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ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CC: Carrying Capacity
CCM: Carrying Capacities Model
CH: Cultural Heritage
CSMP: Cultural Site Management Partnership
EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment
EMP: Environmental Management Plan
EP: Environmental Planning
EPM: Environmental Planning and Management
GEF: Global Environment Facility
GIS: Geographic Information System
GUI: Graphical User Interfaces
ICCROM: International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property
ICOMOS: International Council on Monuments and Sites
ICT: Information and Communication Technology
ICZM: Integrated Coastal Zone Management
IUCN: International Union for Conservation of Nature
LAC: Limits of Acceptable Change
MAB: Man and Biosphere Programme
MAP: Madrid Action Plan
MoU: Memorandum of Understanding
RDBMS: Relational Data Base Management System
SEE: South East Europe
SSM: Soft System Methodology
TAC: Tourism Action Committee
TSAP: Tourism Strategy and Action Plan
UNECAP: United Nations, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific
UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNWTO: United Nation World Tourism Organization
WCH: World Cultural Heritage
WHL: World Heritage List
Wi-Fi: Wireless Network
WNBR: World Network of Biosphere Reserves
WP: Work Package
1. INTRODUCTION

Cultural Heritage in South East Europe is very impressive. The legacy of thousands of years of history has not only left material traces, such as historic buildings or characteristic architectural features (dry stone walls, chapels, fountains, vernacular buildings) (EC 2002), but also a wealth of immaterial culture, be it customs, folklore, know-how, handicrafts, culinary specialties, music, dance and others. Almost every village has its own distinctive heritage, which not only identifies it, but also differentiates it from neighbouring villages. The majority of SEE countries have made considerable efforts to inventory and conserve their built heritage. At international level, unique and outstanding examples are recognized through their nomination as a World Heritage site under the auspices of UNESCO. In Europe there are now over 962 such sites listed, among them 745 Cultural sites (in the CHERPLAN project the sites of Aquileia (Italy), Hallstatt (Austria) and Idrija (Slovenia) are included in the World Heritage List), so there are no doubts that this immense heritage has the ability to attract tourists, not only to the actual sites but also to the surrounding area.

The idea of this publication originated from a discussion within the CHERPLAN Steering Committee meeting in Montenegro. Participants noted that all the involved pilot project sites present a common ‘Hit-and-Run’ Tourism problem, with tourists visiting the site for few hours to continue their travel to other destinations with more attractive accommodation and recreational facilities. This type of tourism generates mainly negative impacts on the heritage sites (dealing with increased waste generation, water consumption and traffic) while the income is almost absent. Daily mass tourism in the area of Hallstatt for example (involving tens of buses per day) has a high environmental impact on the territory. In the other CHERPLAN sites the number of tourists is still limited and concise strategies with defined limits and measures against Hit-and-Run Tourism were able to prevent unsustainable tourism development in these sites.

In discussing Hit-and-Run Tourism, we need, however, to consider how a sustainable tourism can be achieved in the Cultural Heritage sites. In addition, Cultural Heritage (CH) is not seen as an overall priority for national development unless its relationship with social values, economic activities and local development is made clear. This kind of tourism constitutes an essential engine for economic development, where the major measurable economic impacts of CH include: job opportunities and household income; centre city revitalization; stable property values and small business incubation. In Europe revenues generated by cultural tourism are most significant: 79% of the turnover in Europe’s Cultural Heritage sector is tourism related, while 16% is derived from maintenance investments by private owners, charities, and foundations (Archimede Programme) with the remaining 5% coming from public and governmental bodies. It is evident that heritage is a driving force for development of tourism industry in our cities. According to recent estimates, more than 8 million jobs are directly and indirectly sustained by the Cultural Heritage sector in Europe. Nevertheless, in this period of economic recession most national governments decided to cut the budget dedicated to this important sector.

For the above-mentioned reasons, it is necessary to find appropriate solutions which, on one hand increase the number of tourists - and in particular the overnight stay - in order
to strengthen the revenues from the tourism sector, and on the other hand adopt an environmentally friendly strategy to preserve the value and beauty of the natural and cultural heritage.

The Environmental Planning and Management concept elaborated in this project can help decision makers improve the development opportunities of the pilot site.

This publication has been developed with the aim of providing a common understanding of terminology and key-concepts. For this reason the second Chapter explains the CH meaning, the importance of the international legal frameworks in managing Cultural Heritage Sites and the relevant role of public participation in developing the management plan in order to balance tourism flow and sustainability of the sites.

Subsequently, Chapter 3 focuses in detail on the Cultural Heritage Management and Environmental Management Planning approach applied in the CHERPLAN project, including impact assessment methodologies, the concept of aesthetic aspects in CH sites and the use of regulations, incentives and GIS applications. Sustainable tourism strategies according to the guidelines provided by the main International Organisations is dealt with in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 constitutes the 'core' of the publication addressing concrete issues such as impacts, opportunities and threats of tourism in Cultural Heritage sites and presents also two case studies (Venice and Dubrovnik). In Chapter 6 readers are provided with the aims, processes, methodologies and description of the main methodologies and deliverables of the CHERPLAN project. It gives also an overview of the CHERPLAN pilot sites as regards their historical, geographic and cultural values. Chapter 7 describes the holistic approach adopted by CHERPLAN with particular reference to the pilot sites analysis. The data provided by the various project partners concerning governance, tourism business, the environmental, social and cultural situation as well as the threats and opportunities of the single sites are delivered and discussed in Chapter 8. Finally, Chapter 9 and 10 will provide decision makers and CH managers with valuable strategies and solutions for the future as well as useful recommendations.
2. CULTURAL HERITAGE FRAMEWORK

Cultural Heritage is about far more than ‘stones and bones’ from the past. It is all the aspects of a community's past and present that it considers valuable and desires to pass on to future generations. Heritage is, therefore, valuable and cannot be recreated.

