic problems, but also as one of the world’s best known small cities. The topic ‘carrying capacity’ is very significant, and Ban et al. (2014, 29–30) used the Fuzzy model of the linear programming to work out that in the Old City ‘sustainable carrying capacity with the anticipated degree of load in four peak hours is 12,239 visitors during the morning in the high season’, considering all tourists. The Institute for Tourism in Zagreb (2007) worked out that 7,000 visitors can be in the Old City per day, and UNESCO recommendations are up to 8,000 visitors per day. It will be hard to find a balance between the necessity of the locals, tourist demands and the priorities of the sustainability of the heritage.

The negative impact of the cruise ships and their passengers on the Old City as a WHS was one of the issues of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee in Doha, 2014 dealing with a request for the State Party ‘to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies the Management Plan of the property, including a tourism strategy and legal regulations of cruise ship tourism (Heritage Impact Assessment Study)’ (UNESCO 2014, 31). Although the first phase of the strategy for tourism development and regulations on cruise tourism has been completed, and the first phase initial concept for the Management Plan was completed and adopted by the City Council in August 2017, only minor progress has been achieved with the development of the Management Plan which has not progressed beyond the scoping stage (UNESCO 2018).

The Authorities of Dubrovnik had a meeting in 2018 with the Cruise Lines International Association (CLIA) to discuss the coordination of the demand of the cruisers market and the needs and possibilities of Dubrovnik with sustainable tourism as a basic aim. It was not about the restrictions to the cruises but the governing of the destination and enhancing the quality to all visitors of Dubrovnik. Ultimately, it will have a positive influence on the quality of life in the tourist season and on the maintenance of the cultural heritage. Hence, the Authorities of Dubrovnik brought out an action plan named ‘Dubrovnik – Respect the City’ (2018) with actions which have to be carried out for managing Dubrovnik as the tourist destination as a long term sustainable project.

### 4 Methodology and results of the empirical research

Research of the ‘Experience of the visited cultural attractions/events and Dubrovnik’ is part of the research in tourist demand, and tourist demand is part of the tourism market research. The survey ‘Culture Dubrovnik’ (CD15), was carried out in the low season (September and October) in 2015 in Dubrovnik.\(^1\)

\(^1\) The data was collected for my doctoral dissertation, and in June 2017 I defended my thesis. This is the reason why there is a time delay between the date of the data collection and the time of the manuscript submission. The results of the part of the survey named ‘experience of the visited cultural attractions/events and Dubrovnik’ were not published. The published results from the other parts of the survey have references.
intention of the survey was to explore the cultural tourist demand, primarily the reasons and motives of tourists to visit Dubrovnik (Table 1) and the experience of visiting cultural attractions/events and Dubrovnik itself in the post-season (Table 2, Table 3, Figure 1). As usual the survey included a socio-demographic profile of the visitors and the features of the travel and accommodation.

Table 1: Reasons for going on holiday and the main motive to visit Dubrovnik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for going on holiday</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>The main motive for visiting Dubrovnik</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun/beach holiday</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>Visiting cultural heritage/events</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest/recreation</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>Sun/sea/beach</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/religious</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>New experiences and adventures</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotourism/nature holiday</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>The environment/nature</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting family/friends</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Passive rest and recreation</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Learn about traditional customs/crafts/language</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/wellness</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>It's a place on my cruising/touring</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports-related</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Visiting friends &amp; relatives</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sport/recreation</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prices</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It's not so far from my home</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gastronomy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire also asked the level of satisfaction in an open structure and for suggestions/opinions about missing attractions/events/activities in Dubrovnik… What do you want to do/see/learn? 2) 320 questionnaires were delivered to hotels and private guest houses to be filled in, 211 were finally used for analysis. Subjects were selected using simple random sampling, and day visitors were not included in the research. The results of the experience were not compared with similar research because there is none.

The majority of respondents were in the age group 20–29, 26%; highly educated 74%; they stayed for more than three nights, 76%; their occupation was professional, 37%; they lived in cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants, 60%; it was their first visit to Dubrovnik, 81%; they had come with a ‘spouse/partner’, 55%. These values show that all respondents were cultural tourists, when comparing this data with the main features of the cultural tourists which can be found in ATLAS 2007, (also ATLAS 2008–2013, TOMAS ’08), and partly in tourism related literature. The stratification of tourist demand related to motives for the travel shows that 38% had the main motive ‘visiting cultural heritage/events’ for visiting Dubrovnik and 24% of the respondents took ‘cultural/religious’ holidays (Table 1).

2) The majority of complaints was addressed to ‘missing night life, clubs, parties, activities’. The second highest number of complaints was unkindness, followed by ‘everything is excellent’, ‘not enough information about the history of the City and attractions’ and ‘no place for shopping’ with almost similar values. However, the results of this particular question should be considered with caution because only one third of all respondents wrote anything at all. The fact that caution is needed can be seen just by looking at Table 1 and the rank of the particular statements.
For all these reasons, it was concluded that at least 38% of the respondents could be called ‘heritage tourists’ because they had all the characteristics of culture tourists plus the main motive for visiting Dubrovnik was ‘visiting cultural heritage/events’. The cross tabulation has shown the high level of connection, 49%, between type of holiday ‘culture/religion’ and ‘visiting cultural heritage/events’. The only difference between the ‘heritage tourists’ compared with the ‘culture tourists’ is in the age group which is 60+ for the heritage tourists (Karamehmedović 2017; 2018).

The results of the part of the survey named ‘Experience of the visited cultural attractions/events and Dubrovnik’ shows that almost all statements have been highly rated (Table 2). Tourists were delighted with the cultural attractions/events, the atmosphere, the uniqueness of the experience and ambience etc. in Dubrovnik although for 48% of the respondents the tourism experience should be more authentic. In order to analyse more deeply the experience of the visitors for the purpose of destination/heritage marketing management the statements were sorted and considered from the four aspects of importance: education/connection, ‘spirit of the place’, impression, satisfaction of the visits/place (Table 2, Table 3, Figure 1).

Table 2: Experience of the visited cultural attractions/events and Dubrovnik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>% (Rank)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education/connection</strong></td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have learned a few Croatian words</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned something new/different</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>89(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was involved in some cultural events</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experience has increased my knowledge</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>92(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now I better understand Croatian customs and culture</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spirit of the place</strong></td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the atmosphere of this place</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>92(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness of experience and ambience</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>87(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are lots of interesting things to see</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>93(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that Dubrovnik residents are friendly</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>90(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a lot of fun and entertainment</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tourism experience should to be more authentic</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impression</strong></td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubrovnik is more a heritage than a culture city</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubrovnik is multicultural and international</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend others to visit Dubrovnik</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>95(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to visit Dubrovnik again</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>85(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn't have problems with traffic (cars/people)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This visit has been a memorable experience for me</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>95(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My visit to Dubrovnik has met my expectations</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>92(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supply of food and wines in the restaurants is so various, delicious and staff so kind</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm very satisfied with the quality of the supply of culture</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>87(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Value for Money’</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got exactly what I expected</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was relaxed being here</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>96(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of variance shows that there are no statistically relevant differences between these groups (Table 3). The figure of the analysis of variance shows that education/connection had a little higher level and the satisfaction a little lower level than ‘spirit of the place’ and impression (Figure 1). Education not only as a motif to travel/visit the destination but also as a way of living is usual for the cultural tourists.

Table 3: Experience of the visited cultural attractions/events and Dubrovnik – ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience – groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>-95%</th>
<th>+95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>1.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/connection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>1.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Spirit of the place’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>1.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>1.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>1.176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Experience of the visited cultural attractions/events and Dubrovnik – ANOVA

Research has shown that respondents of the conducted survey were very satisfied with their experiences because the statements connected with the experience have been highly rated (Table 1). So, the conclusion is 1.) the respondents were cultural tourists according to the socio-demographic profile (except for the age group); 2.) the reason for going on holiday ‘culture/religious’ was in second place; 3.) for 38% of respondents the most important motif for visiting Dubrovnik was ‘visiting cultural heritage/events’. Considering all of the above this explains why tourists show up in such big numbers despite the fact that they can expect a crowded location and masses of other tourists. They just want to come to visit the WHS, the Old City of Dubrovnik, and its stones, even though generally the main reason for going on holiday was sun/sea/sand.
It is very important to repeat, and to stress, that 81% of visitors were in Dubrovnik for the first time. According to TOMAS surveys, most of the visitors to Dubrovnik are on their first visit, as well as it being their first time in Dubrovnik-Neretva County. According to the same surveys ‘culture’ as a motive to visit Dubrovnik is always in the first five motives. On the other hand, from the first TOMAS surveys in 1987 until the last one, ‘Summer 2017’, visitors always complain about the lack of ‘night-life, clubs, parties’ and ‘places for shopping’ in Dubrovnik. So, it can be concluded that even when visitors are satisfied with being in Dubrovnik there are still possibilities for improvement.

Speaking about social sciences research there are always some limitations, primarily related to the human factor. But the results of this research can be used in practice processing customer segmentation and market profiling; in creating a tourist product; in designing the tailor-made experience; and as a pillar for heritage/communication plans. There is not enough market research to identify more specific niche products. More research is necessary during the months when the carrying capacity of the city is exceeded as well as in developing the potential of winter visitors.

5 Steps to successful tourism heritage management and marketing

There are concerns for the long-term sustainability of WHS as a tourist destination, especially in the situation of overtourism, so the priority has to be given to the long-term preservation of the existing heritage, as well as its governing. Preservation of the heritage is a part of the heritage communication with all stakeholders and with the visitors in the process of interpretation. Cultural/heritage tourists develop their own culture visiting heritage places and they understand and accept the necessity of the preservation even if they cannot, at that time, visit that particular attraction. Their behaviour on the heritage site is respectful, perhaps even better than residents.

Speaking about heritage management and comparing Dubrovnik with Salzburg, according to Luger/Nayak it seems that some problems are not exclusively reserved just for Dubrovnik. When they write in their article ‘World Heritage – sacramental experience, heterotopia, and sustainable tourism,’ about existing problems in the WHS they conclude ‘there are conflicts almost everywhere’. It can be recognised that some problems in Salzburg and Dubrovnik are the same, such as ‘a great need for a legal framework to avoid destruction or misuse of the heritage’; the need for plans for the ‘responsible use of the architectural heritage’ but also the question of implementing accepted plans; ‘the legislative protection of the heritage is insufficient’; ‘speculation in real estate’ which caused very high prices of real estate in Dubrovnik making it impossible for local residents to purchase real estate to live in. In the case of the Old City in the last two decades it resulted with a
symptom of the empty city. A lot of foreigners have bought houses in the Old City which are used only during the high season. Yet, the last extension of the buffer zone is a double-edged sword. It is hoped that it will stop uncontrolled building but on the other hand might exclude local residents from being able to build/buy a house to live in.

Adoption and implementation of the heritage management plan, including the heritage communication plan, is obligatory for a WHS. There is a necessity to open special training schools for heritage management and provide ample financial resources. It seems that efforts until today have not been sufficient due to inappropriate public policy and the lack of enthusiasm and/or interest by politicians.

Talking and thinking about experiences, especially reading Goa’s problem of the interpretation of the past, it is evident that Dubrovnik has a similar problem. Some respondents complained about the lack of information on the recent past, ex-Yugoslavia and the Croatian War of Independence in the 1990s. Interpretation of these critical periods of time depends on ‘who is telling the story, who is in a position of power to influence the past…and therefore which stories or versions of those stories are told’ (Timothy 2011 cited in Luger/Nayak).

This problem exists because tour leaders/guides come to Dubrovnik from all corners of the world and lack the knowledge to be able to interpret the past of Dubrovnik and explain its history. The Dubrovnik Republic existed for almost 500 years, and to interpret such a long and rich history needs more than just a quick course of a month, or even shorter.

Comparing Dubrovnik with other WHS it performs well in terms of architectural preservation but there is still more valuable architecture heritage such as the old Renaissance villas and palaces with their gardens, the Early Renaissance Aqueduct, buildings, roads, parks and gardens from the periods of the Romans, the French, and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, and the old Austro-Hungarian railway line. There is also the history of the school of paintings from the 15th and 16th centuries, well-known historical events and people, the carnival tradition, myths and legends, as well as the old and rich archives of historical documents, and the general history of the written word.

Managing the cultural heritage, and the systematic maintenance of the heritage, needs to be continuous so that further generations can enjoy and use it (McKercher/Du Cros 2002). A modern approach to the maintenance of the heritage adopted the necessity to manage the cultural heritage as a whole at the same time respecting the uniqueness and needs of each part/object/unit of it. A national cultural valorisation of the unit and the whole is basic for the valuation/use of heritage in tourism. The issues of identification and evidence of the heritage, the methodological conceptualised conservation documentation which can be used in tourism to emphasise and interpret the heritage, and the official protection of the heritage, are still liquid issues, as well as the question of ownership, for many historic houses and other parts of heritage in Dubrovnik.
These issues are also relevant for financing protection, restoration, adoption, maintenance, and conservation of the heritage. There are no signs/marks, for example, on historic houses, villas, stately homes etc., and it is almost impossible to find the UNESCO mark in the Old City. A sign/mark on the heritage implies defined obligations/rights of the owners/national and local authorities in the domain of the maintenance of the heritage as well as the category of the heritage for the use in tourism or its general use.

There is no visitor guidance system or world heritage visitor centre in Dubrovnik. The lack of communication with locals and visitors about issues of the maintenance of the cultural heritage, and similar, is evident, and political support is ad hoc. The special and urban plans are changing ad hoc; the official land register is not adjusted with other official evidences (land zoning and ownership); legislation in all fields connected with a heritage is too complicated; there is no transparency of the information needed for the public to know (it should all be on-line); investments in heritage should be stimulated, not inhibited. The total revenue of the monument annuity in Dubrovnik has to be spent on the maintenance of the heritage, and financial tools (credit lines, the packages of the insurance, tax reductions) allow effective cash flow for the heritage.

All mentioned issues also have to find a place in the heritage management plan for the entire city of Dubrovnik. This plan is in the process and it is expected to include a team of highly educated professionals/experts to manage the site properly. The strategy for culture in Dubrovnik might and should be a very useful and relevant platform for the development of the cultural sector, creative industries and for the governance of the cultural heritage.

Emotional experience is the key to success, innovations and competitiveness, and visitors are seeking authentic and interactive experiences. Service providers, tourist agencies, tour leaders/guides, high and lower class hotels, ethno-hotels and heritage hotels, little family hotels and family farms, are all on the front line to develop an innovative and creative experience and to enable a familiar and intimate atmosphere, feeling the ‘spirit of the place’. Stories about local culture, traditions, identity and generally about the place and living, in the past and now, are best told first hand in immediate contact. The smells and colours of the flowers in the gardens, birds singing, the wind in the hair, the touch of sea water on the skin, are certainly all never forgotten experiences.

Destination marketing has to enable self-sustenance of the cultural heritage, the sustainability of the destination in the long term, and to enhance the well-being of the destinations’ residents. The heritage sites could not be managed separately from the community, synergy between all stakeholders has to be achieved. For Lug-Nayak “a world heritage site is an “open-air classroom”. In the case of Dubrovnik it is an open stage, a place where people come, and will come to see and to be seen, as in former days. It is a question of prestige to visit Dubrovnik, to take coffee on the main street Stradun, to enjoy the warm sea and beauty of paradise,
and as the playwright George Bernard Shaw once said ‘those who seek paradise on Earth should come to Dubrovnik.’
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Dieter Dewulf

A Four-Leafed Clover for Tourism in Bruges, Belgium

Strategic Vision Memorandum 2019–2024

“In terms of tourism, Flanders is taking the first steps in a major transition that will move us away from an ‘experience’ economy and towards a ‘meaning’ economy. The following question plays a central role: how can tourism, the perspective of the visitor, help to ensure that a healthy balance exists within communities between what the residents, the visitors and the entrepreneurs find important? In Bruges, the jewel in Flanders’ touristic crown, this question is posed with particular clarity, and perhaps even greater urgency. Bruges’ new vision of tourism reflects maturity and intelligence, and the city will find a willing partner for its efforts in Flanders Tourism.”

(Peter De Wilde, CEO of Flanders Tourism)

1 Introduction

The world is changing fast, and so is tourism. Tourism in Bruges is due for a new story that anticipates the permanent driving forces behind the successive changes. A story with more than just an economic underpinning. A story based on a strategy where we expressly choose not for ‘more’ but rather for ‘better’, thus also for other than the usual KPI’s (Key Performance Indicator). A positive story that contributes to the well-being of our residents, visitors and entrepreneurs.

We have a number of good examples. Wonderful Copenhagen was the first European DMO (Destination Marketing Organisation) which, with a new strategy, refreshing announced The end of tourism as we know it. Based on the transformative power of tourism, in Travels to Tomorrow the Tourist Office of Flanders is forging the link to a new image of the future. In the meantime, DMO’s are preparing themselves for a future in which their role will be different from that of today. You can read about what is changing in Tomorrow Today, the manifesto of European Cities Marketing, the association of 120 DMO’s from the most important European city destinations, including Bruges.

In Bruges, the effect of all these changes has its very own dynamic, so we aren’t simply doing a copy-paste of what other cities are doing; instead, we are writing our own story. Brief and powerful, custom-tailored to the city, with ambitious goals and clear choices, in line with the city’s policy programme.
The renewed vision sets forth the city’s ambitions with regard to tourism. It offers a foothold for our employees, partners and stakeholders who are involved in implementing the tourism policy. We went through a participatory process together with them. They are our ambassadors to support and help realise the new story, in the interest of our city, Bruges.

2 A snapshot of tourism in Bruges

The economic balance sheet
In 2018, 8.3 million visitors were counted via mobile data in the historical city centre of Bruges. That is one million more than in 2017, and almost two million more than in 2016.

Not all visitors are tourists. Amongst them are 1.2 million day recreationists; these are residents from the 17 surrounding municipalities who visit the city in order to shop and enjoy culture.

The largest group of visitors – nearly 6 million – is constituted by day trippers. According to our definition, day trippers are visitors who come to Bruges from outside of the 17 surrounding municipalities for a recreational purpose and stay here for at least 1 hour. Day tourism in Bruges grew by 13% in one year, and by 36% over two years. A day tripper in Bruges spends an average of € 74.50. Almost half of the day trippers are present in the city between 1 and 3 hours. Day tourism is above all domestic tourism, but the share of foreign visitors is increasing every year. A rapidly-expanding segment within day tourism are the so-called excursionists; this is a specific group that travels to Bruges from a place of stay other than their own residence. Out of the 44% of foreign day trippers, 1 out of 3 is an excursionist. Over the past two years, the number of international excursionists grew by 147% and now amounts to 10% of all visitors coming to Bruges.

In 2018, 1.1 million visitors stayed for one or several nights in the city centre. The overnight tourists accounted altogether for a total of 1.8 million overnight stays. Overnight tourism in the city centre grew in one year by 8% and over two years by 26%. An overnight tourist spends 145€ per person per night. 82% of the overnight tourists are of international origin and 92% visit Bruges for a recreational purpose.

The total turnover of the day and overnight tourism in the centre of Bruges is estimated at 703 million euros for 2018. Around 6,000 people earn their living in tourism. Bruges’ visitor economy is the city’s third most important economic sector.

The social balance sheet
Almost 20,000 residents live in the historical city centre. The number of visitors per 100 residents per day, the so-called crowd index, amounted to 120/100 in 2018.
On 32 days the crowd index came to more than 210/100, the equivalent of the Procession of the Holy Blood, a top day for Bruges.

Despite these high visitor numbers, Bruges residents continue to embrace tourism: 80% acknowledge the importance of tourism for the local economy; 75% find that tourism contributes to maintaining the city’s architectural and historical heritage; 76% support tourism and no fewer than 90% believe Bruges must remain an important tourist destination. Yet Bruges residents are not blind to the potential disadvantages of tourism: 47% fear that affordable living is coming under pressure; one in four finds that tourists can cause a good deal of inconvenience, above all when it comes to traffic. Half of the residents feel constricted in their comfort due to the presence of tourists, and for this reason 66% sometimes avoid the city centre. One third experience the increasing number of tourists as a threat to liveability but, despite this, the vast majority still feel at home in the city. 70% of the residents find that the advantages of tourism more than outweigh the disadvantages.

Despite their high numbers, the city continues to score well amongst visitors, also and above all in terms of friendliness and hospitality. Overnight tourists experience the city as calm, relaxing and cool; day trippers sometimes also experience the city as very “touristic”. With 8.6/10 amongst the overnight tourists and 8.7/10 amongst the day trippers, Bruges nevertheless obtains the highest general satisfaction scores of all of the art cities. But 36% of the day trippers and 29% of the overnight tourists experience certain places as being too busy. Bruges is perceived by visitors as expensive. With 7.3/10 in terms of price-quality, we do less well than the other art cities.

3 Tourism in Bruges in a changing world

Ground-breaking tourism

Today, thanks to globalisation, travel is more accessible than ever. This evolution is particularly visible in Bruges. Never before have more visitors come to the city, and they come from all over the world. Within the 4.4 km² of the ‘egg’ we now count up to three times more visitors than residents during the absolute peak moments. Above all in holiday periods and on the weekends we see them in the same places and at the same times, more and more often for only a couple of hours. Amongst residents, entrepreneurs and visitors there is a growing understanding that city tourism is reaching a limit in terms of carrying capacity. Bruges was far ahead of its time in taking measures to keep the impact of tourism manageable; in the interest of its residents and in the understanding that what is good for residents is also good for visitors. Therefore Bruges is today not at all comparable to the circle of European cities that suffer under a constant excessive pressure of tourism. We wish to keep things that way with smart management, and we can make adjustments as necessary.
The economic paradox

Although the visitor economy in Bruges is doing well in general, it is also vulnera-
bile. Geopolitical, economic and monetary stability is essential for any international
destination that is largely dependent on the leisure segment. External events lead to
capriciousness in the visitor statistics and nervousness on the part of those who live
from tourism. A striving for volumes has always characterised the tourist economy,
as has the related risk that a one-sided offer oriented towards mass tourism can de-
velop. That is not different in Bruges. As a result, the city becomes less attractive
for residents and for visitors who are looking for depth and diversity. Such visitors
are smaller in number, but they have more time to discover and appreciate the city.
And that makes them more interesting, in the macroeconomic sense of the term. It
is imperative to make well-balanced choices so as to sustainably anchor the visitor
economy.

The digital transformation

Few sectors underwent such a rapid transformation as tourism over the past
decade. Driven by new technologies and platforms, a new experience economy has
been able to develop, in which connectivity and interrelatedness between people
play a central role. Today, exchanging and sharing (authentic) experiences takes
place within the group with which one identifies on the basis of one’s own
interests. Moreover, the meaning of travelling is increasingly defined by non-tou-
ristic entrepreneurs. The tourist marketplace has shifted to a new environment,
which puts the model behind the classic business operations under pressure. In
order to remain relevant for our visitors, it is important to understand the
mechanism behind the digital transformation and to develop our local tourism
policy around it.

4 A four-leafed clover for tourism in Bruges – strategic goals

Bruges is unique, a rarity like a four-leafed clover. Ever since the Middle Ages a
four-leafed clover has been regarded as a lucky charm. Comparable to what
tourism has – so far – been for the city. The rapidly-changing world heralds the
end of an age, thus also in tourism. Henceforth the question is no longer what the
city can do for tourism, but what tourism can mean for the city. The framework for
the new vision of tourism is the city’s policy programme with a link to four of the
seventeen sustainable development goals of the United Nations. We retain the
four-leafed clover, but the message is changing.

This is the new central goal

“Tourism in Bruges supports the desired dynamic of the entire city which is balan-
ced, connected, attractive and enterprising. Tourism in Bruges contributes sustai-
nably to the well-being of residents, entrepreneurs and visitors”
We transposed the central goal into four strategic ones.

**Strategic goal 1: Tourism contributes to the Balanced City**

We accompany touristic development in the city. We wish to control its impact. We work in a more focused manner on segments and target groups that are interesting and relevant because of their intrinsic qualities, not merely because of the volumes they generate. We define the success of tourism differently: along with the economic added value, account is also taken of the social added value and the added value for the environment. In this way we keep the support base for tourism high.

**Strategic goal 2: Tourism contributes to the Connected City**

A city that connects people is a city that captivates and inspires. Visitors are our guests, temporary residents of the city. We encourage contact between the temporary residents and the permanent ones. We connect with our visitors in every phase of the visitor cycle. We work to eliminate physical and other thresholds. We write the success story that is tourism in Bruges in collaboration and co-creation with all placemakers: the residents, visitors and entrepreneurs.

**Strategic goal 3: Tourism contributes to the Attractive City**

Bruges is a strong international brand. With what it has to offer in cultural and historical terms, the city speaks to visitors from all over the world. With an open view on this world and with respect for history and tradition, we contribute to a top-quality experiential climate in line with the intended city positioning. There is room for innovation and experimentation here. In this way we put Bruges on the map as a contemporary, surprising cultural destination and we remain top of mind for the visitors we wish to attract.

**Strategic goal 4: Tourism contributes to the Enterprising City**

Tourism in Bruges ensures prosperity. We create a favourable investment climate in which entrepreneurship can sustainably develop itself. There is no place for short-term gain here. We are reducing the impact of external, unexpected events on the tourist economy. The non-entrepreneur as well may be enterprising and benefit from tourism – provided that there is a level playing field for everyone.

5 A four-leafed clover for tourism in Bruges – strategic choices

We use the four-leafed clover to express our ambitions for tourism in Bruges. To fulfil these ambitions, our four-leafed clover needs to be rooted in a rich and fertile soil. The substrate that we prepare is a mixture of seven supplements that we call strategic choices.

**Strategic choice 1: Overnight tourism is a priority**

Everyone is welcome in Bruges, but no specific actions focussed on day tourism will be undertaken. The growth of excursionism is being curbed, while
multi-day, residential tourism is being encouraged. Within the recreational stay segment we are focussing proactively on the individual visitor, while the group market is only being facilitated. Within the business segment the focus is placed on attracting residential congresses, meetings and incentives.

**Strategic choice 2: Smart growth**

We are aiming for qualitative growth in the visitor public (in both day and overnight tourism): we are striving for a prolongation of the length of stay with a view to higher spending, and a higher visitor satisfaction in the hope of increasing potential repeat visits and the inclination to recommend. We are striving for quantitative growth of the residential tourism in the quieter periods (midweek and the low-season months of January, February, March).

**Strategic choice 3: LEISURE and MICE**

Inherent to the first and second strategic choices, MICE and LEISURE are given equal weight in practice.

**Strategic choice 4: Target groups take precedence over target markets**

We are working on target groups that are of strategic importance for the city. In the MICE segment these are companies and organisations that have a link with the economic areas in which the city and region are strong. In the LEISURE segment this is the (cultural) added value-seeker. The intended target groups are present in all geographic markets. Activity in a geographical market is determined by the current and potential share of the intended target group. The choice for the target group always takes precedence over the choice for a market.

**Strategic choice 5: Spread and concentration**

No touristic offer is stimulated outside the core touristic zone that is stressful for liveability in these residential neighbourhoods. However, outside the core zone a wider offer of unique and authentic experiences can be developed, whether temporary or permanent, for visitors who belong to the segments and the target groups that are being actively worked on. We are thus evolving from a tourist concentration to a differentiation model. This model allows the tourist area, where relevant and desirable, to be expanded in a limited and controlled way to other urban quarters inside and outside the city centre. The offer to cities and regions that, in terms of experience, are an extension of Bruges is also being further developed.

**Strategic choice 6: Maintenance of the hotel and holiday accommodations stop**

The selective criteria for new hotels or extensions of existing ones in the city centre remain in effect. The holiday accommodations stop in the city centre is maintained.

**Strategic choice 7: Emphasis on management with directed marketing approach**

We are making a fresh start with the tourism cluster. VisitBruges is evolving into a knowledge-driven management organisation with a directed marketing approach.
6 Action plan 2019–2024

We are operationalising our strategic goals and choices to seven worksites with priority actions. These worksites are linked to the city’s multi-year plan 2019 – 2024 and thus are also decisive for the deployment of people and resources.

Worksite 1: We are accompanying the touristic development by keeping its impact manageable.
- We are carefully monitoring the touristic pressure on the housing market.
- We are maintaining the selective criteria for new hotels or extensions of existing hotels in the city centre (the selective hotel stop).
- We are developing a city-wide vision of lodging development, taking into account the city’s carrying capacity.
- We are expanding the holiday accommodation stop to areas in the sub-municipalities where the residential function is threatened.
- Day tourism in groups outside the core touristic zone is not being facilitated.
- Agreements are being made with the players involved to spread out the visit of cruise tourists in time and space.
- The burdensome forms of tourism contribute financially for using the city.
- The excesses of tourism that lead to nuisances or disrupt the image of the city are being addressed and constrained.
- An action plan is being drawn up to curb the unilateral RECA and shopping offer aimed at tourists and to encourage diversity/authenticity.

Worksite 2: We are implementing the tourism activities with our partners on the basis of a participatory model
- We are creating a broad support base by involving the sector representatives in the monitoring and implementation of the tourism action plans.
- We are meeting the information needs and requirements of the sector via an efficient sector communication.
- We are activating the existing concept of master classes and workshops in order to share and exchange knowledge and experiences with the sector network.
- The touristic database is being developed into a full-fledged sector portal where all relevant sector info can be consulted in a single place and used in own applications.
- With the other art cities we are setting up projects of common interest in the cooperative non-profit association vzw Kunststeden Vlaanderen.

Worksite 3: We connect with our visitors, both physically and virtually, at places and times where they are looking for inspiration and information or are prepared to share them.
- A programme is being set up in order to renew the tourist reception offices and equip them to match the contemporary needs and requirements of the visitors.
- A programme is being set up to communicate with the visitors at other interesting places in the city.
- We are optimising our own online platforms in order to create, manage and share relevant content.
- We are conversing in real time with our visitors via our own online channels and via new interactive applications.
- We are present with relevant content on the most important external platforms and review sites which are frequently consulted by visitors.
Worksite 4: Bruges as a destination is powerfully positioned in the market with the right story, addressed to the right target group, via the right channel at the right time.

Each year an action plan is drawn up and implemented for MICE and LEISURE focusing on the strategic choices and target groups that the city is addressing in priority. Agreements are being concluded with partners for implementation of the action plan. As part of the action plan, Bruges is visually and informatively present in the country’s most important airports.

Each year a separate tourism action plan is drawn up and implemented for the sub-municipalities belonging to the macro-destinations Coast and Bruges Hinterland.

Worksite 5: With targeted actions we are contributing to a top-quality experiential climate that supports the city’s positioning.

We are studying how, via smart technologies, we can increase visitor comfort and better manage visitor pressure. Together with our stakeholders we are setting up a programme to qualitatively upgrade the first-line reception. We are developing and promoting a unique and exclusive offer of in-depth experiences aimed at the individual (cultural) added value-seeker. We are reorienting the Christmas market towards an innovative concept that fits within a broader winter experience.

Worksite 6: We are working on important preconditions for sustainably anchoring touristic entrepreneurship.

Via targeted impulses, partners are being encouraged to work on inclusive accessibility and reduce their impact on the environment. The new Convention Centre is the instrument for transforming Bruges into a MICE destination.

We are submitting our candidacies in an oriented and proactive manner in order to attract events and congresses that support the desired image of the city. The City of Bruges is facilitating the transport that is being organised by the private sector from train stations, airports and seaports to Bruges. The City of Bruges is supporting the development of new routes via West Flemish airports and seaports.

Worksite 7: Via monitoring, research and knowledge exchange we are reinforcing the actions that are being proposed to achieve the policy goals.

We are measuring visitor volumes and are receiving new data that we convert into usable information in order to forecast visitor flows and behaviour. We are participating in studies to understand how residents perceive the touristic development. We are monitoring and investigating how Bruges is perceived by visitors as a destination. We are participating in research to better understand the profile of our visitors. We are measuring the effectiveness of our marketing actions. Tourism Bruges participates in international workshops and networking events in order to keep abreast of the most important trends and developments in tourism. We buy relevant studies and research in order to support our functioning.

The evolution of authorised and unauthorised tourist accommodations is constantly monitored.
7 Where do we want to stand with tourism in Bruges in 2024?

We are refining our ambitions. We are intentionally not speaking of Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) but rather about Tourist Sustainability Indicators (TSI’s). On the basis of five indicators we specify where we, in implementation of our renewed vision, wish to be with our tourism within five years. In 2024…

… Bruges scores higher than the average of the European benchmark cities that participated in the Global Destination Sustainability Index (GDSI). The GDSI is linked to the sustainability goals of the United Nations. It evaluates the performances of destinations on 73 sustainability indicators that are relevant for tourist destinations. For an increasing number of companies and organisations, the score of cities in the GDSI is a decisive criterion for whether or not they wish to hold their meeting or conference there.

… The support base for tourism amongst Bruges residents is at least 76%; this is the percentage that expressed their support for tourism in the most recent Residents Survey (at the end of 2016) conducted by the Tourist Office of Flanders and VisitBruges. The residents survey is being conducted once again in 2019 and will be repeated periodically.

… The Net Promoter Score (NPS) for Bruges as a destination is positive. The NPS expresses the annual score on the question of how likely it is that visitors will recommend Bruges as a destination to family and friends. Via artificial intelligence we know why or why not. Measuring the NPS provides us with valuable information about customer loyalty (in the tourism context, this equates to potential repeat visits).

… The length of stay of visitors has risen, both in the day tourism segment and in the overnight tourism segment. We measure the length of stay via mobile data.

… The customers of VisitBruges give an outstanding score with regard to the provision of services. The customer satisfaction score (CSS) indicates how satisfied our customers are about the services provided by VisitBruges. We map out the underlying reasons via artificial intelligence. Measuring the CSS yields valuable information on customer satisfaction in both a B2B and B2C context.

8 Mission and organisation

Logically, our ambitions are also reflected in the mission and organisation of VisitBruges.
**Mission**

Our mission reads as follows:
On the basis of the city’s core values, we contribute sustainably to the desired urban dynamic which is balanced, connected, attractive and enterprising. In this way we contribute to the well-being of our placemakers (residents, entrepreneurs and visitors). With VisitBruges:

- We are supporting a top-quality experiential climate.
- We are powerfully positioning the international destination of Bruges in the market via the right story, addressed to the right target group, via the right channel at the right time.
- We connect with our visitors, both physically and virtually, at places and times where they are looking for inspiration and information or are prepared to share them.
- We are accompanying the touristic development by keeping its impact manageable.
- We are contributing to making the visitor economy more sustainable.

**Organisation**

The tourism cluster is something of an outsider within the Bruges Group, because the activity is primarily oriented towards a different customer than the residents – and moreover, in an international context. We therefore continue to direct the tourism activity from a separate cluster under the name VisitBruges.

In order to be able to achieve the proposed goals, VisitBruges is evolving from a classic tourist department to a knowledge-driven management organisation with a directed marketing approach, comparable to the fresh start that DMO’s have already taken or are in the process of taking in other European destinations. The core tasks thus continue to lie at the intersection of marketing & sales and reception of the public, but priority is also placed on managing and developing the international destination of Bruges.

VisitBruges works transversally, in the first instance within the Bruges Group (tourism has interfaces with many other policy areas) but also and above all on a city-transcending level in harmonisation with provincial and regional tourism authorities and other urban destinations in our European network. This generates not only fresh insights but also tangible advantages.

Participation and innovation mustn’t be hollow concepts, so we anchor the structural sector consultation in our team architecture and we get outside experts involved in our activity.

Within the tourism cluster we work in the most efficient and effective way possible. Therefore, the non-profit association ‘vzw Meeting in Brugge’ is being integrated into the urban organisation as a newly set up ‘business & events’ department within VisitBruges. The tourism cluster no longer has any separate departments and thus henceforth coincides fully with the DMO VisitBruges. The
digital activity is the binding agent between the teams and a necessary evolution in order to remain relevant for our customers, partners and stakeholders.

The specific dynamic and purpose of the cluster justifies a powerful team composed of employees with specific profiles. Like a well-functioning bicycle chain, every link is important.

VisitBruges has excellent employees with the necessary qualifications, but in order to be able to turn at the desired gear ratio, a number of targeted reinforcements are necessary.

9 Inspired by …

Where did we draw our inspiration from?

A wide range of data, studies and research constitutes the substructure of this strategic vision memorandum. Indispensable sources include: the residents and art cities surveys that we periodically conduct with the Tourist Office of Flanders and the other art cities, current trend and benchmark reports as well as our own visitor information that we acquire via mobile data. We peeked over the walls of Bruges to find good international practical examples within our European cities network. In WES Studie en Onderzoek we found a partner who supported us and did the necessary checks for methodological accuracy.

In any change process, it is important to have your stakeholders at your side. Creating a support base is an intensive, long-term effort, but definitely worthwhile in the end. We initiated our consultation and feedback process with a masterclass to which we invited international experts. We brought the sector representatives and municipal departments together in a feedback group that substantively and editorially accompanied every step in the drafting of the strategic vision memorandum. We organised in-depth workshops with our stakeholders network. In one way or another, no fewer than 47 organisations and municipal departments and a large number of committed employees, colleagues and partners were involved in this co-creative process. We wish to expressly thank them for their inspiring and positive feedback.

The new strategic vision on tourism begins from a profound respect for the city and its residents. We find it important to also give the residents a forum in the renewed tourism policy. This is a challenge that we will take along as a working point during the upcoming period.
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Wider Benefits and Challenges of the World Heritage List Inscription

Case Study of Gamzigrad-Romuliana, Serbia

1 Introduction
The idea of recognizing World Heritage Sites emerged during the 1960s, and officially become part of the UNESCO activities through the adoption of UNESCO World Heritage Convention in 1972. To be inscribed in the UNESCO World Heritage List, properties have to meet several criteria related to the well documented values and importance, buffer zone, plan for conservation, as well management structure and plan. The inscription of a site on the World Heritage List brings increasing touristic activities, international public attention, as well as visibility of the outstanding values of a site. All these issues encourage new academics interested in studying the wider benefits of cultural heritage to socio-economic development, as well as the developmental dimensions of cultural heritage before and after the inscription in the UNESCO World Heritage List. Over the past 20 years, different researchers have examined these benefits in different ways. They studied the role of heritage in urban regeneration (Hospers 2002); sustainable tourism (Chhabra 2009; Pomering et al. 2011; Jimura 2018); strategic planning of heritage protection (Fonseca and Ramos 2012); and the contribution to sustainable development (Landorf 2009).

There are not only positive benefits to World Heritage List inscription. Smith (2002) sees World Heritage status as “a double-edged sword” that may also have negative implications. There are several studies that examine the benefits and issues of World Heritage inscription a wider context in different regions. Leask and Fyall (2006) discuss the participation of different stakeholders in the management of WHSs, visitor management, and the economic contribution of tourists to World Heritage Sites; Harrison and Hitchcock (2005) investigate the interrelation between conservation and tourism; Airey and Shackley (1998) explore how World Heritage status can revitalize local culture and crafts; while Bianchi and Boniface (2002) demonstrate how tourist growth in WHSs can commercialize local craft production. Vareiro et al. (2013) explore how local people perceive the influence of the UNESCO WHL inscription on economic development. He found that nearly 80% local people believe that tourism helps to supply new services to residents. Su and Wall (2014) and Jimura (2007) collected data with similar results. They found that local people perceive more variety of local business activities after the World
Heritage listing, as well as the strong influence of tourism on the improvement of local economic development. In spite of these positive observations, there is no consensus about the wider benefits of World Heritage listing. In 2015, the World Heritage Centre (UNESCO 2015) reported that 20% of WHSs were negatively affected by the impacts of tourism.

This paper is dedicated to explore the wider benefits and challenges of the World Heritage inscription of the archaeological site of Gamzigrad-Romuliana in Serbia.

2 Archeological Site Gamzigrad-Romuliana

There are five World Heritage Sites in Serbia: Stari Ras and Sopoćani (listed in 1979); Studenica Monastery (1986); Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (2004, extended in 2006); Gamzigrad–Romuliana, Palace of Galerius (2007); and Stećci Medieval Tombstone Graveyards (2016).

The archeological site of Gamzigrad-Romuiana is located in Eastern Serbia, near to the City of Zaječar. The site represents Galerius’s fortified palace (III-IV B.C.) with a complex of architectural and spatial buildings for public and private use. The complex is composed of the Emperor’s palace and memorial complex, and it was built with the intention to be the residence of the Emperor Galerius Maximianus after his abdication (for more see: Medić-Čanak 2017). The northern part in the fortification place is dedicated for ceremonial purposes and residence, and the southern part is for public use. Part of the palace is located on the birthplace of Galerius, and the site was also named “Felix Romuliana” after his mother Romula. The memorial complex Magura represents a mausoleum and consecrated monuments erected in the glory of Emperor Galerius and his mother (Stojković-Pavelka et al. 2007). All objects symbolize the ruling program of the tetrarchy and the late Roman concept of imperial symbolism (Institute for protection of cultural monuments of Serbia 2007).

Archeological excavation and conservation of this site started at the beginning of 1950s, after having been declared a cultural site in 1948 (No 407/48). After almost 30 years of research activities and archeological elaboration, Gamzigrad–Romuliana was inscribed as a cultural monument with outstanding properties and a monument of great importance for the Republic of Serbia in 1979 (Official Gazette 14/79). In the 1990s the activities for the preparation of the nomination file for inscription on the World Heritage List started. In the zoning plan for the Republic of Serbia (Službeni glasnik RS br. 13/96), Gamzigrad–Romuliana was recognized as an important heritage site that requires a special planning framework due to its inscription in the World Heritage List. This has resulted in the preparation of the Spatial Plan for the Archeological Site Gamzigrad-Romuliana (Službeni glasnik RS 131/04), and designation of the protection zones and their surroundings. It was defined as zones with degrees I, II and III level of protection.
of archeological sites as well as regimes. In 2005, preparation of nomination file for the WHL started through a public awareness campaign, stressing the universal value of this fortification, and its importance for the national heritage as well as for the world heritage. In the same year, the archeological site was also included in the Priority intervention list within the programme “Cultural and Natural Heritage of South East Europe – IRPP/SAHH” coordinated by the Council of Europe. This programme was created for South-Eastern European countries (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, Romania and Serbia) with the main aim to introduce new professional standards and approaches in the heritage policy, management and rehabilitation of sites. This new approach was focused on using heritage to foster reconciliation and sustainable development. (Mikić, Drača 2014). Through this project, Gamzigrad–Romuliana, as one of priority sites, received the Preliminary Technical Assessment, Feasibility Study and Business Plan for future investment in rehabilitation.

In 2007, Gamzigrad–Romuliana secured the status of World Heritage Site. This contributed to the inclusion of the site into numerous plans at the regional and national level, such as the Master Plan for the Cultural-Historic Route Road of Roman Emperors (2007); Action Plan for implementation of the National Sustainable Development Strategy for the period 2011–2017; Local Economic Development Plan of Zaječar (2010–2014); and the National Tourism Development Strategy for the period 2016–2025. There is a common distinction to all of these documents they all give Gamzigrad–Romuliana a mainly touristic importance, explaining that inscription into the WHL gives it an international visibility and attraction to the site. In addition, one of the ideas is to connect the sites related to the life and work of Roman Emperors who were born and lived in the territory of present-day Serbia. This piece of information makes an essential touristic fascination, since there were 17 Roman Emperors born in the territory of Serbia, and Italy was the only country where more were born (Master plan 2007). This is how the Master Plan for the Cultural-Historic Route Road of Roma Emperors was created, aiming to connect Gamzigrad, Naissus/Mediana, Trajanov most, Dijana, Trajanova tabla and Viminacium. Gamzigrad–Romuliana has a central function therein due to its WHL status and international importance, sacral complex of Magura, but also interesting narratives, such as the life story of Galerius, a boy who rose from a shepherd to become Emperor (for more see: Master plan 2007).

Small and less developed countries such as Serbia, in searching a fast solution for improving their economic situation, see the UNESCO WHL as a magnet for tourism development. Gamzigrad–Romuliana is a very attractive cultural heritage site in Serbia from the tourism point of view. Currently, this archaeological site belongs to the Eastern Touristic Zone of Serbia, with the highest degree of tourism importance. Various programs are organized for tourists and the local population. Until 2007 and the inscription into the List, the archaeological site had been promoted through exhibitions and thematic cultural programs mainly aimed at increa-
Hristina Mikić

sed the knowledge about the site, Galerius’s life, and the Roman era (Živanović 2014, 133). Since its inscription into the WHL several programs have been organized on the spot to promote the idea of Gamzigrad: Antika Fest, dedicated to Roman theatre; the school of Felix Romuliana, dedicated to the promotion of philosophy; classic and rock concerts; the art colony Gamzigrad, inspired by the beauty of the site ambience; a mosaic school with experts invited by the museum to teach youngsters on creating mosaics; and other activities.

After Felix Romuliana was inscribed as a World Heritage Site, the growth of the tourism industry is evident in Zaječar City. There are two types of visitors on the site. The first represents individual tourists visiting the site all year round. The second comprises group visitors, among them a large number of school trips.

Table 1. Number of visits to Gamzigrad, 2001–2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Individual Visits</th>
<th>Group Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15990</td>
<td>1816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3765</td>
<td>22528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3644</td>
<td>18666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4191</td>
<td>18941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5670</td>
<td>18593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5859</td>
<td>23114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7154</td>
<td>23045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>9213</td>
<td>28497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8322</td>
<td>22389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3769</td>
<td>20830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7689</td>
<td>18335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7305</td>
<td>17047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8345</td>
<td>15835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6572</td>
<td>11308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6533</td>
<td>14348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7875</td>
<td>15587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7286</td>
<td>16397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>6689</td>
<td>15780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the period 2001–2019, visitor numbers increased almost 50%. An abrupt increase in visitor numbers was obvious immediately following the inscription on the WHL, confirming an increase in interest in WHL archeological sites. The number of international visitors has been growing constantly year by year. Their share in total number of visits has grown from 7% in 2007 to 28% in 2018.

The management of this site is divided between three stakeholders: The National Museum of Zaječar (responsible for day-to-day management, in cooperation with other local and regional tourism organizations for cultural and tourism promotion); the Archeological Institute of Belgrade (responsible for archeological excavation); and the Republic Institute for Heritage Protection (protection standards, conservation and restoration works).
3 Methodology of Research and Data Collection

In this analysis we started from the assumption that inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List can be expected to have impacts on three main stakeholder groups: residents, visitors and local businesses. Therefore, data is collected from samples drawn from three type of respondents: members of the local community in Zaječar (115 respondents), visitors to the site (100 respondents), and the local business sector (small enterprises and entrepreneurs in creative industries and tourism – 40 respondents).

The aim of the survey was to gain insight into the standpoints and opinions of local population, visitors and the business community on the values and wider benefits of this World Heritage Site and its influence on heritage protection, sustainable development and the quality of life in Zaječar. The research methodology was inspired by the methodology of the Council of Europe and London School of Economics that was developed within the project “Wider Benefits of Investment in the Cultural Heritage in Western Balkans”. The project was implemented in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia in 2013.

The questionnaires distributed to local community members consisted of six questions by means of which we gathered data on the frequency of visits to the sites, perception of its values and benefits of the WHL inscription. The survey was conducted during the local manifestations (“Easter Bazaar” and “Zdravo, domaće, prirodno”) in September 2018 and April 2019. The local community’s sample included persons belonging to the age groups of 45–64 years and they accounted for about 49% of total respondents, whereas 30.3% and 6.6% were persons aged between 25–44 and 18–24, respectively.

The visitor study was conducted by fully-structured interviews and consisted of six questions to gain an insight into motives for the visit as well as their perception of the values and benefits of the site. The survey was conducted in the period March to May 2019, and it included people who visited the archeological site in the previous six months. The majority of visitor respondents (56%) belonged to the age group of 25–46 years, 29% were persons aged between 45–65 years, while 12% were from the age group 18–24. 96% of respondents were domestic visitors.

The business research covered entrepreneurs and associations engaged in creative industries and tourism resident in Zaječar city. This survey consisted of 6 questions related to business’s perception of site values and wider benefits of the WHS inscription on economic development and improvement of business activities. The sample consisted of 40 creative companies and craft entrepreneurs participating in the local manifestation “Easter Bazaar” and the local fair “Zdravo, domaće, prirodno” as well six restaurants recommended for tourists. The research was conducted in the period September 2018 and April 2019. The structure of the business respondents indicates that 67% of them work as individual entrepreneurs,
23% of them are organized in associations and 10% of them as a firms. Nearly two thirds of the respondents have been engaged in business for about 17 years.

Additionally, anthropological valuation analysis method was also used. Anthropological valuation has been done by individual consultations with 35 members of local creative entrepreneurs, tour guides and visitors.

4 Socio-economic Benefits and Challenges of World Heritage Site of Gamzigrad-Romuliana

In order to discover how different stakeholders (local community, visitors and business) perceive Gamzigrad-Romuliana, respondents were asked to describe the ways in which this WHS contributes to the quality of life, development of local community and business, as well about their perceptions of its value.

The majority of respondents (87%) from all three groups visited the site at last once a year and with friends and families (78%). More than two thirds of respondents indicated event attendance and general interest in cultural heritage as key motivations for visiting Gamzigrad-Romuliana. These responses suggested that this archeological site is mostly perceived as a cultural tourism attraction. Many respondents confirmed that their interest in this site grew with the inscription of Gamzigrad-Romuliana on the WHL as well as with its greater promotion as part of the “world” cultural heritage. Thus, the attribute “world” influenced its attractiveness, and the feelings of visitors that by visiting this site they can acquire knowledge about universal values of cultural heritage for mankind as a whole, not just for national culture.

The perception of values of the WHS Gamzigrad-Romuliana includes typologies applied by previous researchers on heritage impacts (De la Torre 2002; Throsby 2012; Bartttlet et al. 2015). In this research they were measured by four elements: social value (increases of social harmony and tolerance), identity value (increases of awareness of the history by the local community), symbolic value (contribution of archeological site to the national heritage identity), and educational value (usefulness in educating people). Respondents were offered a series of statements reflecting different dimensions of heritage value, and they were asked to indicate levels of disagreement and agreement with each of them. The majority of respondents recognized the principal role of Gamzigrad-Romuliana in strengthening identity value (see: Tables 2, 2a and 2b). They predominantly believe that this archeological site creates awareness of the history by the local community.

There are different perceptions of the importance of Gamzigrad-Romuliana between older (the age group 45–65) and younger generations (the age group 18–24). The first respondents group perceives the identity value to be main value of Gamzigrad-Romuliana, while the second group’s viewpoint is that the WHS represents national heritage (symbolic value). There is a higher level of awareness by younger generations concerning the historic importance of Gamzigrad-Romuliana.
They acquired knowledge through media, events, social networks and the internet which is mostly the result of the National museum of Zajecar activities in communicating the importance and heritage values to the local community and broader audiences (Barttlet et al. 2015).

Tourist visitors think that Gamzigrad-Romuliana offers an educational experience (see Table 2b). Such findings correspond to the very common tourist motif to visit archaeological sites, for acquiring new knowledge and education (Crompton 1979; Remoaldo et al. 2016; Oehmichen-Bazán 2018; Vitro Recuero et al. 2011).

### Table 2. Residents’ Perception of the Values of the WHS Gamzigrad-Romuliana (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social value</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity value</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic value</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational value</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: total number of respondents – 115; multiple responses. Source: Survey results. Own compilation.*

### Table 2a. Visitors’ Perception of the Values of the WHS Gamzigrad-Romuliana (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social value</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity value</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic value</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational value</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: total number of respondents – 100; multiple responses. Source: Survey results. Own compilation.*

### Table 2b. BusinessPerception of the Values of the WHS Gamzigrad-Romuliana (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social value</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity value</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic value</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational value</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: total number of respondents – 40; multiple responses. Source: Interviews and survey results. Own compilation.*

The role of cultural heritage as a contributor to sustainable development can be translated into different economic and non-economic benefits, for example: new jobs, new crafts or creative business, attracting tourists and new investment, increase of economic quality of life as well as spill-over effects. We listed heritage benefits in several statements (symbolic benefits – Gamzigrad contributes to a sense of identity and pride in the local community; tourism benefits – Gamzigrad attracts tourists; local business benefits – Gamzigrad helps local business develop-
ment; social benefits – Gamzigrad increases social cohesion and dialogue in local community; investment benefits – Gamzigrad attracts new investment to this area; and recreational benefits – Gamzigrad is useful for recreational activities), and used the Likert five point scale for measuring respondents’ disagreement or agreement with each statement. Results of respondents’ answers are summarized in Tables 3, 3a and 3b, and they show that the perception of all three respondent groups was mostly associated with tourism benefits (78.8%) and social benefits (about 61%).

**Table 3. Residents’ Perception of the Benefits Provided by the WHS Gamzigrad-Romuliana (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of benefits</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic benefits</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism benefits</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local businesses benefits</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefits</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New investment benefits</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational benefits</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: total number of respondents – 115; multiple responses. The type of benefits is adapted from Throsby (2012) and Barttlet et al. (2015). Source: Survey results. Own compilation.*

**Table 3a. Visitors’ Perception of the Benefits Provided by the WHS Gamzigrad-Romuliana (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of benefits</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic benefits</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism benefits</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>57.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local businesses benefits</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>55.60</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefits</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New investment benefits</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>10.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational benefits</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>35.70</td>
<td>25.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: total number of respondents – 100; multiple responses. The type of benefits is adapted from Throsby (2012) and Barttlet et al. (2015). Source: Survey results. Own compilation.*

**Table 3b. Business’ Perception of the Benefits Provided by the WHS Gamzigrad-Romuliana (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of benefits</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic benefits</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>51.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism benefits</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>57.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local businesses benefits</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>55.60</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefits</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New investment benefits</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>10.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational benefits</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>25.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: total number of respondents – 40; multiple responses. The type of benefits is adapted from Throsby (2012) and Barttlet et al. (2015). Source: Interviews and survey results. Own compilation.*

Despite the low level of investment benefits recognized by respondents, WHL inscription of this archeological site confirm certain economic impacts. In group
interviews with creative and tourism entrepreneurs, a connection was noticed between this site and increased local entrepreneurial activities. Around 89% of them stated that the WHL inscription of Gamzigrad-Romuliana and its promotion contribute to the improvement of their economic position. There are two ways Gamzigrad-Romuliana has influenced local entrepreneurs: they benefit from increasing numbers of tourists, and their demand for local products and services. About 90% of representatives of the catering and tourism industry estimate that their turnover has almost doubled since Gamzigrad-Romuliana was inscribed in the World Heritage List. Another improvement of the economy that came with the inscription of Gamzigrad-Romuliana on the WHL is the revival of old crafts, production of souvenirs and other items for tourists such as traditional food. Representatives of the business community agree that their visibility has increased with the promotion of Gamzigrad as the World Heritage Site. Tourism organizations often promote their products as the unique local offer: the authentic local experience of gastronomy, culture and everyday life. At the same time, entrepreneurs estimate that more work needs to be done on networking at both national and local levels, and systematically designed cooperation.

5 Conclusions

The present research identified wider benefits of the WHS for three groups of stakeholders: the members of local communities in Zaječar; creative and tourism entrepreneurs in Zaječar; and visitors of the archeological site Gamzigrad-Romuliana. The research also identified challenges related to the WHL inscription.

The analysis showed different benefits associated with the WHS inscription of Gamzigrad-Romuliana. In the economic sense, wider positive benefits were expressed by business who stressed that thanks to Gamzigrad-Romuliana and tourist visits, their products have become recognizable and local traditional food recommended to other customers. Around 89% of them consider that the WHL inscription and its promotion contribute to the improvement of their economic position.

The role of this archeological site in fostering social dimension of development was recognized in the form of creating awareness of local history, increasing community pride and celebrating the site as an important element of national heritage as well as the common heritage of mankind. The respondents estimate that inscription of Gamzigrad-Romuliana on the WHL contributed to the development of the community, but also to revival of hope, feeling of trust and pride among Zaječar residents.

The findings showed that there are different opinions on how the inscription on the WHL influenced the heritage protection and management. A lack of harmonized legal provisions regarding the management of the touristic area and the management of cultural heritage presents an obstacle to better regulation of these relations.
From inscription on the WHL, the management structure has still been minimal and not supported by adequate financial resources. Touristic and cultural professionals have different views towards further development of this site. The tourism stakeholders believe that inscription to the WHL triggered wider development of this site for tourism purposes, especially since the site is recognized at the international level. They consider that it is necessary to build visitor center hotel infrastructure, and to work on increasing the number of tourists and the length of their stay in Zajecar. Among them is a low level of awareness about negative impact of increased visitor numbers on this site. Cultural and heritage professionals are more cautious concerning tourism promotion of the site. They very often point out the arguments that the site must be thoroughly investigated, and all the necessary protection measures implemented to make it suitable for touristic visits. There is a general agreement between different stakeholders that the management of this WHS needs to be based on the principles of sustainability. While touristic professionals are entirely focused on economic aspects, cultural and heritage professionals perceive these principles primarily from the standpoint of protecting cultural values. The sustainable development dimension of this heritage site is closely related to the above. Although it is based on the use of a holistic approach to tourism and heritage protection management, there is only a small degree of involvement of different stakeholders and community members in these processes. In future, this can create a major challenge for the further development of Gamzigrad-Romuliana.

In order to ensure the sustainable development of Gamzigrad-Romuliana, it is necessary to establish a strong and governance-oriented management system for the site. It should be based on the principles of intersectoral cooperation between tourism, culture, economy, education and science. Such a management needs to harmonize the interests, values and expected benefits of all stakeholders, to utilize the synergic effects, and to synchronize measures for its protection, interpretation and tourism promotion. The private and civil sectors have an important role to play in these processes. Involvement of new stakeholders from local economy and community associations, can add new value to the promotion and interpretation of this site.
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Monica Basile

A New Entrepreneurial Model for Co-planning a “Win-Win UNESCO Experience”

Experiences from Lombardy, Umbria and Trentino/Dolomites, Italy

1 Introduction

Over the last few decades, global tourism has witnessed a significant increase. The 2018 World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) data reports that the international arrivals worldwide reached 1.4 billion (OS1). In addition, a further increase is foreseen, mainly due to some social and economic factors that have occurred in recent times, such as: the increasing number of retired people with economic availability, higher level of education and with more free time for leisure (Baum 1995 in Vanhove 1997); the progress of technology (Bosselman 1999) as well as new forms of media and transportation means; and resulting from the modern global phenomenon of low-cost air travel (Červinka, Švajdov and Tyvka 2014; Basile 2009).

However, this is not just a quantitative phenomenon. We are also facing an evolution in this sector from a qualitative point of view: an ever-higher percentage of tourists have an ever-higher level of education, which means they have a heightened environmental and cultural awareness (Vidal 2008). In particular, the cultural tourist is driven primarily by “the intention to gather new information and experiences to satisfy their cultural needs” (Richards 1996, 24).

Today, even this new tourism has evolved into what experts call “creative tourism”, or tourists who aim to develop “their creative potential through active participation in courses and learning experiences which are characteristic of the holiday destination where they are undertaken” (Raymond and Richards 2000). The overall influence of cultural tourism represents 40% of total international arrivals (OECD 2009) and it is constantly growing (UNWTO 2018 a).

With regards to this we can speak of a new “creative tourist”, whose interests are mainly focused on residents’ habits, customs and lifestyle, identity and narratives, creativity and media, which represent the “intangible heritage”, instead of the more obvious “tangible heritage” of museums, monuments and the historical, artistic and natural beauty of an area (Richards and Wilson 2007, 18).
Intangible heritage represents a great opportunity for the majority of UNESCO destinations, since sustainable tourism products, based on local experiences, can be designed by involving the local entrepreneurial community who act as storytellers to communicate the local traditions to guests.

It can also become an important driving force for the growth and development of local activities and businesses that are usually small and are often struggling economically.

From this point of view, destinations and tourist entrepreneurs should re-design their offers, expanding their attention to the uniqueness of local experiences related to the traditional and innovative “know-how”, which is still immensely undervalued considering its potential appeal.

Both tourists and residents can benefit from this creative tourism, as it contributes to counteracting over-tourism when destinations become overwhelmed by visitors but in turn depopulated by residents, which often leads to the closure of traditional businesses. In this way, World Heritage Site (WHS) status offers destinations a competitive advantage as well as an important driver to foster sustainable local development for the resident population (Vasile 2019). Experiential tourism offers the opportunity to get to know how the local community lives in symbiosis with the WHS, in particular in Natural Heritage Sites, in order to discover the rhythms, the sense of respect and all the knowledge and sensations related to local inhabitants’ lifestyle.

How can we apply these theoretical guidelines in a practical way? This article discusses a new model, the “Win-Win UNESCO Experience”, designed and applied by the author. It is based on the active role that local entrepreneurs can play in partnership with local public-private organizations, to develop strategies during specific capacity-building sessions, which is the core of this business model.

2 Theoretical background

The “Win-Win UNESCO Experience” model is based on several existing applied models and guidelines developed by international institutions – such as the European Union (EU), UNESCO, UNWTO, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and Council of Europe – that look at heritage as a tool for sustainable local development both for WHS destinations and for their local communities. The theoretical references were, first of all, the LEADER approach, a “participatory local development” methodology introduced by the EU to “actively involve local stakeholders in the development of an already identified area” (OS2). Secondly, the “bottom-up” participatory model is used to develop projects by stakeholders through capacity-building training seminars (UNESCO 2013) which stimulate entrepreneurs’ creativity; it is combined with the “top-down” approach used by the local governance (Destination Management Organisations, DMOs), Chambers of Commerce, Employers Trade Associations, and the WHS Manager), in order to
start the innovation process through local entrepreneurs. Finally, inspiration was also taken from the model applied in the UNESCO World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Toolkit (OS3), which enables WHS communities to manage tourism processes pro-actively and focus on the importance of the communication of the uniqueness and authenticity of a site. And lastly, from the model applied in the UNWTO Global Report on Cultural Routes and Itineraries (2015), in the guidelines for DMOs (UNWTO 2019), as well as in the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Goal 17 Partnership through Capacity Building (OS12).

3 The creation of the “Win-Win UNESCO Experience” model

The “Win-Win UNESCO Experience” model has three main objectives: Firstly, to fill the gap of institutional guidelines specifically designed for entrepreneurs who intend to develop sustainable products by enhancing the uniqueness of their destination’s tangible and intangible heritage. Secondly, to achieve one of the UNESCO goals which is “… to change how people travel. Staying longer in destinations, experiencing the local culture and its environment, and gaining a deeper knowledge and appreciation of World Heritage values” (OS4). Thirdly, to introduce a competitive advantage to destination offers based on product-experiences, which include local entrepreneurs who can actively involve guests in their typical activities and, at the same time, benefit from an additional income deriving from it.

The developed model consists of constructing a tourist product-experience or a cultural itinerary based on the UNESCO cultural, natural, landscape heritage – which it is also applicable to creative cites. Both public and private local institutions (including Chambers of Commerce, Employers Association, Local Government and WHS Management) usually finance the introduction of the “Win-Win UNESCO Experience” model as a long-term local sustainable development project. They invite entrepreneurs from different cultural and economic sectors (such as agricultural, artisanal, tourism, fashion, commerce, food and wine, and the media), who are already working directly with aspects concerning the World Heritage universal outstanding value and those who wish to join, to take part in capacity-building training seminars.

Capacity-building is the fundamental part of this model aimed at creating mutual trust and beneficial relationships among public and private stakeholders based on a “win-win partnership”. Furthermore, these training sessions aim primarily at encouraging entrepreneurs to believe in building a tourism product linked to World Heritage and the potential of its attractiveness to visitors. At the end of the training period the relationships that have been created between stakeholders are long lasting and become sturdy networks for future collaboration. Usually, even many years after the training, the alliances between entrepreneurs are still ongoing, and are strengthened by their own momentum and self-motivation (Basile 2018 a).
During these seminars, entrepreneurs start by voluntarily introducing their product and service innovations on an individual level; then, all together, they design one joint destination product that represents the local cultural itinerary based on the World Heritage. Being a World Heritage Site makes a destination a unique attraction to which the entrepreneurs link up their new product-experiences or cultural itineraries, as in a WHS’s brand extension, which includes all the creative entrepreneurial activities of the territory. The “Win-Win UNESCO Experience” tourist products are provided by the most innovative local entrepreneurs, who open their commercial activities and make tourists become “craftsmen for a day” or “explorers of the natural heritage site for a day”.

Basically, the hoteliers are the model’s gateway by promoting the new product-experience to new customers during the low season and inviting them to extend their stay to discover the WHS and all related activities. Thanks to these new activities, hoteliers can increase their number of guests during the low seasons; these guests are keen on trying the experiential offer linked to the sharing of the “traditional and innovative intangible and tangible heritage, handicrafts, productions, and natural heritage”. The model brings additional revenue to local stakeholders, generated by new activity designs (through workshops, visits with food and wine tastings) related to the World Heritage universal outstanding value. It represents a sustainable but profitable model, which actively contributes to keeping destinations alive which would otherwise risk marginalisation; it also gives an innovative contribution to the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in particular to Sustainable Goal 17.9 – multi-stakeholders partnership through capacity-building – by presenting successfully cross-sectoral private-public partnerships, created through capacity building that generate long-lasting sustainable tourism products. In this article, the focus is on the aspects of product creation and its implications both on an entrepreneurial level and on the effects on the territory.

4 Case studies of the “Win-Win UNESCO Experience”

This section will shed light on some practical case studies, designed and developed by the author, in which the theoretical model has been applied to the intangible cultural heritage (food and wine culture), to tangible cultural heritage (both historical and religious), and to natural heritage sites.

The food and wine itinerary “Discover Valtellina” Lombardy, Italy

This case study illustrates the re-launching of the Alpine tourist destination Valtellina, Italy, which was at risk of depopulation due to the shutting down of small family businesses. The main goal was to transfer the traditional local knowledge of the intangible heritage to tourists coming from Saint Moritz – Switzerland – through the Rhaetian Railway in Albula, Bernina Landscape (WHS 2008). The three editions (2007, 2009, 2011) of this four-day training project, financed by the Sondrio...
Chamber of Commerce, allowed 54 entrepreneurs to develop effective commercial networks between the various sectors. They included local food producers (such as wine, cheese, meat, apples, milk, bread and all agricultural alimentary products), traditional craftsmen (mainly stonemasons and carpenters), hospitality workers (such as restaurants, hotels, cafes, wine bars), and retailers (family shops, supermarkets). They all introduced special sales points, called the “Valtellina Corners”, as a means to promote the Cultural Itinerary as one, through direct entrepreneurial actions as well as through marketing strategy financed by the Chamber of Commerce. Basically, tourists have an authentic experience, and in turn generate extra income to sustain agricultural producers who can therefore afford to sustain, for example, the art of dry-stone walling (WHS 2018). An overview of the effectiveness of this training has been clearly confirmed, with the food and wine cultural itinerary remaining very active. This has demonstrated that over 87% of the 54 Corners initiated during the third edition of 2011 are still operational and running under the same business name as in 2018, despite the blow of the recent economic crisis in Italy. According to some qualitative interviews, the turnover has increased from between 40% to 200% for the businesses that took part in the project (Basile 2018 b).

Cultural itinerary “On the Etruscan routes”, Umbria, Italy
The case study shows the process of creating a new product in order to re-launch the off-season period represented by Christmas 2018 in the province of Perugia, characterized by Assisi, the Basilica of Saint Francis and other Franciscan Sites (WHS 2000) as well as the “Longobards in Italy. Places of the Power (568-774 A.D.)” (WHS 2011). The cultural itinerary “On the Etruscan routes” was designed spontaneously by a network of private entrepreneurs who took part in a four-day training course, financed by the Chamber of Commerce of Perugia and carried out by Isnart. The craftsmen (who trade in traditional ceramics, ancient weaving, gold jewellery with the Etruscan technique), the producers (mainly of chocolate, wine and oil) and workers in the service sector (including taxis, city guides and travel agencies) welcomed tourists sent by the tourism sector (including hotels and restaurants), offering them unique experiences such as hand weaving with looms of the 1700s, the creation of Etruscan jewels, the production of personalized cho-

---

1) Source: data provided by the Sondrio Chamber of Commerce during the autumn of 2018. This percentage, however, should be revised upwards, considering that the 13% of registered business “mortality” includes some “take overs” which are not accounted for by statistics, but are in fact an indication of good continuity management

2) Source: data provided by the Sondrio Chamber of Commerce during the autumn of 2018. 80% of the companies participating in the project are individual companies or partnerships, for which it is not possible to draw on the databases of the Chamber’s Business Register, thus making it difficult to estimate quantitative indicators such as the overall increase in local turnover. From the qualitative interviews carried out at the end of 2018 by the author to the entrepreneurs of the case studies, it emerged that the increase in turnover attributable to this action as a pioneer of a series of other structural improvements - is extremely variable and falls within a range of between 40% and 200% over the last 10 years, during a period of widespread economic crisis in Italy

3) Italian Research and Training Institution for tourism, inhouse Agency by The Italian Chambers of Commerce
colate, and the decoration of handmade ceramics. The short-term effectiveness analysis is still ongoing, but at the end of January 2019, in a public event, both hoteliers and craftsmen participating in the project estimated a significant increase of hotel occupancy and in overall revenue (Basile 2019).

The natural itinerary “The Dolomiti Walking Hotels”, Trentino, Italy
This is an in-depth analysis of the case study of the successful sustainable hotel project applied to the hospitality industry located in The Dolomites, a World Natural Heritage Site since 2009 (listed for the aesthetic value of its landscape and for the scientific importance of its geology and geomorphology in dolomitic limestone), since it is included within the national best practices.

Its aim is to give guests the chance to live an extraordinary experience within the local population, who live in a kind of symbiosis with the World Heritage Site. This idea led to the creation of the “Dolomiti Walking Hotels” in 2008, still a very active voluntary network of independent family-run hotels, specialized in hiking, who have developed a long-term relationship with their guests based on the discovery of The Dolomites and their natural heritage.

The Dolomiti Walking Hotels (DWH) project was created by the Hotelier Association (ASAT, Federalberghi Trentino) in order to increase the occupancy during low seasons (in June and September) and to provide an alternative offer to mass tourism. It offers a new tourist product-experience which attracts a new customer target group, the hikers. Hikers are willing to discover the uniqueness of the Dolomites through “slow rhythms”. Thus hoteliers and guests build a long-lasting relationship based on the common passion for the natural heritage site, and the hospitality experience is designed precisely to guarantee that hikers live a full and immersive experience in the WHS. The voluntary network of hoteliers shares respect for the WHS, since the hoteliers are descendants of hoteliers who have lived in the same hotel for several generations and share the commitment in safeguarding and transmitting the values of the natural heritage for the future generations. They are not only mountaineers and mountain guides, but are also involved in local voluntary activities such as the mountain rescue service.

During the capacity-building training, which lasted for one year and was designed and managed by the Marketing and Research Department of the Hotel Association, the hoteliers analysed the needs of current and potential hikers, especially those coming from northern Europe. They compared their hospitality styles, which were already adopted individually, and negotiated a common standard of hospitality for hikers and mountain enthusiasts visiting the Dolomites (Basile 2015). Furthermore, even an inexperienced visitor, who chooses from the three star, three star superior, four star and four star superior Dolomiti Walking Hotels, is “accompanied” to discover The Dolomites with trained employees of the hotel, which additionally offers a library with mountain books and maps and hiking equipment which can be used free of charge.
In addition, hoteliers organize and accompany their clients in three excursions per week, free of charge. Visitors also benefit from the partnerships and facilities developed by the Dolomiti Walking Hotels (DWH) with local enterprises and cultural institutions (for example, with the Museum Ladin de Fascia, hosting the ethnographic collections of the Ladin community, a linguistic minority located in the heart of the Dolomites) (OS5). The “Manual of Hospitality for Hikers” is the result of the high quality standards that the entrepreneurs set themselves, approved by the local government of the Autonomous Province of Trento (OS6), which has acknowledged the Dolomiti Walking Hotels (DHW) as an excellent network for hikers in Trentino.

Overall, it has proven to be a successful project: the average stay, during the summer season, is seven nights and the average overnight cost is higher than the provincial average, being € 90 compared to provincial € 79,7 (for one overnight stay in B&B for two people. The “newcomers” (new guests rather than repeat ones) represent 25% of the total guests who stay over, and the majority of whom find out about the DWH through the internet channel and express particular interest in being “in contact with nature” (Observatory of Tourism 2012). Furthermore, the 2019 guest satisfaction in DHW is high, with an average of 4,54 points out of 5 according to the Trust You4) evaluation (OS7). If we analyse the retention rate of the founding members of the DWH project in its 12-year life span, it can be seen that 43% of them actually decided to leave the DWH Club but were replaced by the new hoteliers who joined. From qualitative interviews with the hoteliers carried out by the author as to why they were leaving the Club, it emerged that the main reason was due to their intention to reposition or relaunch their hotels to different target groups rather than to hikers.

Hoteliers stated that Italian customers, who represent the majority during the summer season, have a low propensity for outdoor physical activities, and they therefore have to invest in different services such as Wellness Centres and Gourmet Cuisine. The phenomenon of the hoteliers’ turnover should definitely be investigated in further studies, as it may highlight the hoteliers’ expectations towards the DWH and their ability to adapt to customer requests.

The hoteliers’ network is therefore based on the principles of sustainable tourism, promoting tourism during the low season, avoiding the use of cars, which are replaced by walking in the mountain, and promoting the intangible heritage through the culinary arts and history. For exactly these reasons, the Dolomiti UNESCO Foundation is backing the project, and the Eurac5) (2013) included it among the good practices of sustainable tourism in the Dolomites, while the Ministry of Italian Economic Development (MISE) included it among its Standards of High Quality projects (OS8).

---

4) Trust You is a global Guest Feedback and Hotel Reputation Software which aggregates all the reviews by customers worldwide www.trustyou.com
5) Eurac: Research Institution of the Autonomous Province of Bolzano, South Tyrol, Italy
5 The repercussions on the local population

This model contributes significantly to achieving the two cultural objectives posed by the UNWTO (2015) regarding the social-economic development and the overall well-being of local populations, while preserving the culture through the social-economic exchange between its community and visiting tourists. During their capacity-building courses, the local entrepreneurs acquire new tools and skills related to marketing and market trends that enable them to further develop their own activities. Moreover, the participants themselves design new creative cultural and tourist experience products that allow the re-launching of both individual activities as well as the destination itself.

The model offers an “experiential product” specifically designed for off-season months when the hoteliers have more available time than during the peak season. They can spend more time for introducing their heritage and develop a solid relationship with their guests. Furthermore, entrepreneurs have the opportunity to increase their net income during the low season.

In addition, the rest of the local population can benefit from this approach. The peculiarity of the “experiential” tourist product attracts motivated tourists who are looking for alternative holiday options compared to the standard relaxing ones at the seaside, on lakes or in the mountains, in which they are no longer simply passive customers, but active and willing to develop a stronger cultural relationship within the destination itself. When the cultural, or creative, tourists have the possibility to choose, they prefer to discover more about what the destination is “hiding”, things that are not necessarily visible or of interest to an average tourist; more specifically, the real life of a community.

Furthermore, local entrepreneurs of small and diverse economic sectors, acquire new skills through continued lifelong learning. The model is of high social value, as stakeholders take up a new social role based on the storytelling of the traditional or innovative “know-how” linked to the intangible heritage WHS towards customers. The positive effects also take into consideration younger generations, mainly by creating new employment opportunities for graduates, for instance the demand of cultural and linguistic mediators, and IT experts for the creation virtual platforms for tourists.

6 Lessons learnt

The results observed so far demonstrate that it is possible to introduce innovation to the tourism sector and offer a better alternative to the existing standards. Entrepreneurs involved in different development projects usually show great enthusiasm and, after the initial training phase, are very proactive and willing to actively take part in the innovative process. This is, in some way, a maieutic process as it brings to light the entrepreneurial and personal potentials of an area that would otherwise...
remain unexpressed, and good product-experience proposals very often come from the local entrepreneurs themselves in a textbook actualisation of the bottom-up model.

All of the above provides an important indicator for the future, because when the local government and the trainers involved are on the same wavelength and understand each other properly, they can together give added value and economic benefit to the trainees. The best practice of the “Win-Win UNESCO Experience” model can then be disseminated in University Master’s Degrees of UNESCO Chair6), and replicated in other destinations. For example, over the past few years, the model of the Dolomiti Walking Hotels received much attention from many other Italian regions: the UNESCO Dolomites Foundation has promoted a seminar in the Dolomites of Friuli Venezia Giulia (OS9), while the Region of Sicily and the Hoteliers Association of Riccione in the sea Adriatico (OS10) invited the Dolomites Hoteliers to provide technical assistance and lectures as a means to illustrate their hospitality model.
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Art History’s ‘Hidden Gems’ as Potential for Visitor Management
A Case Study on World Heritage Regensburg

1 Introduction
“Chaos at the airports, overcrowded destinations: the travel industry is about to choke on its success” (OS1) or “Eight per cent … of all greenhouse gases are produced by travelling” (OS2) – topical headlines in Der Spiegel and Die Zeit which clearly show that tourism has long lost its image of an alleged “white industry” (Euler 1989, 11). What seems to be a rather academic discourse within the scientific community at first, is increasingly affecting travellers in the “age of tourism” (d’Eramo 2018, 10) in a direct way: the once at the turn of the millennium pristine beach in the Seychelles attracts more and more investors; the hype about the best selfie in front of the pagoda in Phnom Penh, that is still outlined as an insider tip in travel guidebooks, is constantly increasing; and “tourists go home”-graffitis are no longer only to be found in European tourism hot spots such as Barcelona or Venice, but also in previously rather unknown destinations like Luang Prabang or Regensburg, which will be discussed in this article.

The cathedral city of Regensburg, once a thriving trade metropolis and political centre of the Holy Roman Empire, is nowadays one of the best preserved medieval cities in Europe and was designated a UNESCO world heritage site in 2006 (Stallhofer 2013). The rich architectural heritage of Romanesque, Gothic and Baroque buildings predominantly escaped the destructions of World War II. Today’s visitors of Regensburg find a largely authentic image of medieval urban culture, that is particularly represented by grand public buildings, bourgeois residences, craftsmen’s houses and important churches and monasteries. The entire ensemble of the “Altstadt Regensburg mit Stadtamhof” (“Historic centre of Regensburg with Stadtamhof”) constituting the UNESCO world heritage site consists of nearly 1,000 buildings.

Meanwhile the city on the Danube has evolved into one of the main highlights in German city tourism, which is represented by constantly rising numbers of arrivals and overnight stays. Especially the cathedral, the Stone Bridge and the historical Wurstkuchl – the world’s probably oldest Bratwurst restaurant – belong...
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The cathedral city of Regensburg, once a thriving trade metropolis and political centre of the Holy Roman Empire, is nowadays one of the best preserved medieval cities in Europe and was designated a UNESCO world heritage site in 2006 (Stallhofer 2013). The rich architectural heritage of Romanesque, Gothic and Baroque buildings predominantly escaped the destructions of World War II. Today's visitors of Regensburg find a largely authentic image of medieval urban culture, that is particularly represented by grand public buildings, bourgeois residences, craftsmen's houses and important churches and monasteries. The entire ensemble of the “Altstadt Regensburg mit Stadtamhof” (“Historic centre of Regensburg with Stadtamhof”) constituting the UNESCO world heritage site consists of nearly 1,000 buildings.

Meanwhile the city on the Danube has evolved into one of the main highlights in German city tourism, which is represented by constantly rising numbers of arrivals and overnight stays. Especially the cathedral, the Stone Bridge and the historical Wurstkuchl – the world's probably oldest Bratwurst restaurant – belong
to the typical must-sees of Regensburg and make a contribution to the positive image of the gateway to Eastern Bavaria. A great number of river cruise tourists that stop at Regensburg on their way to the Black Sea, promotes Regensburg’s position as a tourist attraction. Considering this one can already observe early signals of a rather critical development. Referring to the tourism boom Die Mittelbayerische – one of the leading daily newspapers in Bavaria – asks whether Regensburg has reached the limits of capacity yet (OS3). Thereby the cathedral city follows other tourist sites that were increasingly reviewed critically by locals as well as visitors. Popular destinations suffer from overcrowding, long queues in front of tourist attractions, lasting traffic jams and packed city centres – just to name a few of the symptoms visitors and locals are dealing with worldwide. This phenomenon has meanwhile been labelled as overtourism and is part of a vivid tourism research discourse (Dodds and Butler 2019; Koens, Postma and Papp 2018; Muler, Coromina and Gali 2018; Seraphin, Sheeran and Pilato 2018). According to Kagermeier and Erdmenger (2019) factors, which have encouraged overtourism, can particularly be seen in a new mobility behaviour, the demographic change, individualisation and digitisation as well as in increasing urbanisation that encourages migration from the peripheries to the cities and centres.

At the same time, the importance of tourism is still an increasing economic factor for numerous destinations. Cities such as Regensburg – including its surrounding region – do not want to give up the benefits from tourism and try to appeal to the visitors’ sense of responsibility and guide the streams of tourists via regulations and markings. Facing the tourists’ focus on so-called must-sees other art-historical noteworthy attractions “off-the-beaten-track” somehow were overlooked, although they could give a sensible alternative towards sustainable city tourism (Loulanski and Loulanski 2011). They represent the complete opposite of overtourism, namely undertourism (OS4). But especially these locations off Instagram-worthy photo settings and touristic mass assemblies have the potential of telling (hi-)stories and building relationships to their visitors.

This article presents three well-chosen examples in the UNESCO world heritage site Regensburg that can sensitise to those locations and give a sensible sights off-the-beaten-track alternative and a spatial equalisation of demands by means of an intelligent visitor management. Firstly, the article offers a concise insight into the complex phenomenon of overtourism. Then a succinct overview of well-chosen structures and developments of tourism in Regensburg will be given. Before we present three hidden gems far from traditional must-sees, namely the Kunstforum Ostdeutsche Galerie, the document Neupfarrplatz and the intangible cultural heritage Regensburger Dombauhütte. A separate paragraph introduces main aspects of calculated visitor management within attractive sights.
2 Touristic explosion – the phenomenon of overtourism

Tourism represents an increasing globalised, transnational world like no other sector: as an essential quality of its service tourism not only interlinks supply and demand but pushes the boundaries with innovative technologies concerning transport and communication that let us forget about time and space. As a mass phenomenon tourism is inseparably associated with the 20th century with its specific boom factors such as overall growing prosperity, motorisation and not to forget less working hours (Fabian 2016, Müller 1991, Shaw and Williams 2002). With the implosion of the Warsaw Pact and the fall of the Iron Curtain new customers with enthusiastic interest in travelling redeemed their postulated freedom of movement; emerging countries – such as India or China – constituted an affluent and consuming Middle Class who has been enjoying the benefits of a widely globalised world.

It is quite difficult to reduce these developments to a common denominator. “Probably their common signature is their boundlessness” Bausinger states (1991, 344). “This characterisation allows a distinct differentiation from earlier forms of travelling. Boundless: first of all this refers to the spatial dimension. The percentage growth of travels to non-European destinations is significantly higher than the total growth of travels. While long-distance travels still were a rare exception in the 1970s, they are a strong and obvious part of the colourful offer. The effort of avoiding overcrowded vacation areas by aiming at poorly attended landscapes as well as the laws of market, that push the quest for new profitable objects, bring on the overcoming of vast distances and the tourist development of last reserves.”

Respective developments have been accompanied by more and more deregulated and internationalized financial markets that facilitate not only the acquisition and transfer of foreign exchanges but also the capital procurement of companies. Globally acting, horizontally and vertically integrated travel corporations have become greatly influential in recent years and benefit from this development (Britton 1982, Hall 1996, Suchanek 2001). They are the dominating touristic gatekeepers (Ioannidis 1998) and paradigmatically represent the boundlessness of modern tourism outlined by Bausinger.

The times when the “touristic explosion” was dominated by a widely standardised product – the classical package tour – are over. This can be seen in an ongoing gradual paradigm shift: one might exaggerate but “touristic classics” such as sea, sun, sand and sex or sightseeing, shopping, shows and short break lose some of their appeal in favour of segmentation, specialisation, sophistication and satisfaction (Buhalís 2001, Scherle 2006, Smeral 1996). First of all the progress of individualisation and pluralisation of lifestyles have led to a hitherto unknown differentiation of demands concluding with the motto: Anything is possible! (Boztug et al. 2015, Fayos-Sola and Bueno 2001). This development does not at least happen amid theoretical discourses of a transformation of modernity to post-modernity and its regime change of Fordism to post-Fordism (Ioannidis and Debbage 1998, Menzel
1995/1998, Steinbach 2018). “Thus, it is increasingly seen that, in recent decades, mass tourism business strategies (the Fordian Era of Tourism) – and especially profit-making through economies of scale and the consequent standardization of rigid tourism packages – are giving way to new paradigm shaped by the segmentation of the new consumer demands, new technologies, new forms of business production and management and new framework conditions” (Fayos-Sola and Bueno 2001, 48).

One of the main implications of this highly complex transformation process are mainly hybrid consumption patterns with seemingly unlimited possible combinations. Hennig (2008, 59) strikingly summarised this development in the context of the leading touristic medium, the travel guide: “Hierarchies have been dissolved, everything is cheerfully mixing up: racecourse and opera house, corner pubs and gourmet restaurants, souks and exotic islands, national parcs and festivals. Heinz Winkler meets Michelangelo, the Cairo bazaar is equally rated as the Egyptian Museum, the Alte Pinakothek has no greater importance than the tavern Falsled Kro.” A really colourful and boundless world of travelling, in which the difference to daily life seems to be the only continuing constant to earlier times.

Summing up these considerations experts are nowadays talking of the so-called overtourism (OS5, OS6, Seraphin, Sheeran and Pilato 2018), which – according to McKinsey and the World Travel & Tourism Council (OS7) – is defined by the following characteristics:

- alienated local residents;
- degraded tourist experience;
- overloaded infrastructure;
- damage to nature;
- threats to culture and heritage.

Overtourism not only undermines main pull-factors that influence the demand and choice of destinations such as urban charms, cultural gems and intercultural encounters (Krippendorf 1986), but also implies a creeping agony of widely helpless, partly actionist destinations, as described by d’Eramo (2018, 111) using the ideal-typical example of city tourism: “Glorious, opulent, buzzing cities that had defied centuries, sometimes even millennia of historical changes (...). And which now, one after another, are fading, depopulating, becoming mere theatre backdrops behind anaemic pantomime plays. Where once the pulse of life beat, grumpy, busy people tried to make their way through the crowd, pushing through and stepping on each other’s toes, you see snack bars and the very-same market stalls with their typical products such as little muslin, batik and cotton flags, pareos and bracelets. What was once a wild undertaking, loud, noisy and passionate, is today to be found in the brochures of travel agencies, quiet and still.”
3 An ambivalent success story – tourism in the world heritage site Regensburg

Tourism in Regensburg is booming – the numbers of overnight stays and the relating developments are unambiguous. In 2017, the city's number of guest arrivals in hotels and accommodations (more than nine beds) increased by 2.0 percent up to 626,210. Overnight stays slightly increased by 1.4 percent to 1.1 million. The average stay of guests in Regensburg is 1.8 days. Still the majority of all overnight stays, 76.8 percent, are German visitors. The growth of foreign visitors is above average, mainly from Austria and the USA. River cruise guests play an important role in the touristic life of the cathedral city. In 2016, river cruises on the Danube between Regensburg and Vienna created an overall value of 110.7 million Euros in this area (OS8). As the following Figure 1 shows, the development knows only one direction: upwards.

*Figure 1: Development of cruise trips on the Danube using Passau as an example in the last 10 years (Source: OS9)*

One of the main factors in this context are the booked sightseeing packages with 46 percent of the added value (OS9). If the success of river cruises is continuing, the destination management has to introduce regulations for visitor management and to offer reasonable alternatives. This is where art and culture come to the fore. Small and big festivals, concerts, extraordinary art performances, and first of all art-historical specialities play an important role to complete the experience of the cultural heritage site. Wisely combining attractive offers, interesting exhibitions and top events with a precise visitor management can gain attention, which so far have been of lower interest (Peeters et al. 2018). Otherwise the tourists’ activity
space will be limited to mere economic and functional aims, states Wöhler (2011, 176). Spaces that lack aesthetic or touristic value lose their uniqueness. They only serve as backgrounds or supply lines to the hot spots such as the cathedral, the Stone Bridge or the Wurstkuchl, which rank within the top visitor magnets in Regensburg. Following the opposite direction, the tourist would leave the “ant trail”, sharing it without reflection according to the Keul & Kühberger study (1996). According to them, control and change of the tourist flow will not be achieved by force, bans or sanctions. In fact, it is the offer of alternatives with value which will modify or broaden the tourists’ activity range.

4 Set boundaries – managing touristic points of attraction

Visitor management and guidance are the main factors of avoiding or at least reducing overtourism. Visitor guidance includes all kinds of measures and countermeasures related to spatial and temporal distribution of visitors to affect their behaviour. This concerns the mobility behaviour of tourists on their way to as well as within the destination. The main goal is to avoid or at least to reduce the negative effects on the region. The measures focus on the relief of highly frequented areas as tourists and tourist attraction are bound by a mutual relationship (Kuo 2003). Tourists visit attractions to experience them. Visitor management is firstly designed to protect these attractions from physical damage. The specific implications to avoid in this context are in particular:

- Overcrowding: mainly depends on the capacity of the attraction, physically (e.g. damaging) as well as psychologically (what the visitor is willing to accept to still have a positive experience);
- Wear: mainly depends on the (mis-)behaviour of the visitors (e.g. leaving marked trails, graffiti, thievery etc.);
- High traffic load: traffic jams, pollution caused by emissions, vibration by bus traffic, damages on buildings etc.;
- Reciprocal consequences for visitors and hosts: (in)appropriate attitudes towards natives, awareness and extent of hostility; mutual respect.

Which strategies of tourist guidance do we already have to minimise the complex implications of overtourism? The UNWTO (2018) names 11 strategies, that are dependent on their extent and accentuation predominantly useful in urban destinations and that give a basis for discussion:

- Calculated spatial distribution of visitors in- and outside the city respectively the sensitive site;
- Calculated temporal distribution of visitors, dividing into time slots;
- Stimulating alternative routes aside the “ant trail” and informing about attractions of a hitherto lower rank;
- Regulation if necessary (group size, taxation of platform providers, setting pedestrian zones etc.);
- Addressing target groups (e.g. Best Agers, Silver Surfers, no party tourists etc.);
Visitor management or guidance especially in historical and sensible locations such as UNESCO-world heritage sites is a main instrument to preserve heavily frequented attractions for visitors not only physically, guarantee a positive and sustainable experience and to save the culture and wellbeing of the local population. The aspect of capacity, which is defined as “the number of people visiting the site without causing irreversible damage to its natural and built environment and without decreasing the quality of the experience gained by the visitors” (Agnew and Demas 2013, 35), is of constantly growing interest. The pivotal intention is not to impose restrictions or exclude interested visitors but to optimise the experience of diverse interest groups.

5 Hidden gems as an alternative to must-sees – selected examples

Additional to the classic sights in the world heritage area that can be found in guidebooks and relevant online portals, Regensburg can be proud of having two important art-historical sites – the Kunstforum Ostdeutsche Galerie and the Neupfarrplatz. Beyond this, it has a rich intangible cultural heritage that is worth to be presented more explicitly.

Kunstforum Ostdeutsche Galerie

The territorial boundaries of the cultural heritage site end just a few hundred metres in front of the museum Kunstforum Ostdeutsche Galerie in front of the Jakobstor (see fig. 2).
The museum ensemble consists of two listed historical buildings, a clubhouse from 1659, a former municipal sports hall built in 1871 and several modern extensions from the 1960s (see fig. 3). Located in a rather peripheral area most visitors, experiencing the medieval flair of the cathedral city do not recognize that they are close to a nationally unique art-historical collection with its historical roots in 1966: According to the culture clause of the Federal Expellee Law (§96 BVFG) the gallery is declared a foundation museum with members of the federation and federal states, the municipality and others (e.g. the Federation of Expellees). The uniqueness lies within the museum's mission: to store, explore and teach art and culture of the German population in Middle, East and South-East Europe before World War II including their artistic heritage.

After the German reunification, part of the mission lost its necessity, but the so far acquired artworks still have their importance within the permanent exhibition as representatives of a historical reflection. The museum has started to build up its top-class collection with the help of donations of works by the Künstlergilde Essen and the Adalbert Stifter Association both formed in 1945. Since its opening in 1970, the museum has faced many modifications. Following the foundation mission, the collection was constantly enriched by purchases or prominent permanent loans from the Federation, several institutions, associations or private collectors. Since 2003, East European contemporary art has become one particular focus. The museum's collection consisting of 2,000 paintings, 500 three-dimensional works and 30,000 works on paper is the biggest art museum in the East Bavarian region. The most renowned artists presented in the Kunstforum are Lovis Corinth, Käthe Kollwitz, Sigmar Polke, Oskar Kokoschka, Gerhard Richter and Max Beckmann.
The museum ensemble consists of two listed historical buildings, a clubhouse from 1659, a former municipal sports hall built in 1871 and several modern extensions from the 1960s (see fig. 3). Located in a rather peripheral area most visitors, experiencing the medieval flair of the cathedral city do not recognize that they are close to a nationally unique art-historical collection with its historical roots in 1966: According to the culture clause of the Federal Expellee Law (§96 BVFG) the gallery is declared a foundation museum with members of the federation and federal states, the municipality and others (e.g. the Federation of Expellees). The uniqueness lies within the museum's mission: to store, explore and teach art and culture of the German population in Middle, East and South-East Europe before World War II including their artistic heritage.

After the German reunification, part of the mission lost its necessity, but the so far acquired artworks still have their importance within the permanent exhibition as representatives of a historical reflection. The museum has started to build up its top-class collection with the help of donations of works by the Künstlergilde Essen and the Adalbert Stifter Association both formed in 1945. Since its opening in 1970, the museum has faced many modifications. Following the foundation mission, the collection was constantly enriched by purchases or prominent permanent loans from the Federation, several institutions, associations or private collectors. Since 2003, East European contemporary art has become one particular focus. The museum's collection consisting of 2,000 paintings, 500 three-dimensional works and 30,000 works on paper is the biggest art museum in the East Bavarian region. The most renowned artists presented in the Kunstforum are Lovis Corinth, Käthe Kollwitz, Sigmar Polke, Oskar Kokoschka, Gerhard Richter and Max Beckmann.

document Neupfarrplatz

The Neupfarrplatz is located in the centre of Regensburg’s cultural heritage area. Its ambivalent historical heritage makes sensitive didactic mediations quite difficult for this very special site but with a seemingly will achieved solution up to this day. From 981 until 1519 the today Neupfarrplatz area was the Jewish quarter of Regensburg. It has been destroyed shortly after Emperor Maximilian I.'s death on the city council's order after having expelled the Jewish population. Where you can find today's Neupfarrkirche, Regensburg's first Protestant church, a much bigger pilgrimage church in honour of Mary was initially planned after the design of Hans Hieber from Augsburg. But the project was never completed due to financial difficulties. The square remained architecturally unchanged for decades but it became the scene for several important moments of recent history: a soldier revolt in 1796, the proclamation of the Bavarian Soviet Republic in 1919, the burning of books and the march of the National Socialists in 1933. They were the reason for the construction of a circular bunker and an extinguishing water tank underneath the square in the early days of World War II – a project that destroyed a great part of the historic structure. During the 1970s was not much awareness given to a sensitive restructuring of the square and some historical town houses were demolished in favour of a big new department store complex. As a compromise, the façade of the former municipal police station has been integrated into the
new construction. In 1995, the city authorities agreed on a full redesign of the square. Subsequent actions like archaeological excavations brought spectacular finds to light and led to the conclusion that these exposed discoveries have to be preserved and presented to a public audience. Parts of early Roman cultivation, vaults of the Jewish quarter, the monumental foundation of the Neupfarrkirche and a section of the air-raid shelter of World War II became visible again. Finally, the city government decided to establish the document Neupfarrplatz, a museum-like complex, where visitors can see and experience a set of these historic buildings. Today's visitors enter the document Neupfarrplatz via a quite simple stairway at the north side of the church and a window gives an insight to one of the cellar vaults (see fig. 4).

Figure 4: document Neupfarrplatz (Source: Gerald Dagit, 2019)

Scarcely didactically presented, at least a video documentation with reconstructed images of the Roman and Jewish quarter give instructive insights into the underground history of the city.

Intangible cultural heritage: Dombauhütte Regensburg
Labelled as the “best maintained medieval city”, Regensburg evokes a certain image: the expectation of an unchanged medieval city where everything can be dated to the Middle Ages whose chronological boundaries are more and more...
blurring. Of course, not all of the more than 1,000 monuments of the city can be dated back to the Middle Ages, not in their present nor their original appearances.

The Regensburg World Heritage Centre in the former Salzstadel at the Stone Bridge uses the city’s history and its application as UNESCO cultural heritage site as a starting point for various guided city tours and provides a historical classification by using examples and exhibits from the local museums (facsimiles or medial reproductions). An incentive maybe, but it may also save time and can prevent visitors from entering a museum as they have already seen some objects. Therefore, it might be of importance to highlight intangible cultural heritage and to show its historical roots, like technical and social conditions and subsequent transformations in society. The most recent example (February 2019) is Regensburg’s Dombauhütte, a master school and craftsmen centre for construction, that is now registered best practice-example for preserving vivid traditions and craftsmanship in the nationwide intangible cultural heritage list together with the state-run Dombauhütten in Bamberg and Passau.

Even before starting construction of the Gothic cathedral around 1275, there had presumably existed a Dombauhütte for the preceding Romanesque building. This “Domfabrica” was first mentioned in a historical source of 1266 recording the dispute between the abbot and the priest of St. Emmeram – according to Fuchs (2010) an evidence for a long existing tradition of this craftsmen centre. This exact tradition is carried on by the Dombauhütte Regensburg, which was refounded in modern times not before 1923. “They ensure their cathedrals’ existence by saving traditional knowledge of medieval stonemasonry, offering training places and mediation work and networking with cathedral workshops all over Europe” (OS10).

For the most part the craftsmen still use the same tools and work steps just like their historical predecessors did. At the moment there is no approach for tourists to have a look at their working process nor is their work included in a museum context. One could imagine a transparent manufactory. The Museum of Fine Arts in Ghent made it possible for visitors to attend the restoration of the Ghent altarpiece in this way. This exemplary project was greatly appreciated. Visitors are delighted by getting insights and a glimpse behind the curtain, watching the preservation of the “medieval” cathedral. Hence, the cathedral mirrors a variety of eras and architectural styles and is not at all a witness of pure medieval architecture. It is a complex interface for many other architectural styles of the city.

6 Conclusion

Tourism industry rushes from one record to the next. “Adding up figures”, emphasizes Allmaier (OS5), “you get staggering numbers. In 1950, we counted 25 millions of foreign travels worldwide. In 2000, the figures were 30 times higher. Now we have 1.2 billion. Additionally we have the domestic trips in each country. An immense hustle that makes the migration of peoples look like a shooting club parade.”
Overtourism represents the symptom of a tourism system getting out of control at the expense of a sustainable touristic development. Especially city centres and cultural heritage sites like Regensburg, are victimized by often promoted in travel guidebooks such as Patricia Schultz’ classic 1000 places to see before you die, a so-called bucket-list of destinations a globetrotter has to work off. Responsible tourism entrepreneurs, administrations and NGOs have started taking action against overtourism affected destinations. One potential answer is the implementation of a strategic visitor management, which directs visitors towards less famous sights to regulate tourist flows. The discussed show the enormous potential of hidden gems. The advantages of an appropriate approach are obvious: on the one hand, tourists would not be dissuaded by rigorous measures like limitations of visitor numbers or an increase of ticket prices; on the other hand, it opens up interesting development potentials for sights that have so far led a shadowy existence. Thus could generate often urgently needed new sources of income. Finally, this might motivate visitors to critically question their travel behavior. Wöhler (2001, 45), concludes that at the end it is the tourist himself, who proves the marketability of products and hence becomes “kingmaker” of a sustainable tourism.
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UNESCO World Heritage Site Old Town of Regensburg with Stadtamhof (© M. Ripp)
Introduction

Famous World Heritage Sites such as the Grand Canyon in the USA, the Great Barrier Reef in Australia or Stonehenge in England attract millions of visitors from all over the world every year. In summer 2017, about 5,250 hectares of beech forests in the Kalkalpen National Park and 1,965 hectares of beech forests in the Dürrenstein Wilderness Area were nominated as the first Austrian UNESCO World Natural Heritage Site (Amt der OÖ Landesregierung 2015). Together with 10 other European countries, the UNESCO World Natural Heritage “Old beech forests and primeval beech forests of the Carpathians and other regions of Europe” represents a cross-border network for the protection of beech forests. UNESCO’s aim is to protect such outstanding Natural and Cultural Heritage Sites in order to preserve them for future generations. Typically, the nomination of a UNESCO World Heritage Site leads to greater public awareness, which is often associated with increasing tourist interest. Many of the UNESCO World Heritage Sites have achieved worldwide fame and are intensively visited by tourists. The designation of an area as a UNESCO World Heritage Site inevitably leads to a higher recognition of these destinations, which often automatically results in greater visitation, which is usually associated with a growing interest on the travellers’ side.

In the Kalkalpen National Park region, local people have been familiar with tourism in protected areas over decades. The national park was founded in 1997 and attracts more than 350,000 visitors every year (see table 1). The functions of the national park include recreation activities for the population. Due to an expected increase in visitation after UNESCO listing, the question arises whether the nomination will lead to an additional attractiveness or whether these effects are overestimated and the change in the region will be negligible. Intensive tourism can lead to damage or destruction of the protected World Heritage Site, e.g. due to inadequate planning or improper management. Conflicts in the World Heritage region can also arise when the local population is not sufficiently informed, typical activities are restricted or the protection has an impact on the economic benefit from tourism or other forms of land use. Inappropriate tourism may have negative...
The Implication of UNESCO Natural Heritage Status for Tourism

The “Old Beech Forests” of Kalkalpen National Park, Austria

1 Introduction

Famous World Heritage Sites such as the Grand Canyon in the USA, the Great Barrier Reef in Australia or Stonehenge in England attract millions of visitors from all over the world every year. In summer 2017, about 5,250 hectares of beech forests in the Kalkalpen National Park and 1,965 hectares of beech forests in the Dürrenstein Wilderness Area were nominated as the first Austrian UNESCO World Natural Heritage Site (Amt der OÖ Landesregierung 2015). Together with 10 other European countries, the UNESCO World Natural Heritage “Old beech forests and primeval beech forests of the Carpathians and other regions of Europe” represents a cross-border network for the protection of beech forests. UNESCO’s aim is, to protect such outstanding Natural and Cultural Heritage Sites in order to preserve them for future generations. Typically, the nomination of a UNESCO World Heritage Site leads to greater public awareness, which is often associated with increasing tourist interest. Many of the UNESCO World Heritage Sites have achieved worldwide fame and are intensively visited by tourists. The designation of an area as a UNESCO World Heritage Site inevitably leads to a higher recognition of these destinations, which often automatically results in greater visitation, which is usually associated with a growing interest on the travellers’ side.

In the Kalkalpen National Park region, local people have been familiar with tourism in protected areas over decades. The national park was founded in 1997 and attracts more than 350,000 visitors every year (see table 1). The functions of the national park include recreation activities for the population. Due to an expected increase in visitation after UNESCO listing, the question arises whether the nomination will lead to an additional attractiveness or whether these effects are overestimated and the change in the region will be negligible. Intensive tourism can lead to damage or destruction of the protected World Heritage Site, e.g. due to inadequate planning or improper management. Conflicts in the World Heritage region can also arise when the local population is not sufficiently informed, typical activities are restricted or the protection has an impact on the economic benefit from tourism or other forms of land use. Inappropriate tourism may have negative
effects on nature and people in the protected area (Bushell/McCool 2007), but advantages are also achievable. Additional income generated by tourism in the region can help to guarantee the protection of the site and enhance sustainable tourism development (BRESCE/UNEP 2004).

The still young UNESCO World Natural Heritage Site “Old Beech Forests” of the Kalkalpen National Park aims for a sustainable tourism development, protecting the unique beech forests. This goal will require an adapted visitor management for the Kalkalpen National Park. In order to develop strategies and plans for tourism development and park management, detailed information about its potential guests is required. The study at hand contributes to this challenging task. A target-group oriented planning is likely to satisfy visitors’ needs and support a sustainable tourism development in the region.

2 The study area

The case study, Austrian National Park “Kalkalpen”, is located in the south-east of the province Upper Austria. The protected area is geographically situated between two mountain ranges and the rivers Enns in the east and Steyr in the west, on an area of 20,856 hectares. As one of the largest connected forest areas in Austria, the national park is the sole designated “Forest National Park” in Austria. As the main tree species from montane to highly montane zones, the European or Common Beech (Fagus sylvatica) can be found (Nationalpark OÖ Kalkalpen 2016). The development of the national park in 1997 was a first result of the rejection of various nature-destroying projects by the local population and green initiatives, such as water power plants and infrastructure for military services (Granner 1999, Nationalpark OÖ Kalkalpen 2016, Nationalpark OÖ Kalkalpen 2017a). The mission statement of the Kalkalpen National Park aims to “protect the dynamic wilderness, species-rich habitats and cultural landscapes close to nature over generations” (Nationalpark OÖ Kalkalpen 2017b). Management objectives are defined to protect natural processes, habitats and species as well as to provide recreation, education and information for visitors (Nationalpark OÖ Kalkalpen 2017b). According to the Austrian Federal Constitution, nature conservation falls within the competence of the respective federal province. Nationally significant projects, such as the designation of national parks, are subject to an agreement between the federal government and the federal state concerned. This agreement between the federal government and the province of Upper Austria is laid down in a federal law, which contains the constitution of the park and the regulation for the park management (Verein Nationalparks Austria 2017).
The Kalkalpen National Park attracts around 365,000 visitors every year, with an upward trend (see Table 1) (Nationalpark OÖ Kalkalpen/Nationalparkbetrieb Kalkalpen der ÖBF 2016). Research showed that Austrian national parks have positive influence on the entire region since they increase the awareness, promote a positive, natural image of the region and act as a “label of quality” or a “quality certificate” for tourism (Fleischhacker/Pauer 2001, 126). Currently the park offers an extensive visitor programme, which is also promoted by regional tourist offices (Nationalpark OÖ Kalkalpen 2017c). 310 jobs in the Kalkalpen region can be assured through the national park (Amt der OÖ Landesregierung 2010). The location in the northern limestone Alps and the fact, that it is Austria’s largest protected forest area is their unique selling proposition (USP). The special characteristics are wide forest areas, rugged landscapes, gorges and valleys, numerous springs as well as rare mammal and bird species. The core zone of the national park is characterized by old beech stands. These old beech forests, which are only native to Europe, have been reduced in the past all over Europe and are therefore very valuable. Inside the national park, more than 50 % of the forests are older than 160 years and 75 % can be classified as natural or semi-natural. Forest management in this area was already stopped in 1994, so that a total of 72 % of the area has been designated as “forest wilderness”. In 2000, eight “primeval forest areas” with a size of 37 hectares were identified (Nationalpark OÖ Kalkalpen 2016). The park was created to protect this diverse natural landscape and was the bases for the following protection by UNESCO.

**Table 1: Development of visitor numbers in the Kalkalpen National Park from 1998–2017 (after: Nationalpark OÖ Kalkalpen 2018, 104)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Visitor Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Austria acted as lead partner for the application and coordinated the submission. The World Heritage Site of beech forests will be developed into a pan-European cluster through gradual expansion. In addition to the UNESCO World Natural Heritage Sites “Carpathian beech forests” in Slovakia and Ukraine, which were recognised several years ago and the “Old beech forests of Germany”, further sub-areas of Ukraine and eight other countries (Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Italy, Romania, Slovenia and Spain) as well as the Austrian beech forests were added to the application in February 2015. In July 2017 the UNESCO Commission added all these forests officially to the list of World Heritage Sites (Grossmann 2017a). The formation of a transnational cluster is important, as only these states altogether represent the extraordinary universal value of the European beech forests. This is the only way to ensure that all the essential parts and singularity of beech forests are represented (Panek 2011). The network intends to link the 12 countries mentioned, with the common goal of preserving today’s beech forests for future generations (Grossmann 2017b). Through listing in the UNESCO World Heritage, the Kalkalpen National Park is in charge of a number of additional tasks and challenges in the fields of nature conservation and tourism and has to ensure that the following goals will be achieved:

- preservation of biological diversity,
- sustainable regional development including tourism and recreation,
- communication and education as well as
- research and environmental monitoring (Groenegres 2009).

In addition to the label “National Park”, the label “UNESCO World Heritage” also gives the opportunity to present the region internationally and to gain an increased national and international attention and popularity. Through international awareness and increased interest, the environmental consciousness of the population in the concerned areas can rise. The greater awareness of environmental protection and the income from tourism may support a sustainable development.

Inclusion in the World Heritage List does not imply financial support from UNESCO, as the signatory states of the World Heritage Convention have to provide the resources for administration and management of the site (Hedden-Dunkhorst/Engels 2008). While the well-known Cultural UNESCO World Heritage Sites include architectural monuments, ensembles and large sculptures, monumental paintings and archaeological objects, the Natural Heritage Sites protect natural phenomena. UNESCO World Natural Heritage includes natural monuments consisting of physical and biological phenomena or groups of outstanding universal value for aesthetic or scientific reasons. Geological and physiographic manifestations as well as exact defined areas, which represent the habitat of endangered plant or animal species and are therefore of exceptional universal value for conservation or scientific reasons of the natural beauty (Ringbeck 2009, 69). The listed World Heritage Sites in Austria are based on national protection laws like “Monument Protection Acts” and “Nature Protection Acts” (Perthold-Stoitzner 2011). The re-
sponsibility rests with the Austrian UNESCO Commission, which acts as the national coordination and contact authority (Österreichische UNESCO Commission 2017).

3 Theoretical background

Tourism is one of the fastest growing industries in the world. On average, global tourism is growing at an annual rate of around 4%. With 7% of all travel expenses worldwide, the growth rate of nature tourism is significantly higher and lies between 10% and 30% annually (Eschig 2008). An increasing interest in nature experiences and environmentally friendly services characterize the tourists interested in holidays in the European Alps (Pröbstl-Haider/Haider 2014). For tourism planning in Nature Heritage Sites, it is important to understand which people are interested in such offers. World Heritage guests are usually well educated, spend more money, travel in groups and usually earn a higher average income. This makes them a very interesting target group for tourism planning (Timothy/Boyd 2006, Luger 2008). Poria/Reichel/Cohen (2013) report, that the term “World Heritage” is perceived as a brand or award with positive associations. However, natural sites are seen much more seldom as a value of distinction than cultural sites, since people assume that nature is not related to a human heritage (Poria/Reichel/Cohen 2013). After being listed as a UNESCO World Heritage Site, visitor numbers are often higher than in comparable areas without World Heritage status. However, it is difficult to measure whether the additional visitors came solely because of the World Heritage designation (Buckley 2004). Other studies show that the listing had little to no significant impact on tourism (Huang et al. 2012). For tourism management, the motivation of travellers is of high importance. A visit to a World Heritage Site is associated with an interest in the history of a region or a place. In the related literature, “education” and the desire to “be entertained” are important motives. Poria/Butler/Airey (2004) divide visitors into three groups, according to the expectations of the visit, which correspond to “heritage experience”, “learning history” and “recreational experience”.

In the World Heritage Convention, however, tourism is also regarded as one of the potential risks for conservation of the World Heritage Site (Engels et al. 2011). In 2011, the World Heritage Tourism Programme was initiated to establish a more comprehensive strategy for the sustainable touristic use of World Heritage (Engels et al. 2011). In order to ensure sustainable tourism’s use in World Heritage Sites, sustainability criteria must be taken into account (Luger 2008, Wanner/Pröbstl-Haider 2019). Conradin/Hammer (2016) also point out, that in the long run World Heritage Sites can only be sustainable, if they are socially accepted and economically affordable. In order to support sustainable tourism development in the young UNESCO World Natural Heritage Site “Old Beech Forests” of the Kalkalpen Na-
tional Park, the following case study was conducted. Against this background, the study presented aims to
• understand the term “UNESCO World Natural Heritage” and its meaning,
• analyze the effect that nomination of the beech forests to UNESCO World Natural Heritage might have,
• discuss the effects of the nomination against the current status as national park only,
• explore the potential target groups that will be attracted by the UNESCO World Natural Heritage Site.

4 Methodological approach
In order to understand the awareness and role of the UNESCO World Natural Heritage for visitors and to distinguish the main target groups for the site, we conducted an online survey based on a fully structured questionnaire. The sample was a convenient sample (Henry 1990). A convenience sample is a type of non-probability sampling method where the sample is taken from a group of people, which are easy to contact or to reach. In this case, the questionnaire was addressed to all people that might be interested in the future of the Kalkalpen National Park region and its forests. No further requirements were necessary to fill in the online questionnaire. The link to the online survey was distributed using snowball-sampling from 21st of March to 13th of June 2017 (12 weeks). This approach ensured that not only visitors and “friends of the park” were able to answer but a wider audience (Przyborski/Wohlrab-Sahr 2014, 184). In total 310 completed questionnaires are the basis for the results presented in the following section. The data were analyzed using “R” based on the following statistical tests:
• Pearson Chi2 (frequencies)
• Fishertest (frequencies)
• Binomialtest (frequencies)
• Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon (differences in independent samples)
• Kruskal Wallis (differences in independent samples).

5 Results
5.1 Socio-demographic description of the samples
In the study, 310 respondents participated of which 56 % were female and 40 % male (4 % unknown). A detailed analysis showed, that overall the female respondents were younger (ø 34.31 years) than the male respondents (ø 38.2 years). The majority were Austrian citizens (90 %) with a higher proportion of regional respondents (45 %). The education level of the participants is rather high, almost half of the respondents have a university degree, nearly 20 % have a matriculation exam (“Matura”) and 20 % gained vocational training.
5.2 Awareness of the UNESCO World Natural Heritage

The respondents show an extensive knowledge of UNESCO World Cultural Heritage. However, this knowledge is in contrast to a very limited knowledge about the nominated heritage in the own country. About 77% stated, that they are fully aware what a World Natural Heritage means. However, only 15% had insights in the Austrian nomination of the “beech forests”. The results also show that the respondents were often not able to distinguish between World Cultural Heritage and World Natural Heritage.

5.3 Possible effects of the nomination to UNESCO World Natural Heritage

In order to answer the question whether the nomination might lead to new visitors in the forests, the respondents were asked if they would visit the park in the near future in general and after its nomination. According to our results, due to the nomination the amount of respondents visiting the forests would increase from 20% to 56%. The results underline that the name UNESCO and the nomination alone are likely to increase the interest in visiting the park. When asked about the possible effects of a nomination, 62% of the visitors stated that they expect an increase in visitation because of the new labelling only. However, the majority admitted that they are not aware which tourism offers (such as visitors’ centre or programs for environmental education) are available.

6 Potential target groups

A further segmentation of the respondents revealed five different tourist segments:
- Experienced visitors to UNESCO Natural World Heritage
- Experienced potential visitors to UNESCO Natural World Heritage
- Unexperienced potential visitors to UNESCO Natural World Heritage
- Disinterested visitors in UNESCO Natural World Heritage
- Disinterested potential national park visitors

Segment 1, the experienced visitors are characterized as people who are interested in visiting the UNESCO Natural World Heritage “Old Beech Forests”. They had already visited the national park and other natural heritage sites before. Respondents belonging to segment 1 are typically a bit older. Their main interests include experiencing untouched nature and pristine landscapes as well as hiking and mountaineering. Most of the respondents, who come from the immediate surrounding of the national park belong to this group.

Segment 2, the experienced potential visitors are also interested in visiting the UNESCO Natural World Heritage “Old Beech Forests”, already experienced anot-
her natural heritage but haven’t been to the national park yet. In relation to segment 1, the respondents belonging to this group are a bit younger. They also appreciate untouched nature and pristine landscapes but they also prefer city trips instead. This group includes the most participants with the highest educational achievements.

Segment 3, the unexperienced potential visitors include respondents who are also interested in visiting the UNESCO Natural World Heritage “Old Beech Forests” but they haven’t visited a natural heritage and the national park yet. To enjoy their holidays, this segment of respondents prefers peace and recreation as well as city trips. This group represent the youngest age average (ø 33.2 years).

Segment 4 was designated as disinterested visitors because they are not interested in visiting the UNESCO World Natural Heritage “Old Beech Forests” but they already visited the national park in former times. They prefer hiking and mountaineering like segment 1 and peace and recreation for holidays like segment 2 and 5.

Segment 5, the disinterested potential national park visitors stated, that they are not interested in visiting the UNESCO World Natural Heritage “Old Beech Forests” and are also not national park visitors. This group prefers relaxation and wellness holidays and they are more interested in visiting alpine huts instead of hiking and mountaineering like segments 1 to 4 prefer. Most of them (nearly 99 %) were not aware of the nomination to UNESCO Natural Heritage. For further information and a more detailed comparison of the five different segments, see table 2.

**Table 2: Comparison of different tourist segments 1–5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Segment 1 (n = 50)</th>
<th>Segment 2 (n = 55)</th>
<th>Segment 3 (n = 47)</th>
<th>Segment 4 (n = 59)</th>
<th>Segment 5 (n = 79)</th>
<th>Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex female</td>
<td>46.9 %</td>
<td>77.8 %</td>
<td>74.5 %</td>
<td>34.5 %</td>
<td>60.3 %</td>
<td>significant (p = 7.745e-06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41.7 years</td>
<td>36.5 years</td>
<td>33.2 years</td>
<td>39.9 years</td>
<td>38.5 years</td>
<td>significant (p = 0.0203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: university degree</td>
<td>46.0 %</td>
<td>70.9 %</td>
<td>48.9 %</td>
<td>30.5 %</td>
<td>51.9 %</td>
<td>significant (p = 0.0012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest motivation: “nature”</td>
<td>82.0 %</td>
<td>64.0 %</td>
<td>49.0 %</td>
<td>51.0 %</td>
<td>35.0 %</td>
<td>significant (p = 6.125e-06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest motivation: “relaxing”</td>
<td>64.0 %</td>
<td>58.0 %</td>
<td>60.0 %</td>
<td>54.0 %</td>
<td>57.0 %</td>
<td>not significant (p = 0.8849)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred holiday type</td>
<td>84.0 % hiking/mountaineering</td>
<td>84.0 % city trips</td>
<td>87.0 % city trips</td>
<td>78.0 % hiking/mountaineering</td>
<td>67.0 % relaxation/wellness</td>
<td>no test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See the world heritage as an added value for the region</td>
<td>50.0 % rather yes</td>
<td>54.5 % yes</td>
<td>61.7 % yes</td>
<td>59.3 % rather yes</td>
<td>51.9 % rather yes</td>
<td>significant (p = 9.999e-05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade-off: protection &gt; economic development</td>
<td>68.0 %</td>
<td>56.0 %</td>
<td>49.0 %</td>
<td>34.0 %</td>
<td>49.0 %</td>
<td>significant (p = 0.006799)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings also confirm existing knowledge about the main target groups. The study shows, that the surveyed persons poorly differentiate between the two types of nomination, namely UNESCO World Natural Heritage and UNESCO World Cultural Heritage. Only 77 % knew the term “UNESCO World Natural Heritage”, but the following questions showed their misunderstanding of the topic. About 12 % directly mixed up the concept of Cultural Heritage and Natural Heritage. Only 77 % knew the term “UNESCO World Natural Heritage”, but the following questions showed their misunderstanding of the topic. About 12 % directly mixed up the concept of Cultural Heritage and Natural Heritage. About 12 % directly mixed up the concept of Cultural Heritage and Natural Heritage.
7 Discussion

The study at hand confirms the trend that the nomination is likely to increase the visitation (Buckley 2004, Conradin/Hammer 2016). The survey results also suggest that an increasing awareness and additional guests can be expected. This will influence tourism in the entire region. The World Natural Heritage Site “Old Beech Forests” is given as the prime reason for visiting (once again) the Kalkalpen National Park for 14 % (“for sure”) and for 42 % (“rather yes”). It can be confirmed with statistical significance that the World Natural Heritage Site “Old Beech Forests” is the pivotal reason for a majority of respondents to visit the Kalkalpen National Park. This shows that with the designation “UNESCO” expectations are raised among the tourists.

The results also underline the ongoing trend in tourism related to the experience of untouched nature and pristine landscapes (Pröbstl-Haider/Elands/Wirth/Bell 2010). Here, experiencing untouched nature and pristine landscape, is classified as the second most important decisive motivation. Around 90 % of the respondents said that this is an (extremely) important criterion for them. These results are in line with other studies, showing that (untouched) nature and landscape are the most important motives for such holidays (Kainulainen 2009, Wirth 2010, Pedersen 2002).

The study shows, that the surveyed persons poorly differentiate between the classification UNESCO World Natural Heritage and UNESCO World Cultural Heritage. Only 77 % knew the term “UNESCO World Natural Heritage”, but the following questions showed their misunderstanding of the topic. About 12 % directly mixed up the concept of Cultural Heritage and Natural Heritage.

The findings also confirm existing knowledge about the main target groups (Luger 2008, 21). In our study typical visitors can be described as follows: they are more often female, well educated, 50–70 % have a university degree and tend to be more willing to spend money on quality programs. They often consider themselves as close to nature or nature lovers, want to experience untouched nature and pristine landscapes and like forests to enjoy nature. The preservation of World Heritage Sites is very important for them. The economic aspects play a secondary role. These findings are in line with studies by Khumalo et al. 2014, Luger 2008, Timothy/Boyd 2006, Wang et al. 2015 and Fuchs 2016.

8 Conclusion

The study explores the acceptance and awareness of protected areas and analyszs the possible effects of new labelling by UNESCO World Natural Heritage. Similar to previous research, the study confirms the high relevance of UNESCO, which is likely to increase the number of visitors. However, most of the respondents had difficulties distinguishing between the two types of nomination, namely UNESCO
World Cultural Heritage and UNESCO World Natural Heritage. For the future promotion and marketing of the UNESCO World Heritage, it is important to know the five different tourists segments presented in this study and their partly limited awareness of the parks unique selling proposition. The proper communication and marketing of the beech forests is a major challenge for sustainable tourism development and planning. With tailored nature related tourism products and target group-oriented programs it is possible to achieve also economic benefits for the national park and the region of the young World Heritage Site. All programs, however, have to follow the sustainability criteria related to World Heritage Sites, respect and protect the forests.
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Value Creation and Visitor Management

Policy Considerations for Managing World Heritage Tourism in the City of Salzburg, Austria

1 Cultural tourism in trend

There are not many cities where culture and tourism are so closely intertwined as in the case of Salzburg. They form the essential economic factors for the city and therefore require careful strategic control. In the case of culture, this is provided by the respective valid cultural mission statements with their focal points and the medium-term financing of cultural institutions specified therein. The same applies to the long-term programme planning of the major cultural institutions, above all the Salzburg Festival. In addition, there are other private or publicly supported cultural and concert organizers. For tourism, the Tourism Concept 2017 with its strong focus on marketing had this function. With the validity horizon 2020–2025, a new concept is currently being developed that is geared to current and future challenges. Regulatory measures for visitor guidance and traffic calming are planned.

With about 10% of the global economic output and an enormous annual growth rate – in cultural tourism one speaks of about 15% and 40% of all trips contain a more or less distinct cultural component – tourism is one of the most dynamic service industries worldwide. All trends indicate that it will continue to grow. In Europe, this is most clearly visible in the needs of the growing urban middle classes in the densely populated countries of Asia, who want to get to know the attractions of European cultural cities (World Travel & Tourism Council 2019; Travel ChinaGuide 2019).

This development can be clearly seen in the example of Salzburg and many other destinations. In Mozart's birthplace, the number of overnight stays and day tourists has approximately doubled over the past 20 years. An initial study estimated five to six million day visitors (ÖAR Regional Consulting 2007). However, overnight stay records or the number of visitors say little about added value. Therefore, Statistik Austria operates a “tourism satellite account” that records the tourism expenditure of domestic and foreign travellers. In Austria, this amounted to around 42 billion € in 2017. The resulting direct and indirect value added effects of 32 billion € contributed 8.7% to the gross domestic product. If tourism and the leisure...
Kurt Luger

Value Creation and Visitor Management
Policy Considerations for Managing World Heritage Tourism in the City of Salzburg, Austria

1 Cultural tourism in trend

There are not many cities where culture and tourism are so closely intertwined as in the case of Salzburg. They form the essential economic factors for the city and therefore require careful strategic control. In the case of culture, this is provided by the respective valid cultural mission statements with their focal points and the medium-term financing of cultural institutions specified therein. The same applies to the long-term programme planning of the major cultural institutions, above all the Salzburg Festival. In addition, there are other private or publicly supported cultural and concert organizers. For tourism, the Tourism Concept 2017 with its strong focus on marketing had this function. With the validity horizon 2020–2025, a new concept is currently being developed that is geared to current and future challenges. Regulatory measures for visitor guidance and traffic calming are planned.

With about 10% of the global economic output and an enormous annual growth rate – in cultural tourism one speaks of about 15% and 40% of all trips contain a more or less distinct cultural component – tourism is one of the most dynamic service industries worldwide. All trends indicate that it will continue to grow. In Europe, this is most clearly visible in the needs of the growing urban middle classes in the densely populated countries of Asia, who want to get to know the attractions of European cultural cities (World Travel & Tourism Council 2019; Travelchinaguide 2019).

This development can be clearly seen in the example of Salzburg and many other destinations. In Mozart's birthplace, the number of overnight stays and day tourists has approximately doubled over the past 20 years. An initial study estimated five to six million day visitors (ÖAR Regional Consulting 2007). However, overnight stay records or the number of visitors say little about added value. Therefore, Statistik Austria operates a “tourism satellite account” that records the tourism expenditure of domestic and foreign travellers. In Austria, this amounted to around 42 billion € in 2017. The resulting direct and indirect value added effects of 32 billion € contributed 8.7% to the gross domestic product. If tourism and the leisure
industry are added together, the figure is 15.9%. The elaborate estimates give an indication of the importance of this economic sector. The calculations are mostly based on the method of gross value added of net sales, which is supplemented and extended by weightings and estimates (Fettner 2019; Statistik Austria 2019).

According to a recent macroeconomic regional study by the Gesellschaft für Angewandte Wirtschaftsforschung (Society for Applied Economic Research), Tyrolean tourism alone, with almost 50 million overnight stays in the period from May 2017 to April 2018, achieved a value added of 6.8 billion €. About 40 % of this is generated by the accommodation and catering sector and 60 % by other sectors such as trade, services, construction, manufacturing and agriculture. In total, the tourism value-added effects in these sectors will secure another 55,000 jobs (Haigner/Walkobinger 2019). Tourism in the Federal Capital Vienna generates a value added of around 3.7 billion € and guarantees around 90,000 jobs (Rottenberg 2018; City of Vienna 2019). The combined value added of the Salzburg Festival of classical music and Salzburg Advent Singing is around 200 million € annually. (Eymannsberger/Kurtz 2017; 2019). Both events are not only among the city's major image carriers, but also generate considerable economic effects that go far beyond the direct added value generated from tourism. A value creation study is currently being prepared for the federal state of Salzburg with its approx. 30 million overnight stays. Without day tourists, the value is assumed to be around 4.5 billion €. Tourism in the city of Salzburg generates a value added of around one billion €, one third of which is estimated to be assigned to the World Heritage (UNESCO Chair 2019).

A study among international tourists published in 2018 gave an insight into the motives of Salzburg visitors. According to the study, 40 % came for the historical old town and for the sightseeing/excursion destinations, 27 % came for the mixture of nature and culture, 21 % wanted to experience the historical heritage of Mozart, 17 % were attracted by the art and culture on offer in the city and 14 % by customs and traditions. 12 % each came to the city for “The Sound of Music”, for the Salzburg Festival or for the special markets. The historic city as World Heritage Site was explicitly mentioned by 10 % of the visitors as a motive, whereby several motives could be named. (TSG Tourism Salzburg, T-Mona Survey 2018).

The thematically broad leitmotif of culture, music, churches, sound of music and world heritage architecture, which follows the basic principle of storytelling, promises an unmistakable experience and – as previous and current satisfaction studies show – will be experienced very positively (Working Group Salzburg Tourism 2017). The main route, also known as the “Street of Ants”, leads millions of visitors through the pearls of the old town (Keul/Kühberger 1996) and up to the fortress, the most visited sight in Austria after Schönbrunn Palace and its surrounding gardens in Vienna.
2 World Heritage – destinations of longing and desire

As in Venice, Florence and many other world heritage sites that are highly attractive to tourists, Salzburg’s tourism is characterized by the hunt for sights to experience the world heritage. However, the high quality of what is on offer should be matched by an appreciative approach that guarantees it due attention: From seeing to interpreting to opening up and understanding – this requires a communication appropriate to the high value of the symbolic figures of remembrance in the form of specific architecture or the cityscape, i.e. heritage communication instead of heritage marketing. A quick walk through in a group on standard routes in connection with a fleeting consumption of images and the obligatory “selfie” certainly does not achieve this and does not generate a sufficiently emotional, experiential or identifying experience. A two or three-hour round tour through the 17th and 18th centuries – souvenir shopping included – certainly does not do justice to the unique ensemble and its historical significance (Hoffmann 2008; Eherer 2013).

Cultural tourism is generally understood to be a culturally motivated journey, which means that an interest in culture can be assumed among travellers. True cultural tourists visit a culturally significant place explicitly for the purpose of viewing works of art, architecture or to participate in a cultural event such as a festival. The cultural dimension is clearly at the centre of the journey. Tourists who spend two weeks on a Mediterranean beach, however, are also eager to catch a glimpse of the ruins of Carthage or Knossos, or they come from one of the Salzkammergut lakes or from an Alpine wellness oasis for a sightseeing tour to the festival city. Such a culturally motivated visit to the World Heritage District makes them casual cultural tourists, especially since they are primarily entertainment-oriented and in this case hardly strive for distinction (Steinecke 2007). The same is true for winter sports enthusiasts who come to the city from their ski resort for a bad weather day to take in the baroque architectural ensemble, power shopping and the atmosphere of a coffee house. In any case, the segment of explicit or casual cultural tourists is growing continuously and therefore cultural tourism is also the focus of attention of the travel industry for economic reasons – valorisation of culture also in terms of observable living environments or traditions (Richards 2018).

The World Heritage Site “Historic City of Salzburg” is undoubtedly interlocked with tourism. For a good 150 years, the city has been one of the top international destinations for cultural tourism. Culture in all its forms and productions is the trademark of this city, it shapes the typical “habitus of the city” (Lindner 2003), which has long since become a “cultural experience” (Brandner/Luger/Mörth 1994) and can also score points in the popular-cultural segment with the Sound of Music tourism (Kammerhofer-Aggermann/Keul 2000; Luger 1994). It is currently visited by an estimated six to seven million day tourists every year and, with 1.8 million overnight guests, has 3.1 million registered overnight stays, plus 360,000 overnight stays in Airbnb accommodation. This represents a doubling compared to
2002 and is accompanied by an increase in the occupancy rate of city hotels (2018: 292 days) as well as a much higher traffic load on the entire road network. Around 15,000 hotel beds are currently available, further hotels are under construction or planned, and there is also an enormous supply of beds in the neighbouring communities outside the city, which is often used by bus tourists who then visit the city as day tourists (TSG information dated 29.4.2019).

Although Salzburg is already known worldwide and branded as the birthplace of Mozart, the Salzburg Festival and in the popular genre with “The Sound of Music”, the award given by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee in December 1996 to belong to the heritage of mankind is another quality feature and seal of approval. While the marketing of music – the classical music of the various festivals and the genius loci Mozart as well as the popular music of the film “The Sound of Music” – in the context of cultural-touristic offers and merchandizing hardly seems to be surpassable, there are so far no explicit tourist offers that would do justice to the World Heritage Site under this label of its extraordinary importance (UNESCO Chair 2012, 2019).

3 Carrying capacity and visitor management

This provokes the question of how many tourists the World Heritage Site can accommodate without damaging the quality of the experience or the facility itself. The fear that everyone will find what they are looking for at the same time, thereby destroying or impairing the experience, cannot be dismissed in the summer peak season and in the pre-Christmas period.

Culture as a tourist experience is an enormous growth market, which has recently led to the phenomenon of overtourism in many places. This refers to a state in which the number of tourists overtaxes the local conditions and is detrimental to both tourists and locals. The limits of resilience or the resilience of a place or a region are then reached or exceeded, the tourism attitude of the population and the tourist experience develop negatively and tourism becomes the opposite of sustainability (Goodwin 2017).

The latest “European City Tourism Study 2018 – Protecting your City from Overtourism”, commissioned by the Austrian Hotel Association (Roland Berger 2018), provides an overview of crowded and prospering tourism cities. The core of the study is the creation of a matrix to create a benchmark on the topic of overtourism. The criteria for this are the survey of tourism density and value creation, with RevPAR, the revenue per available room, being used as an indicator. This is calculated by dividing the net logistic turnover by the sum of available rooms and the lower it is, the lower the added value.

According to expert opinion, the price of rooms in Austria is below the value that corresponds to the quality offered in an international comparison. This has a negative impact on this study, as Salzburg falls into the “mass trap” category, with
cities such as Bordeaux, Bruges and Prague, because the number of visitors is very high, but the return per room is comparatively low. Cities such as Amsterdam, Barcelona, Dublin, Frankfurt, Lisbon, Reykjavik and also Venice are described as “under pressure”. “Shining stars” would therefore be cities such as Berlin, Heidelberg, London, Lausanne, Munich, Rome and Vienna, Lucerne, Paris, Stockholm and Zurich, which rank among “peak performers”. Bern, Hamburg, Madrid and San Sebastian are named as cities with sustainability quality. A large number of cities also examined show unused potential – among them are Istanbul, Helsinki, Dresden, Cologne, Budapest, Brussels, Verona and Lyon.

Since the result is based on only two parameters, the findings of this study must be put into perspective. Firstly, the price of rooms in small Austrian towns – to which Salzburg belongs despite its festivals and cosmopolitanism – is actually in the lower segment by international comparison. The price level in Switzerland is double or triple that of Vienna or Salzburg, and the number of tourists in Bern or Zurich is far from reaching the same level as in Vienna or Salzburg. According to industry experts, however, the RevPAR of many Salzburg hotels is higher than the average value of 88.80 € assumed in this study for the 52 cities examined, and even tops the list in an Austrian comparison. Secondly, the study does not take into account the size of the city in relation to the tourist zone – which the authors themselves admit is a weakness (Preveden/Mirkovic et al. 2019). Small, monocentric tourism centres are under much greater pressure. Some districts in Amsterdam and Barcelona are exposed to similar pressures as the historical old town of Salzburg, but the area surrounding the tourist centres is much larger and the flows of visitors are spread over a larger area. Thirdly, day tourism is not taken into account and fourthly, the density of tourism in Venice – especially if day visitors are included – is probably much higher than in Salzburg, but due to the demand situation, room prices have reached an exorbitant level. The extremely negative consequences of the incomparably higher burden of tourism are expressed in other problems, such as a lack of housing and overpriced rents, emigration, the eroding community and the endangered ecology.

According to this study, Swiss cities would be the most successful, because the number of tourists is still within limits and hotel prices are very high. However, Switzerland is one of the most expensive travel countries in Europe, which is a problem for both travellers and the hotel industry. Not least because of the high exchange rate of the Swiss franc, which has pushed Swiss tourism among European guests back to the level of the 1960s, the Swiss tourism industry has been complaining for years about insufficient demand from other European countries and about the sub-optimal utilisation of hotel capacity (Tourism Research Centre 2015/16). This example shows that studies with results, focused only at economic value creation, need a more comprehensive evaluation in a larger context.
4 When the “red line” is crossed

In the recent literature on mass tourism and, more recently, on overtourism and overcrowding, there is widespread consensus that this is a state of affairs in a tourism destination that corresponds to a “perceived excess” of tourism (Pechlaner/Eckert/Olbrich 2018). Exceeding the “critical threshold” has accompanied the scientific discussion in the context of carrying capacity for many years as a dispositive, whereby it is decisive who determines the definition of the carrying capacity of a destination and with which indicators. The extent of the tourist infrastructure and its utilisation is one aspect, the traffic load or the use of the mobility infrastructure is another. Thirdly, there is the view of the local population, whose room to move is impaired by the mass of visitors. Their attitude towards tourism depends on the benefits they derive from the situation and whether their living conditions are negatively affected due to crowding, and whether tolerance of the per-
ceived acceptable changes reaches its limits (tolerable rate of growth). Finally, visitor satisfaction is also an indicator of the extent to which tourists' wishes are satisfied, because endless queues and other inconveniences or restrictions caused by other tourists can have a major impact on the travel experience.

For the planning of sustainable tourism development, reference can be made to the Carrying Capacity Value Stretch Model (Mansfeld/Jonas 2006), which determines a level of tolerance with regard to an expectation level based on a current situation. If a “red line” is crossed in relation to the current level, the mood among the population will develop negatively. Salzburg’s citizens, for example, are used to the large number of tourists in the Historic City and accept the central lanes full of visitors during the peak season, as well as overflowing garbage containers, occupied parking lots and coffee houses, but they find it disturbing when large groups of tourists block the way to the Old Town even in the low season or already in the early summer morning. If this unpleasant experience of density becomes a permanent state of affairs, public discontent is aroused. The aim of control must therefore be to manage visitors properly and not to overstretch the level of tolerance.

In order to maintain the acceptance of tourism among the local population or to shape it positively for future development, tourism policy and destination management can lay down the primary measures to be taken. But also the tour operators, civil society, above all the Old Town Business & Tourism Association and the “Stadtverein” (a civil society association aiming at a good preservation status of the historic city), which recently published a “White Paper for the City of Salzburg”, calling for measures to curb tourism and preserve the World Heritage Site in a sustainable manner (Bastei 2019), are stakeholders. They are willing to get involved and seek long-term, workable solutions, because the problem will not solve itself in view of the unleashed mobility and the constantly growing volume of travel.

As shown in a recent survey conducted in May 2019, a vast majority of the Salzburg population demands tourism policy interventions on the part of the city, such as control measures concerning coach traffic, a regulation for Airbnb accommodation, a car-free old town in which only supply and hotel traffic is permitted, the establishment of a World Heritage Visitor Centre and even the limitation of day tourism is finding a majority. Traffic management measures and the equalisation of visitor flows are participatory tasks and also require responsible communication management. They should be formulated in a tourism master plan or in an urban development concept in the form of objectives and measures, and their implementation should be checked by continuous monitoring and adapted to the circumstances (UNESCO Chair 2019).

In the benchmarking study “World Heritage & Tourism – A Case Study on the Salzburg World Heritage Site” (UNESCO Chair 2012), the tasks to be solved as a matter of urgency at that time were identified: The creation of a tourism manage-
ment system; improvement of communication; establishment of a World Heritage visitor centre; increasing the number of main residences in order to revitalise the old town; creating awareness & civic pride for the World Heritage Site among the population; concretising overall responsibility for the World Heritage Site; staffing and funding for the World Heritage management measures to be taken; an “upgrade” of the tourist bus terminals. Directly connected with this were the strengthening of public transportation, the development of products under the quality brand title of World Heritage and the creation of a political lobby for World Heritage.

Most of these problems are still pending. The increase in individual tourism has led to an excessive increase in passenger car traffic and has exacerbated the transport problem. According to the recent study (UNESCO Chair 2019), the public transport system is considered inadequate by the locals, there is still massive criticism of the coach terminals close to the old town and the exodus of citizens from the old town is equally acute. Only with regard to the responsibility for the World Heritage Site has there been an improvement: steps have been taken to intensify communication about the World Heritage Site and a World Heritage Centre has been in the planning stage for some time.

Comprehensive tourism policy measures – which must primarily include the creation of a destination management system and new, environmentally friendly transport solutions – are probably necessary in order to quickly gain the room for manoeuvre needed to cope with further tourism growth in the future. The increasingly easy affordability of long-distance travel for Asians or the middle class of emerging countries, low air fares because aviation fuel is not taxed appropriately, the growth of city tourism through further offers from so-called “low-cost carriers”, the – sometimes illegal – letting of apartments to city tourists, which creates pressure on the housing market, the reckless behaviour of tourists who take up public space and attractive places are only some of the central symptoms of the phenomenon of overtourism. In addition, there is the burden of seasonal concentration, the gap between the economic importance of tourism and the challenging working conditions for service providers. Large transport capacities of cruising ships and coaches cause the intermittent appearance of a large number of tourists. This overstrains not only World Heritage sites, often small-scale historical centres, but also other destinations. “Herd” or “horde” tourism fundamentally impairs the tourist experience. But even the culture-driven heritage tourists differ between those who have chosen the destination for well-considered reasons and those who are only here to send the obligatory selfie of themselves in front of an image-laden building without really having any idea of the high quality of the cultural heritage surrounding them (d’Eramo 2017; McKercher 2002). The dominance of these “swarm tourists” can be countered with forms of visitor management, but other factors of global tourism development can only be influenced by the destinations to a certain extent or not at all (Goodwin 2019).
From the point of view of travellers, the effects of mass tourism include the following phenomena: large crowds of people, long waiting times, overpriced gastronomy and not very authentic cuisine, increased traffic and noise, an oversupply of tourist services (souvenir and fast food shops, kiosks) as well as waste and environmental pollution. What is most disturbing for tourists is the excess of their own kind – of other tourists who represent a burden and conflict factor in their own tourist experience.

Tourists perceive certain forms of overtourism, but usually cope with the challenges pragmatically, avoid them wherever possible or endure inconvenience. Urgent need for action has not yet been directly derived from customer satisfaction research (Bauer/Gardini 2019; Arnberger 2014). Rather, for certain tourism strongholds, coping aids and tips based on the experiences of others can be found in guide books or travel blogs. A wealth of online platforms and blogs offer help and their advice is used as a guide to successfully visiting Prague, Venice or other crowded destinations. Patience and tolerance are required everywhere as core competencies. Those who seek uniqueness must accept to share this experience with many others who are looking for the same thing, and adjust better to the expected situation.

In any case, the tourism of the future will also demand changes in attitude and behaviour from the tourists themselves. Pearce (2018) sees the ideal type as a “smart tourist” – the intelligent or experienced tourist who draws five lessons from the expected situation in advance. First, this tourist is well prepared for the destination and knows how to behave appropriately. Secondly, as an intelligent traveller, he uses the best mobility offers, travels to the destination by train or stays on the periphery with his car and uses public transport. He books guided tours, which he uses with the available discount cards. Thirdly, as an empathetic guest, he acts respectfully towards the local population and behaves within the framework of local conventions. As such, he also succeeds in making acquaintance with local people. Fourthly, this guest devotes sufficient time and attention to the place he or she is visiting, gets involved with the atmosphere and tries to behave in a “minimally invasive” manner, almost like a local, in order to trigger as few negative effects as possible. Fifthly, this tourist will therefore also be a smart technology user, because he will use the new technologies to optimize his stay.

Clearly, such suggestions apply in principle to all tourist destinations and especially to those under great pressure such as historic old towns or even some winter sports resorts. Uncontrolled and mass tourist flows are everywhere connected with badly behaved guests, who leave behind a lot of rubbish, produce hours of traffic jams on the streets and create enormous price pressure on housing due to second homes and short-term rentals.

Also in Salzburg phenomena of overtourism can be observed on special occasions, during the high season in summer and in the pre-Christmas period. Nevertheless, the available data on the international image of the World Heritage and
festival city show a very positive picture for a stronghold of global cultural tourism, the tourist offer is consumed with great satisfaction. A stay in the city is therefore considered enjoyable, relaxing, and what is on offer is considered traditional but also authentic. Less than a fifth of visitors experience the city as expensive and overcrowded, with criticism of the price-performance ratio in the gastronomy sector being the loudest (TSG-T-Mona survey 2018).

In a study recently published by McKinsey (2017), 68 cities are compared with regard to their hazard risks. These hazard situations are divided into quintiles, which in circles from inside to outside increasingly represent the threat situation. The example of Barcelona, a city that has been struggling with overtourism for a long time, shows a pronounced seasonal overloading of the infrastructure, a somewhat lower but nevertheless high threat level to the historic sites, the concentration of tourism on a few attractions and the alienation or dissatisfaction of the locals. The intensity of tourism seems to be only halfway in line when the population or the size of the city is taken as a yardstick.

Barcelona (metric calculation of the potential risk)

According to this study, with 930,000 annual visitors per square kilometre (guideline value), the critical limit of tourism intensity is exceeded, the crowds become unacceptable for both tourists and locals, and the infrastructure and environment are overloaded. If this figure is applied only to the tourist districts of the
cities, such as the Central District in Vienna, the Historic City of Salzburg (2.4 square kilometres), Dubrovnik, Česky Krumlov etc., the limit is exceeded many times over in view of this indicator. Salzburg logically has a much higher tourism intensity than Vienna in terms of overnight guests due to its small number of citizens. With three million overnight stays, there is a factor of 20 per Salzburg resident for a population of 150,000, in Vienna there are around 9 overnight stays for each of the 1.8 million Viennese (with around 16 million overnight stays in 2018). However, the actual burden and overstrain on the infrastructure is mainly caused by day visitors, who – especially if they arrive with their own car – also overstrain the traffic infrastructure system.

5 Sharing the city with strangers

Internationally, the topic of overtourism has made an astonishing career, not least due to the extensive media coverage of the cries for help or protests of residents in some popular destinations such as Venice, Dubrovnik, Barcelona or Amsterdam. The city councils were forced to take political steps to contain the revolt of the citizens. A similar situation existed already in the 1980s when villagers in developing countries protested vehemently against the tourist sell-out of their most beautiful beaches and landscapes (Baumhackl et.al. 2006). Amsterdam and Barcelona are pioneers in this respect, having made the most comprehensive efforts to deal with the excesses of tourism conceptually. Both cities strive to extend the length of stay of tourists, speak of “sharing” and regard tourists as “temporary” residents of the city. Targeted tourism policy measures are used to prevent tourist ghettos and a further concentration of tourist shops and offers. The aim is to improve the quality of life for both locals and tourists through better cooperation between the tourism industry, information centres and cultural institutions, by adapting the infrastructure and improving the facilities on offer (Richards/Marques 2018; Goodwin 2019, Responsibletourismpartnership 2019).

Sharing the city with strangers and thus striving for intercultural understanding is one of the major goals of tourism, but it also requires regulation. Airbnb has turned what used to be “couch surfing”, where people were interested in meeting other cultures, young, usually undemanding travellers and hosts, who provided air mattresses or couches, into a profit-driven industry. In this debate, locals contrast their right to their own city with the freedom to travel for tourism, the right to tourism. The two rights need to be harmonised, and Amsterdam has come up with the concept of balancing, “Stad in Balans”, the balancing of interests that integrates the positive and negative aspects into a development concept that ultimately is beneficial for all parties involved (van Ette 2017).

This was necessary in order to minimize the enormous burden on the urban population. In August 2017, more tourists than locals slept in Amsterdam – which is unusual for a city of (almost) a million inhabitants, but which is normal for many
holiday and winter sports resorts in Tyrol or the province of Salzburg during the season. In the inner cities of Amsterdam, Barcelona, Copenhagen, Lisbon and Rome, each inhabitant has tourists as neighbours for almost half of the year and the population of the old towns double during this time (Richards/Marques 2018). In contrast, the attitude towards tourism in Salzburg is still positive, although the negative aspects such as high intensity of tourism due to the topographical limitations, the housing and traffic situation in the city are explicitly expressed in the criticism.

6 From destination marketing to destination management

Over the last five years, the number of tourists in many European cities has increased very strongly, but the income of hotels per available room (RevPAR) has also risen considerably – despite the boom in Airbnb overnight stays. Due to the general growth in tourism, the hotel industry has been able to maintain its position against Airbnb accommodation, but steps have been taken to reduce this offer and to combat illegal rental, albeit for different reasons. Housing is extremely scarce and very expensive in all these cities, and short-term profitable rentals by Airbnb further reinforce this trend (Richards/Marques 2018).

Amsterdam has demonstrated how tourism policy can be steered and was the first to set up a series of strategy-driven activities, including an “Enjoy & Respect Campaign”. The local tax was increased to finance steering measures, licenses for shops offering only tourist goods were limited, and an attempt was made to broaden the range of attractions with a partial shift in visitor flows. As a result, other destinations in the surrounding area are being upgraded (campaign “See Amsterdam, Visit Holland”) and the municipal DMO is experimenting with a range of cultural institutions, museums and encounter programmes. The improvement of mobility and the reduction of car traffic – for example through a new metro line, the bicycle has right of way, etc. – and a large-scale housing renovation programme (Stadherstel Amsterdam) show that the city is implementing a veritable governance programme, which includes new technologies as well as strengthening community processes. The measures go far beyond tourist visitor management and aim at an integrative urban development (van Ette 2017).

The example of Amsterdam shows how, in view of the enormous growth in tourism, destination management involving all stakeholders has been developed instead of destination marketing as a new form of integrated cultural and urban development policy. This required laws and regulations in order to be able to intervene in a regulatory and controlling way, because the longer active intervention is postponed and the longer it is hoped that the markets will self-regulate, the more pressing the problems become. Up to now, city governments have been content to leave tourism development to city marketing organisations. It was all about growth and attracting new guests. In view of the current situation, other challenges arise,
because more tourism can no longer be the goal for destinations under enormous pressure – including Salzburg. Tourism management has to be seen in a wider context and requires strategic planning intervention by urban policy makers, including transport policy measures such as housing policy, environmental protection, cultural policy and socio-economic policies. This also meets the requirements of UNESCO and its programme for sustainable tourism (UNESCO 2019).

Salzburg can learn from the experiences of a number of European cultural and World Heritage cities in order to counter overtourism and to dampen the transformations of the urban environment it triggers. The involvement of the local population and civil society groups is always indispensable for such a process. The lobby group representing the interests of the merchants, the Old Town Business and Tourism Association, sees the seasonal congestion in the alleys and squares as an increasing problem and has set itself the task of making the inner city more attractive as a shopping city as well as a residential and entertainment district. This is achieved through a series of events, productions and performances such as “Jazz in the City”, “Hand.Kopf.Werk. 90 Betriebe zeigen Kreativität” (“hand.head.handiwork. 90 craft enterprises show creativity”) or food festivals, which are widely consumed by the local population. Among other things, it is committed to ensuring that visitors to the Historic City (tourists and locals alike) are offered events and the most attractive shops possible, which is in keeping with the high quality of the World Heritage Site. One of its demands is to make tourism compatible with the old town, but another is to preserve the old town as a valuable living space. In particular, traffic calming and a permanent solution to the problem of coach tourism are a central concern. With all these demands, the Old Town Business Association is in agreement with the civil society organisation “Stadtverein” and many of the inhabitants of the Historic City. Preferring visitors who stay longer and introducing active visitor management as well as a dynamic, demand-based pricing system are urgent wishes. A further expansion of the number of beds is viewed critically; the aim is rather to achieve a high occupancy rate and value creation throughout the year (Gfrerer 2019).

In a tourism policy aimed at sustainability, the city government could also count on the support of the “Stadtverein”, which in its “White Paper for the City of Salzburg” also proposes steering measures for tourism and public transport as part of a comprehensive urban development concept that must bear the signature of the inhabitants as those directly affected (Bastei 2019).

There are many starting points for a more comprehensive concept for regulating tourism. On the supply side, this applies in particular to the supply of beds, the restriction of the expansion of the hotel industry, the licensing of further accommodation or secondary residences and the licensing of Airbnb accommodation. The expansion of this offer should be subject to strict control or limitation. Through variable pricing (seasonal and dynamic pricing), demand and supply can be better coordinated. In order to calm traffic, the introduction or reinforcement of
Park & Ride solutions is proposed, with the inclusion of public mobility offers that are also available to the local population.

On the demand side, communication services on a large scale are needed to attract the tourists they want and to get the others under control. This requires regulations such as the limitation of the number of coaches that can call at a terminal in Salzburg at the same time, in the same way as the number of cruise ships that are allowed into a port is limited in tourism destinations such as Dubrovnik or Venice. Here, too, discounts or other benefits can be used to promote or strengthen the early or late season and thus reduce peak loads during the high season. The collection of higher tourism taxes creates opportunities for the city to use these revenues to regulate or optimise visitor management. Information and codes of conduct are needed to urge conspicuous or alcoholized tourists to observe local manners and conventions (see Negussie/Frisk in this book; Richards 2018).

In some cities, an upper limit is first rejected, then probably discussed and introduced later – perhaps not immediately in terms of the number of tourists, but in terms of the number of licenses, permits etc. for pure tourist infrastructure, souvenir shops, private rooms/airbnbs and parking, as happened in Amsterdam and Dubrovnik. In this way, one can also counteract the “sell-off” of public space – a goal that is pursued in Salzburg in particular by the Stadtverein. If the large squares are all constantly used or are full of swarms of tourists, the special character of the “Italian city”, relevant to the extraordinary character of the city, would no longer be valid, and thus the World Heritage Site would lose its authenticity and also its integrity (Bastei 2019).

Dubrovnik has taken a number of urgent restrictive measures, not only to improve the quality of life of its inhabitants in view of the 529 cruise ships that docked in 2016 and attract 800,000 visitors, but also to ensure that it does not lose its World Heritage status (Karamehmedović in this book). UNESCO had threatened with consequences if no action was taken against the overcrowding of the old town. UNESCO has already demanded appropriate regulatory measures from Venice on several occasions. Only the recent increase in the number of accidents caused by large cruise liners seems to be leading to a rethink on the part of the city administration or the government in Rome (Settis 2015).

Examples of this kind serve as suggestions for bringing the negative effects of mass tourism phenomena under control. They should be integrated into a sustainable growth and development policy that takes account of commercial, environmental, cultural and social aspects and leaves no doubt that tourism does not disadvantage the local population. Well-planned tourism contributes to enriching the lives and prosperity of the inhabitants of World Heritage Sites or other destinations for many reasons (Neugebaumer 2014). However, in order to prevent social disparities – some residents have the benefits, employment, income, and others only the disadvantages, are overwhelmed by traffic and have to accept restrictions on their mobility and quality of life – a carefully planned and effectively imple-
mented tourism policy is needed that assesses all possible consequences and takes into account their impact on urban development.

The McKinsey report Coping with Success (2017) lists the elements for building a sustainable development strategy for a destination: Vision and aspiration (vision for the destination, number of visitors, carrying capacity, economic expectations); segment strategy (which visitors/target groups do you want to have more than others); product strategy (uniqueness); infrastructure (spatial planning, bedding, accessibility, mobility, usage rules); marketing and communication strategy (promotion and information); organisation and management (role of public and private sector, structure and financing).

Part of this destination management must be the standard repertoire of sustainable tourism and regional development as formulated in the UNWTO Guidelines, the UN Agenda 2030 or in the Guidelines for Sustainable Tourism Development in the context of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention or the UNESCO World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme 2011. In the World Heritage and tourism city of Salzburg, only first hesitant steps have been taken in this direction so far. Further and coordinated measures are necessary and should be included in the new tourism concept. They are essential for a balanced and sustainable development in the long term.

Bibliography


Baumhackl, Herbert/Gabriele Habinger/Franz Kolland/Kurt Luger (Hg.): Tourismus in der “Dritten Welt”. Wien 2006.


Preveden, Vladimir/Goran Mirkovic u.a.: Städtestudie Protecting your city from overtourism. In: Tourismus Wissen – quarterly, Jänner 2019, 71–75
TSG: Brandmark Studie 2018


The Author

Kurt Luger is a professor of Transcultural Communication and holder of the UNESCO Chair “Cultural Heritage and Tourism” at the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Salzburg. He is also chairman of the Institute for Interdisciplinary Tourism Research and of EcoHimal, Society for Cooperation Alps-Himalaya. Recent publications: MediaCultureTourism (2018); Alpine Travels (ed. with Franz Rest, 2017); Tourism and Mobile Leisure (ed. with Roman Egger, 2015); Culture, Tourism and Development in the Himalayas (2014); The Endangered City – Strategies for Humane Building in Salzburg (ed. with Christoph Ferch, 2014). kurt.luger@sbg.ac.at; www.kurt-luger.at
Sarah Braun & Caitlin Southwick

Creating Ownership, Value, and Understanding Through Interactive Sustainable Tourism

The cornerstone of creating effective sustainable tourism for practitioners and visitors alike is communicating the ‘why’ behind proposed planning and conservation initiatives. Education is key to buy-in from all involved stakeholders, whether it be the site management staff, conservators, local businesses and government, or the visitors themselves. When each stakeholder understands the value and reasoning behind successful, sustainable initiatives, goals are more easily achieved because each party understands they will benefit in some way, whether tangibly or intangibly. When this platform of unified understanding is created, the ability to capitalize on the multi-dimensional characteristics of sustainable development is possible.

In order for those dimensions to work together, a culture of ownership among all relevant stakeholders must be cultivated and developed, including the visitors that interact with the heritage site or exhibit. Ample studies in the business sector illustrate the creation of ownership culture is vital to achieving a prosperous and engaging company culture. Furthermore, evidence also suggests the most successful companies aim to create and foster that ownership via a firm’s overarching strategies and goals rather than simply labeling individuals as ‘owners.’ (Thomson/Shanley/McWilliams 2013). Why is this effective? Simply calling an individual an owner of an object or ideal does not make the statement true or lasting over time. Real ownership comes from the emotional response a subject or entity inspires in a person and the vested interest that feeling creates. These same business principles of successful employee-ownership culture are also relevant to sustainable tourism and development. In reference to climate change, for example, research shows “emotions are necessary for understanding” and also in turn, “provide for motivation” (Roeser 2012) in rallying persons around a single goal and objective.

Failure to create buy-in often happens when understanding of initiatives is unclear, misunderstood, or fails to appeal to any aspect of an individual’s life they deem important and personal. Developing and implementing an effective communication strategy is key in creating buy-in inside and outside an organization or institution. This is why it is crucial to analyze and develop each message a stakeholder will receive. A successful communication strategy designs and executes the
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most effective way to manifest a vested, personal response that generates engagement. With clear objectives, terms of reference, and effective communication, it is then possible to implement progressive policies and intervention for sustainable development, as well as examine opportunities that exist for growth, development, and future longevity.

Cultural Heritage and Sustainability

Museums and cultural heritage sites are trusted pillars of learning and knowledge, and are, therefore, in a unique position to portray truths about our planet and future. Heritage professionals have the ability to create a credible objective based around the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The path to a sustainable future is intrinsically tied to the cultural heritage sector. Developing effective sustainable development policies and projects can be broken down into three aspects:

• Internal Education and Implementation: educating cultural heritage personnel and incorporating sustainability into educational programs, university and professional development. This also includes operations, policies and programming.

• Communication Strategy & Partnerships: Sharing and showcasing success. Museums and cultural heritage centers, built heritage sites and any institutions must share trials and triumphs, showcase best practices to inspire change; effectively disseminate information, internally and externally, including transparency in practices, publications, conferences and news outlets. Publicizing the effort will play an important role to attracting the attention of the public.

• External Engagement Activities: Educating the public and community outreach. By embracing their inherent role as educators and stewards of heritage and the future of our planet, cultural institutions can educate the public about the SDGs, showcase how to engage and inspire real change, while simultaneously involving the community – creating dialogue, ownership, and opportunities for engagement.

Internal Education & Implementation

Each party plays an active role in the success of sustainable policy implementation, especially at the heritage and conservation level. The foundations of sustainable practice come from within, and the preservation of the site begins with those professionals trained to preserve them. While the question of sustainability is complex to answer, recent research shows that individuals utilize the SDGs in various ways highlighting “mental maps” in order to apply them to their own situation (Bain 2019). Our own findings (Southwick/Braun 2019) show that compartmentalizing small, actionable items in relation to the SDGs allows for individuals and groups to
formulate a basic task list of areas where changes can be easily made and implemented.

Formulating that strategy to be both effective in conveying understanding and purpose may seem like a daunting task. However, there are tools available and ready-to-use that assist any organization or group in analyzing, breaking down, and launching sustainable development initiatives. Perhaps one of the easiest to access and apply is the framework of Sustainable Development Goals developed by the United Nations as part of the Agenda 2030. The SDGs outline the varied and broad spectrum that contribute to true, lasting sustainable development – arranged into 17 separate goals, 169 targets, and 232 indicators to monitor progress (United Nations, 2015). In a 2019 workshop at the American Institute for Conservation’s (AIC) 47th Annual meeting, this framework was the basis for a hands-on discussion and exercise to engage and empower heritage professionals in larger sustainable development policies. The workshop on sustainability first defined the term and reviewed each of the 17 goals, asking participants how those goals might relate to the heritage sector, and then, in turn, discussed action points each individual could take back to their respective institution to implement (Southwick/Braun 2019). In conjunction, each participant was given part one of an adapted toolkit based on the overarching objectives of the UNESCO Sustainable Tourism Toolkit (UNESCO 2014), which focused on identifying and/or developing a case study that exemplified successful implementation of one of the 17 SDGs, regardless of how small or minute these actions might at first appear. The examples ranged from something as simple as implementing a lab recycling program to engaging and training local residents on archeological excavations.

Another key tool is the Museums and Sustainable Development Goals, a guide included in the new book, *Handbook of Climate Change Communication*, outlining a six-step plan for implementing the SDGs and seven key activities in which museums can engage. This approach is scalable, and can be applied to practitioners, institutions, networks and the overall sector (McGhie 2019).

Creating a list of achievable tasks, or an action plan, allows for a solid foundation of stewardship and ownership to grow from the inside out with policies that improve internal processes, as well as objectives that utilize patrimonial resources that aim to engage and interact with the visiting public (Raftani/ Kamal 2014). Actionable policies are the building blocks of sustainable development in a larger context. Engaging in programs such as Ki Culture’s Sustainability Ambassador Program (www.kiculture.com), helps achieve a sense of community and provides resources and support for developing internal policies. Ideas for how to begin to approach the SDGs in daily practice can include:
By simplifying and isolating singular activities, an individual’s belief in their own capability to make a difference grows. Participants from the workshop noticed that they were already engaging with sustainability, which nurtured the confidence to continue engaging and demonstrated that this seemingly intangible, unrelated concept was already inherent in their daily practice and institution. This empowerment transformed into a vested interest and an actionable item – one they are able to exe-
cute. Collectively, the cultural heritage sector can implement this same strategy to engage staff, visitors, and surrounding businesses in tourism experiences that focus on the sustainable development.

**Communication Strategy, Partnerships**

Communication and partnerships are key to any sustainability strategy, both within the cultural heritage sector and externally. Creating an environment of sustainability within an organization can begin with basic steps, as outlined above. Once this internal foundation has been established, the results need to be shared with relevant stakeholders in a context that is easily understandable, and then translated to the visitor experience in a way that encourages engagement and interaction. For a destination and its heritage sites to be truly sustainable, the foundation must have a holistic focus, which includes the visitors. It is fundamental that museum officials, conservators, and all other staff members understand their vital role in the success of sustainable practice – in the workplace, how it relates to their surrounding environment, and how that translates to the tourism experience. Examples of ways to create an effective communication strategy and effectively engage stakeholders include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share, Engage, &amp; Foster Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Showcase accountability in commitments to sustainable practice (SDG 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share publications and conservation advancements with museums, professionals, and relevant parties (SDG 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use your progress and knowledge to partner with other businesses and organizations in your community to help them develop their own actionable tasks (SDG 4, 9, 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase training/volunteer programs that target youth and disabled persons in your community (SDG 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure your information is easily accessible to all individuals, empowering all areas of the community – e.g. digitize collections, offer forums and/or reduced/free admission on certain calendar days (SDG 4, 10, 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner with organizations or non-profits focusing on causes associated with sustainable development – e.g. causes for gender equality, access to sustainable healthcare, green energy, etc. (SDG 3, 5, 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and foster engagement with smaller museums and institutions in developing countries by becoming sister organizations: including training and support; involvement in international organizations, conferences, and publications (SDG 9, 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for capacity building that engages all relevant stakeholders (SDG 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curate exhibits and develop educational programs on sustainability and climate change (4, 13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the aforementioned methods to educate, implement and engage heritage professionals, business, government officials, citizens, and visitors are focused around...
the idea of inclusivity. Inclusivity encompasses communication, and most importantly, dialogue. Giving each party space at the table to voice their questions and concerns will allow the list of actionable items to include them as a fundamental part of any initiative. This inclusivity is key to creating ownership for all relevant parties, including visitors.

External Engagement Activities – Interactive Tourism

The first step to engaging successful sustainability measures is creating a holistic, internal approach and ownership as an institution. But the cultural heritage sector offers a greater opportunity for engagement: that of the public. Offering visitors an interactive way to engage with the overarching goals of SDGs through exhibits, workshops, volunteer and support opportunities allow for achievable methods in which they can ‘own’ a part of heritage preservation and positive impact. It is important also to reiterate that continuing to showcase results, setbacks, and challenges (i.e. in an online forum, publication, mailing list, etc.) maintains the space where visitors can interact and engage long after their visit, much like the Great Barrier Reef Marine Foundation (GBRMF) has been able to achieve through tourism monitoring via mobile applications and other technology and their “Eye on the Reef Program” (2019). Interactive initiatives like these allow the collective experience into their own personal, everyday lives.

Heritage is built around cultural identity and the intangible emotion and feelings it triggers – awe, sadness, gratitude, joy, wonder, anger, etc. The myriad emotions visitors experience can drive the desire to “leave a permanent impact on the world in order to feel less small,” or perhaps in the case of the future of the planet, more hopeful (Armenta(Fritz/Lyubomirsky 2012). Therefore, heritage experts across the field are in the unique position to leverage heritage as valuable tool for sustainable development. If the visitor is able to feel how the cultural identity of a site or exhibit relates to their own personal experience, as well as understand how that ties to the overarching importance of global sustainability, the heritage sector has, in essence, created a steward of not only a site, object, or exhibit, but sustainable development.

This is done through communicating the message effectively and efficiently through visitor engagement. It is imperative to achieve buy-in from visitors as well. Rather than displaying dry facts and information, visitors should be presented with interactive opportunities to give feedback or their point-of-view, get involved in the initiative, or see how their experience impacts the world around them. This allows for visitors to not only actively engage, but create that space for dialogue, action and involvement. Visitors should be offered the opportunity to express their emotions, ideas, values and concerns; provoking critical thinking and real understanding of the issues, to fully recognize how they are directly affected,
locally and individually (McGhie 2018). Experience is key for evoking emotions and creating connections, that ultimately lead to buy-in.

Cultural heritage and world patrimony offer a unique opportunity to connect visitors on issues of sustainability and climate change. While the unfettered and unregulated heritage tourism has the potential to damage climates, ecosystems, and communities, integrated policies implemented around sustainable development can trigger positive impact of tourism and can outweigh the negatives (Tourtellot 2010). By doing so it works towards making the UN Agenda 2030 a reality. Combining the concept of creating ownership for staff, businesses, and visitors, as well as utilizing spaces, collections or sites, cultural heritage can communicate effectively why sustainability matters, what people can do to have a positive impact themselves, and how.

Many museums and cultural heritage sites have already begun to use their spaces as interactive tools for communicating sustainability. Exhibits can be designed to engage specific audiences, like children or young adults. Creating ownership in this context means that the audience becomes engaged with what they are seeing and establish an emotional connection: they begin to care. Individuals visit museums or sites to connect with cultural heritage as a foreigner or a local reaffirming identity. This offers the perfect opportunity to utilize heritage as a tool to engage with ideas and contemplate the concept of sustainability. Interactive experiences allow the audience to engage mentally and often hands-on, creating action and critical thinking. An exhibition at Manchester Museum in 2016 called Climate Control their visitors engaged by creating choices: the visitor could enter the section “Exploring the Past” or “Exploring the Future” (McGhie 2017, 2018). This choice already gives visitors an active role in the experiment. Further in the exhibit was a wall with black dots. Every visitor added a black dot to the wall, which represented climate change. The mass of black dots showed the impact of each individual on the world.

At the end of the exhibit, visitors voted on ten questions, giving them an opportunity to express themselves and reflect.

Henry McGhie, former curator at Manchester Museum stated, “the point of all this is to give opportunities for people to express themselves, and to find out what others think, and break out of echo chambers. It is amazing how many people care about nature, and think about the impact of their lives. The aim of the whole exhibition... is about promoting constructive thinking, feeling and doing” (2018).

Carnegie Museum of Natural History developed an initiative to engage their audiences with climate change by using informal learning and showcasing how to influence climate decision-making, focusing on the local community, and how issues of climate change affect local systems. They have developed kits which are used at local community events to spark discussions with people of all ages (Climate and Urban Systems Partnership, n.d.).
Shaping our Future City was an exhibit at Scienceworks in Museum Victoria, Australia. The emphasis of this exhibit was on interaction, and the target audience was children (8–12 years old). Visitors could engage with the interactive full-body digital platforms and ‘do pro environmental actions’ and see how the scene is transformed. Kate Phillips from the museum stated:

“The power for this exhibit is in starting with the audience (8–12 year-old children) and what they like to do (full body immersive games, seeing themselves) and then the exhibition development team went through a considered process of user testing, listening carefully to the perspectives of members of the audience. Their feedback to us was to include things they recognized and valued in their neighborhoods (eg the local park, my garden), to leave out skyscrapers (which were in the original version) and instead show more recognizable suburban houses. They also wanted clear messages about ‘good’ and ‘bad’ behavior, such as sorting garbage to be recycled or composted.” (Museums & Climate Change Network 2019).

Other elements of the exhibition included interactive screens where visitors could wave their arms to activate wind turbines and solar panels, which gradually removes the CO2 pollution from the screen, and “planting” native plants in a park, which brings native animals back to their ecosystems.

Other activities that promote sustainability relate to social aspects. Many cultural heritage institutions are more familiar with engaging communities and visitors on a personal level, however, they may not realize that many of their programs are already in alignment with social sustainability goals. Activities including community outreach and education, working with persons with disabilities, hosting community events and initiating volunteer programs already align with the SDGs.

Excellent examples stem from the Commonwealth Association of Museums, which has had a long-standing focus on encouraging museums to use their resources – their collections, exhibitions, programs and expertise – to address the SDGs. The National Museum of Malawi has become the #1 HIV/AIDS testing station in Malawi. The museum has made a statement, recognizing that AIDS is a cultural issue as much as it is a health issue, and is addressing the cultural roots of AIDS, resulting in a significant decrease in the epidemic (SDG#3). The Commonwealth Association of Museums additionally is active in promoting women’s rights, including developing exhibitions and programs related to the 16 Days of Activism for the elimination of violence against women (CAM Bulletin 2019).

Activities and ideas range from exhibitions to educational programming, on local or global levels. More ideas and examples are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourist visit or Engagement</th>
<th>Exhibitions on climate change with examples of how the local environment is being affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add climate knowledge and sustainability tips to current exhibits – add a fact about the landscape depicted in a painting or a comment on a piece depicting different cultures and values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Show ways that the local environment is changing and how climate change will affect the site in the future – highlight what the potential threats are and what the outcomes will be

Create partnerships with organizations dedicated to various sustainable causes and invite experts to come to the site/museum, host activities to support these causes

Develop platforms for distance engagement after the visit, i.e. crowd-sourced mapping, mobile applications, video monitoring, etc.

Create calls the action in your exhibit that are easily shared with others on social platforms; utilize the technology that is accessible and free to many to reach a larger audience.

Target market your initiatives to reach the right audience with messages that inspire action and easy involvement.

Capitalize on large campaigns and social media initiatives to reach individuals that share interests with your organization

Human beings are already actively looking for a cause. In America alone, twenty-five percent of the adult population in 2017 donated their time to volunteering either their time, money, or talent to causes and organizations that make a difference and mean something to them personally. The social media movement #GivingTuesday raised over $380 million in the US in 2018 (Nonprofit Source 2018). In other words, the heritage community has the ability to reach an incredible diverse group of people already in search of making the world a better place – the underlying objective of the SDGs.

The key to capturing this audience is enticing them to visit, and in doing so, interacting with their emotional cues to inspire a cause they care about supporting after their initial visit is over. Inspiring groups to become involved in sustainable development initiatives is not isolated to outside visitors. In fact, engaging the local community to rediscover the assets and heritage of their own backyard has the ability to revitalize entire neighborhoods and communities.

One such organizations is the Association Marocaine D’aide aux Enfants en Situation Précaire (AMESIP), an Non-governmental Organization (NGO) located in Rabat-Sale Morocco focused on providing education and professional training as well as a champion for youth education and empowerment in the poorer neighborhoods of the Rabat-Sale area. AMESIP has been instrumental in the implementation of initiatives that have brought about social change for the area youth through education, and in turn, the sustainable development of the area (Vallee du Bouregreg 2013).

During the 1950s, the city of Sale was subject to continuous unchecked urbanization and population growth, resulting in the buildup of shantytowns that continued well into the 1980s. Many residents of this area iduring this time instead flocked to the opposite side of the River Bouregreg for a modern lifestyle in Rabat,
leaving Sale to decline (Elsheshtawy 2008). This decline led to increase in poverty levels of residents that remained, as well as lack of access to education. AMESIP aimed to change that.

Today, the NGO has 14 educational centers, three of which are nationally accredited educational and vocational training facilities through the Moroccan government (AMESIP 2019). The growth and development of these facilities teach Acrobatic and Culinary arts that give youth of the area the opportunity to learn a viable trade, bring home income to their families, and engage with the surrounding community with paid performances. Through the development of these programs, which focused both on Moroccan heritage and the influence of other cultures on their society, the students of these educational centers drew visitors from across the river, in their own community and abroad. The transformation spurred continued growth and development along the river banks with a new marina, public transport systems connecting the two banks, and housing complexes built with sustainability guidelines (Vallee du Bouregreg 2013).

Witnessing the transformation of the area resulted in the creation of ownership for the students of AMESIP and the surrounding community. In personal interviews performed during field research in 2014, it was plain that the traditions and values of the country ran deep in the hopes and desire of the future. These extremely talented performers were asked if they wished to leave Morocco to pursue their careers outside. Their reply was a resounding ‘No.’ Even though the opportunities for pay and prestige were greater in foreign locations, each one of the students had the unwavering desire to build the local community in Morocco, to promote their work, and also force the evolution of how they are perceived as performers throughout the Rabat-Sale area and across Morocco (Braun 2014).

Ownership requires a vested personal interest of the visitor/stakeholder. In some cases, this can be difficult in areas where visitor management is required to put the patrimonial resources ahead of visitor access to the site. However, safeguarding and limiting access does not need to sacrifice the interactive visitor experience. At the Mogao Caves in the Gansu Province, a World Heritage Site south east of the Dunhuang oasis, there are 492 cells and cave sanctuaries carved into their cliffs. These caves and cells are decorated with incredible sculptures and wall paintings. Continually increasing visitor numbers and no adequate visitor management plan, threatened to create an unsustainable situation at this World Heritage Site.

Not only was the Outstanding Universal Value of site in danger, but the visitor experience had the potential to become both unsatisfactory and unsafe. The Getty Conservation Institute, together with the Dunhuang Academy began a comprehensive visitor study in 2001. This research assessed the impact of visitation to the painted caves of the WHS, identified the maximum number of visitors (if any) the caves and their art could sustain with zero damage, as well as analyzed ways to improve the quality and safety of the visitor experience.
The project incorporated the VERP (Visitor Experience and Resource Protection) model utilized by the U.S. National Park Service, and looked at the capacity for visitors to the caves and a larger Visitor Use Zone. The project worked together to create a situation that was sustainable for the cultural heritage, limiting daily visits, with guided tours to enrich the visitor experience and control time spent inside the caves. The larger Visitor Use Zone focused on a Visitor Centre where individuals have the opportunity to engage with the site at a deeper level through 3D film and immersive exhibitions about the site (Getty 2013). The joint efforts at the Mogao Caves to safeguard the site, while maintaining a vibrant and enriching visitor experience is an excellent example of visitor management and interactive, sustainable tourism.

It is the job of heritage professionals to create the narrative that preserves the site for generations, but also their responsibility to present it in a context in-line with the longevity of our planet. Now, more than ever, working together to learn and understand the needs and wants of each stakeholder helps to find the common thread for complete buy-in and support from all groups invested in the success of a tourism destination. Moreover, and perhaps most importantly, it is imperative the importance of sustainable practice be translated effectively to the visitor experience. How a visitor interacts with a site plays a large role in the responsibility and ownership an individual feels towards a site’s survival. It influences how they move through the site and how they treat the destination, and, if successful, builds a need and want to be part of something bigger than themselves after they leave. By weaving the ‘why’ of sustainable practice into the tourism experience, visitors are able to walk away feeling like they are part of the collective memory of history – which, ultimately, they are.
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Introduction

The global health crisis caused by Covid-19 has dramatically affected the global tourism sector to the extent that, in most countries, tourism and leisure activities have come completely to a halt. It appears clear, at the time of writing, that the broader economic and social impact of the pandemic will force a fundamental rethink in the way we live our lives – in ways that policy makers and citizens have not previously contemplated.

Resilience and sustainability are both concepts that feature prominently in post Covid-19 recovery thinking, either on a multinational, national, regional or local level – the ability to bounce back from crisis and the sustainable use of resources are at the heart of the current discourse. As mathematical modelling of the spread and control of the virus gives way to economic models of what the future might look like, most commentators predict a slower recovery curve than initial forecasts, as citizens, businesses and governments come to terms with what is being called the ‘new normal’.

Without downplaying the hugely negative impacts of the pandemic, this paper • argues that the current crisis provides government, especially local and regional government, with a unique opportunity to start to re-balance tourism – progressively moving away from international mass tourism, to more sustainable, more local, cultural heritage-based tourism. • draws on earlier work commissioned by the European Association of Historic Towns and Regions1) providing practical guidance on how historic towns and heritage cities can move towards sustainable cultural tourism through a proactive, integrated process of review and delivery, engaging all stakeholders.

2 Resilience and Sustainability

Resilience is at the core of United Nations work on disaster risk and crisis-prevention and sustainability is the central plank of UN Sustainable Development Goals, 1) The European Association of Historic Towns and Regions was created by the Council of Europe in 1999. It is the registered name of Heritage Europe (EAHTR) a not for profit company limited by guarantee
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The global health crisis caused by Covid-19 has dramatically affected the global tourism sector to the extent that, in most countries, tourism and leisure activities have come completely to a halt. It appears clear, at the time of writing, that the broader economic and social impact of the pandemic will force a fundamental re-think in the way we live our lives – in ways that policy makers and citizens have not previously contemplated.

Resilience and sustainability are both concepts that feature prominently in post Covid-19 recovery thinking, either on a multinational, national, regional or local level – the ability to bounce back from crisis and the sustainable use of resources are at the heart of the current discourse. As mathematical modelling of the spread and control of the virus gives way to economic models of what the future might look like, most commentators predict a slower recovery curve than initial forecasts, as citizens, businesses and governments come to terms with what is being called the ‘new normal’.

Without downplaying the hugely negative impacts of the pandemic, this paper • argues that the current crisis provides government, especially local and regional government, with a unique opportunity to start to re-balance tourism – progressively moving away from international mass tourism, to more sustainable, more local, cultural heritage-based tourism.
• draws on earlier work commissioned by the European Association of Historic Towns and Regions\(^1\) providing practical guidance on how historic towns and heritage cities can move towards sustainable cultural tourism through a proactive, integrated process of review and delivery, engaging all stakeholders.

2 Resilience and Sustainability

Resilience is at the core of United Nations work on disaster risk and crisis-prevention and sustainability is the central plank of UN Sustainable Development Goals,

\(^1\) The European Association of Historic Towns and Regions was created by the Council of Europe in 1999. It is the registered name of Heritage Europe (EAHTR) a not for profit company limited by guarantee
defined in 2015 and adopted by nations around the globe (UN 2015). Many of these goals are relevant for tourism e.g.

- Goal No.11, Sustainable Cities and Communities, relates to all types of tourism that involve cities

- Goal No.13, Climate Action, where different forms of tourist mobility, from cruise ships to planes, are contributing to global emissions and impacting negatively on the planet.

The concepts of sustainability and resilience are like brothers and sisters i.e. from the same family, but still different in character. John Spacey (2016) expresses the inter-relationship clearly, defining sustainability as the practice of reducing or eliminating environmental impact and improving the quality of life of communities – whilst resilience focuses on designing things to endure physical, social and economic shocks and stresses. Resilience, in this context, is primarily associated with city planning and urban design. Its goal is to give cities the structures, systems and resources that allow communities to make it through disasters or sudden change. The practice of resilience can also apply to a nation, region or organisation. Cultural heritage also includes a variety of resilient qualities (Ripp/Lukat 2017). Spacey points out that sustainability and resilience tend to use many of the same techniques. That is to say, that many of the things that improve quality of life and reduce environmental impact also tend to make an area more resilient.

*Figure 1: Sustainability & Resilience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Forest Management. Example: 18th century Germany</td>
<td>Psychological Resilience: the ability to bounce back from a stressful or adverse situation. Theoretical basis developed in the United States in the 1950s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objektive</td>
<td>To maintain the overall natural resource base</td>
<td>To make systems flexible enough to deal with changes without changing their principal character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Premise: Everything that we need for our survival and on the natural environment. Process: To create and maintain the conditions under which humans and nature can exist in productive harmony, thereby enabling the fulfilment of the environmental, social and economic requirements of present and future generations.</td>
<td>The ability of a system to respond flexibly to situational and well-being depends, either directly or indirectly, changes and negative factors without changing the essential state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Primarily linear</td>
<td>Dynamic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>To enable economic development without damaging the natural resource base.</td>
<td>To stimulate flexibility, adaptability and order to deal with risk-preparedness in sudden or long term changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Integration</td>
<td>Semi-integrated</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters Involved</td>
<td>Limited number</td>
<td>High number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Matthias Ripp*
Taking the twin concepts further, Ripp and Rodwell (2016) explain the differences conceptually in the table above, using the case study of Forest Management in 18th Century Germany.

While sustainability is a more holistic and linear approach concerned, in the main, with preserving finite resources, resilience incorporates more systemic thinking around preparedness to avoid disaster and the ability to re-bounce after crisis.

3 Towards Sustainable Cultural Tourism

Although sustainability has been part of mainstream thinking on cultural heritage and tourism for some time, delivering sustainable cultural tourism has remained largely aspirational to date, with mass tourism maintaining its dominant role world-wide. Resilience has only more recently entered the discourse in terms of its importance in delivering cultural heritage led tourism but has particular relevance post Covid-19.

The tourism industry is arguably unique because its myriad businesses across the world often rely on assets and services that they do not own, run or fully pay for – ranging from historic landscapes and cathedrals to transport systems and refuse collection. From the international or even national perspective it is an economic sector that cannot be easily planned or controlled other than at the local level. For these reasons the responsibility now falls to local and regional governments to grasp the current post Covid-19 window of opportunity. This means providing the leadership to engage with their communities to rethink, inspire and coordinate a common vision that provides a pathway to systemic change and a more sustainable and resilient future.

Reconciling tourism with sustainability remains unquestionably a major policy challenge, even though not a new phenomenon. The European Association of Historic Towns and Regions (EAHTR), supported by the Council of Europe, established an international expert working group2 in 2009 to prepare, on its behalf, guidelines on how historic towns could develop more sustainable cultural heritage based tourism. The full technical report was adopted by EAHTR and the Council of Europe in 2009 (Sustainable Cultural Tourism in Historic Towns and Cities 2009). This Guidance of course does not exist in a vacuum, with a wide range of international charters and declarations providing context. In addition to the Agenda for Sustainable and Competitive European Tourism (European Commission 2007), other charters and guidelines that relate to sustainable tourism include:

- International Cultural Tourism Charter – Managing Tourism at Places of Heritage Significance (ICOMOS 1999)

---

2 The expert group was led by Brian Human (BRH Associates) and comprised: David Bruce (Walled Towns Friendship Circle), Anthony Climpson (New Forest District Council), Michele Grant (LR Consulting), Peter Lane (Planet PLC), Professor Robert Maitland (University of Westminster), Duncan McCallum (English Heritage) and Matthias Ripp (World Heritage Management, Regensburg).
• The Burra Charter (ICOMOS Australia 1999)
• The Malta Declaration on Cultural Tourism: Its Encouragement and Control (Europa Nostra 2006)
• The Dubrovnik Declaration, Cultural Tourism – Economic Benefit or Loss of Identity? (Council of Europe & EAHTR 2006)
• Cultural Tourism Policy Guidelines & Declaration (UNESCO 2017)
• Barcelona Declaration – Better Places to Live, Better Places to Visit (NECStouR 2018)
• Kyoto Declaration on Tourism and Culture: Investing in Future Generations (UNWTO 2019)

The summary EAHTR Guidelines – Sustainable Cultural Tourism in Historic Towns and Cities (EAHTR 2009) – are intended for use principally by policy makers and practitioners within municipalities but have relevance also for other stakeholders best placed to influence more sustainable approaches to cultural tourism. We have needed to add only very minor updates to the guidelines as part of this paper, in order to take account of the importance of resilience in the current circumstances, and in the light of more recent publications referred to above.

Whilst these guidelines focus on the ‘what’ and the ‘how’ of sustainable cultural tourism, they do not aim to provide a detailed tool kit of potential solutions. Replicating solutions that have been successful elsewhere requires careful consideration of the needs and challenges of an area and should not, in our view, be the starting point of any strategy aiming to deliver sustainable and resilient cultural tourism.

Instead the guidelines provide a scoping tool as the key first step to help ensure that the tourism offer developed is both sustainable and resilient and meets both local and visitor needs. They are designed to help decision makers openly assess their current approach and to develop a clear plan of action relevant to local circumstances. In this way the guidelines remain entirely relevant to all historic towns and cities across Europe and world-wide and provide a catalyst to re-balance tourism locally and kick-start a move towards more sustainable and resilient cultural heritage-based tourism.

4 Guidelines for Sustainable Cultural Tourism

We reproduce extracts and illustrations below, including minor updates, from the published summary guidelines in order to explain the approach advocated. The key processes and questions set out aim to provide a structured framework within which relevant strategies and solutions can be identified and a practical pathway to change agreed and implemented.

The following definitions are used in the guidelines:
**Cultural Tourism:** Tourism, the principal purpose of which is to share and enjoy physical and intangible heritage and culture, including landscapes, buildings, collections, the arts, identity, tradition and language.

**Historic Towns and Cities:** Historic places and areas, including villages, small towns, cities and parts of larger urban areas with significant cultural and heritage assets.

**Sustainability:** The guidelines are based on the Brundtland Commission definition of sustainable development, as development that “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”.

**Resilience:** The ability of cultural heritage tourism to re-bounce and recover from challenges and crisis.

**A Framework for Action**

An effective framework requires an integrated approach to: developing a position statement; objectives and policies; processes; delivery and action; as well as a basis for appraisal.

Municipalities are encouraged to use the checklist of questions below as a framework for the creation of an Action Plan that meets the needs of their locality. Answers to the questions posed need to be based on a self-critical, open assessment of the circumstances prevailing and will benefit from independent evaluation and support.

**Position Statement**

Sustainable cultural tourism requires careful planning and management. Achieving this demands a clear starting point provided by a rigorous position statement to establish:

a. The key cultural assets of the place
b. The current profile of tourism to the place
c. The social, economic and political factors shaping attitudes towards tourism
d. Regional, national and international tourism trends

**Objectives and Policies**

a. Is there a consistent local vision, objectives, strategy and policy framework for cultural tourism agreed at the heart of corporate municipal government?
b. Is the strategy joined up with regional and national policy?
c. Does the framework include a cultural tourism strategy, destination management plan and inclusion of tourism issues in land use and transport planning policies?
d. Does the policy framework:
   i. Take a long-term view?
ii. Ensure a holistic and integrated approach across the full range of multidisciplinary activities?

iii. Have a foundation on robust, objective evidence and an understanding of culture, heritage, tourism and tourists?

iv. Manage risk and adopt the precautionary principle?

v. Include the ability to respond and recover to crisis and to take into account factors to strengthen urban resilience

vi. Include provision for review based on monitoring?

Processes

a. Are all stakeholders, including residents, businesses, politicians and heritage and interest groups responsible for the stewardship of the place engaged in the development of the objectives and policies and the subsequent delivery of more sustainable tourism?

b. Are there measures to develop effective decision making through education and training for policy makers and decision takers?

c. Does the approach to developing local engagement include:
   i. Establishing formal or informal inter-agency delivery partnerships?
   ii. Use of a Tourism Forum to facilitate an ongoing dialogue with the host community?
   iii. Use of local guides and volunteers?

Delivery and Action

a. Take steps towards establishing a sustainable and resilient destination:
   i. Include a clear understanding of which local products and markets are to be developed and which are to be managed.
   ii. Ensure that marketing and media exposure is objective and aimed at potential cultural tourists who have a real interest in visiting the destination for its inherent qualities.
   iii. Use destination management techniques to balance demand and capacity by managing/restricting access to sensitive sites and spread the visitor load both spatially and temporally and consider lengthening the stay.
   iv. Include an understanding of factors and mechanisms to respond to potential crisis (resilience).
   v. Use interpretation carefully to celebrate the distinctive culture, heritage and diversity of the place.
   vi. Establish mechanisms to ensure that a proportion of the economic benefit accruing from tourism is reinvested in the culture and heritage of the place.
   vii. Actively promote the use of sustainable transport, including cycling, walking and public transport, locally and for access, and charge accordingly.
   viii. Meet visitor needs for services, information, comfort, stimulation and safety.
   ix. Provide advance information to visitors to plan their visit effectively and encourage appropriate and sustainable behaviour and transport use.
   x. Respect diversity and meet the needs of minority groups and people with impaired mobility.

b. Take steps to support and develop sustainable businesses:
   i. Favour businesses with good long-term prospects that are rooted in the inherent strengths of the destination?
   ii. Encourage businesses that take conservation and community engagement seriously and show strong corporate social responsibility?
iii. Encourage community businesses based on marketing locally distinctive products?
iv. Encourage businesses that invest in training and skills to provide jobs for local people?
c. In developing sustainable products, is there a focus on:
i. Attractions that are built on the inherent strengths of the area and which reinforce distinctiveness and identity?
ii. Complementing the inherent qualities of the place where there is pressure to diversify the product(s)?
iii. Products that are identified and developed by the local community — community based tourism — and provide them with a direct income?
iv. Using tourism creatively to find new ways of viably and flexibly reusing historic buildings?
v. Sourcing local goods and materials that benefit local people?
vi. Services and products with small carbon footprints?

Appraisal
a. As culture, heritage and tourism are not static, is the approach to sustainable cultural tourism subject to fundamental regular review, dependent on the rate of change, usually at not more than five year intervals?
b. In order to provide evidence for policy development and investment decisions, are tools and methodologies developed continually to:
i. Measure the local quantitative dimensions — volume and value — of tourism?
ii. Assess the physical and social impacts and other qualitative aspects of tourism?
c. Do you regularly review best practice to learn from the experience of other destinations?

Process Overview
These guidelines embody the fact that places and cultural tourism are not static, but exist in relationships that affect each other. Figure 2 summarises the principles and guidelines as a process.

Figure 2 Sustainable cultural tourism – a dynamic process

In applying the guidelines, it is important to consider the relationship with the visitor. Figure 3 sets out a simplified form of a visitor journey that embraces the thinking behind this framework. Each step has a counterpart in the principles and guidelines and is important in ensuring that the objectives are realised on the ground.
Figure 3 Sustainable cultural tourism and the visitor journey (with acknowledgements to Tourism Site Network)

Action Plan

All the preceding stages should be brought together in a Sustainable Cultural Tourism Action Plan. This has seven main steps:

1. Endorse the Principles (see full guidelines) through adoption as corporate policy
2. Establish a stakeholder group of all key interests in the community
3. Prepare a collective Position Statement
4. Assess the current position against the guidelines
5. Agree actions, resources and timetable
6. Implement proposals
7. Monitor and review

The production of a Sustainable Cultural Tourism Action Plan will benefit from a degree of independent support working in partnership with the municipality and local stakeholders.

5 Conclusions

The global health and economic crisis created by the Covid-19 pandemic has impacted hugely on society and created unprecedented levels of uncertainty as to what the future holds. The tourism and leisure sector has been hit hard and the need for coherent strategies on the way forward are especially urgent for social, economic and, critically, environmental reasons. This paper argues that the crisis presents a unique opportunity for those responsible for tourism to imagine a different world: to effect positive and systemic change by rethinking our approach towards more sustainable, more local cultural tourism.

Whilst cultural tourism is an important part of the European economy, there is also a compelling case for safeguarding place-based European cultural heritage as
the main resource for cultural tourism. Indeed, there are innumerable opportunities for a positive relationship between culture, heritage and tourism. These will be different in each place and responses will need to reflect these differences. Parts of Europe, for example, were struggling before the pandemic to manage the numbers of international visitors whilst other, often newer, EU member countries have, as yet, limited experience of the destination management approach to tourism embodied in these guidelines.

We place sustainability and resilience at the heart of the guidance proposed, where tourism should not be perceived as a closed sector, but rather as part of a system which includes urban heritage, tourism and the cultural, social, economic and environmental interactions that arise. The principles and guidelines set out in this document aim to provide a consistent and holistic framework for decision making by municipalities and other stakeholders, while respecting and recognising the potential of local distinctiveness. The guidelines do not ignore the broader environmental issues – an argument that travel is inherently unsustainable – but seek to show how actions towards more sustainable tourism can be taken locally in the context of that bigger picture: in part by celebrating and exploiting the fact that visitors can be local as well as international and that businesses can be rooted in the inherent strengths of the destination.

We see the key leadership role in securing more sustainable cultural tourism as falling, in large part, to historic towns and heritage cities. The democratic mandate of local and regional government provides the platform to engage with their communities – citizens and businesses – in order to rethink, inspire and co-ordinate a common vision that provides a pathway to systemic change and a more sustainable and resilient future. The guidelines presented here are designed to show how decision makers may openly assess their current approach and begin to scope and develop a clear plan of action for a better, more sustainable and resilient future. The Covid-19 pandemic presents them, and all of us, with a once in a life time opportunity to rise to that challenge and ensure the pandemic cloud can indeed have a silver lining.
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