In the past, the meaning of Cultural Heritage included only monuments and great works of arts. Aesthetic and historic values were the main criteria that determined the significance of CH. This means, for example, if a Cultural Heritage is deemed to have high aesthetic value or has association with an important person or historic event, it would be considered as having high cultural importance. Today - in addition to aesthetic and historic values - social values, such as traditional practices or beliefs, are considered amongst the main criteria for determining the cultural significance of CH places.

Countries use different methods to determine their Cultural Heritage and the type and significance of culture may vary from country to country. In general, the heritage law of a country defines what constitutes Cultural Heritage for that country. Furthermore legal definitions in many countries are often very narrow and may not be applicable to all elements of cultural expression. The manifestations of Cultural Heritage can be grouped into the following two broad categories (UNECAP, 2008):

**Tangible heritage:** Physical manifestation or symbol of cultural expressions or traditions of the societies that are living or lived in the area. Monuments, traditional buildings, archaeological sites, temples, historic cities, etc. are examples of tangible heritage.

**Intangible heritage:** Non-physical manifestation of cultural expressions and traditions of a society that has its roots in the cultural values and practices of the previous generations. Traditional ways of life, social practices, festivals, music, craftsmanship, etc. are examples of intangible heritage.

This classification is useful for understanding different manifestations of CH, although tangible and intangible heritage are mostly interlinked.

Tangible heritage can be further classified as either immovable or moveable heritage. Tangible heritage objects that cannot be moved are referred to as immovable heritage. Immovable heritage cannot be moved as for example temples and archaeological sites. Moveable heritage can be moved from one place to another, e.g. statues that are not fixed to a structure or artefacts, such as furniture, potteries, or musical instruments.

In the past, CH meant only tangible heritage, especially monuments. Now the definition of Cultural Heritage has become much broader, encompassing all creative expressions from people’s existence in the past, near past and present that have been passed on to the present generation. These include intangible heritage as well as historic areas and cultural landscapes.

Cultural Heritage speaks about the traditions, beliefs and achievements of a country and its people, and about the history, art, spiritual beliefs and social values of a particular group of people. By telling us about the past and by demonstrating the achievements and excellence of past generations, Cultural Heritage represents our identity and can help us appreciate the cultural diversity of humankind.
2.1 International Regulatory Framework for Heritage Protection

It is worth to emphasize the importance of the international legal framework in managing Cultural Heritage sites (e.g. UNESCO, EU, Council of Europe), since they are the foundations of most national and regional laws and regulations. It is also important to take into account that the protection, restoration and revitalization of Cultural Heritage are a responsibility of the state parties. Therefore it is up to the national authorities to elaborate strategies and regulations for the heritage protection as well as the socio-economic use of the sites, especially with regard to sustainable tourism.

A key source for Cultural Heritage Legislation at international, EU and national level is the International Art and Heritage Law database (EUI, 2012 - [www.eui.eu/Projects/InternationalArtHeritageLaw/Home.aspx](http://www.eui.eu/Projects/InternationalArtHeritageLaw/Home.aspx)).
The following UNESCO conventions are the basis for further regulations at national level:

**Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage**

Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 16 November 1972, in force 17 December 1975, 1037 UNTS 151.

The Convention has been accepted (by accession or ratification) by 189 states. As regards the CHERPLAN partners, Albania, Austria, Greece, and Italy have ratified the Convention, while Montenegro, Slovenia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have made a notification for succession.

**Underwater Cultural Heritage**


The Convention has been accepted (accession or ratification) by 189 states. As regards the CHERPLAN partners, Albania, Italy, Montenegro and Slovenia have ratified the Convention, while Austria, Greece and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have not yet signed.

**Intangible Cultural Heritage**


The Convention has been accepted (accession or ratification) by 142 states. All CHERPLAN partners have ratified the Convention.

**Cultural Diversity**


The Convention has been accepted (accession or ratification) by 124 states. As regards the CHERPLAN partners, Austria, Greece, Italy, Montenegro, Slovenia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have ratified the Convention, while Albania is engaged in the accession process.

---

**2.2 Importance of Cultural Heritage Sites Management**

CH sites are unique and vulnerable places that can easily get damaged. They constitute very valuable and irreplaceable assets, hence good care needs to be taken to ensure that their cultural significance is preserved. It is therefore important to be aware of the kinds of risks that might threaten CH sites in order to identify the measures required for the protection and the appropriate future use of the sites. The CH sites throughout the world are in constant danger from both natural and man-made threats. Natural threats
can range from natural disasters, such as earthquakes, floods, typhoons, etc. to humidity or dampness.

Some of the major human-induced threats listed in the Training Manual for Trainers published by the United Nations include:

**Ignorance**: Not knowing the CH sites or their values and ignorance about appropriate protection measures can have a devastating impact on CH. For example, many countries do not carry out regular and systematic studies/surveys to identify and prepare inventories of heritage sites. As a result, the public or even the site managers do not have any clear knowledge of their CH site.

**Neglect**: is often tied to ignorance. Neglect can slowly but irreversibly damage a site. For example, there are many CH sites in almost every country that are not listed as protected sites. Consequently, people or the government do not pay much attention to their protection. Constant exposure to different kinds of threats and lack of care gradually damage the sites.

**Illegal trade**: Illegal trade of heritage objects, such as paintings, statues or other artefacts, is a major problem causing loss of CH in SEE countries. Archaeological sites are raided, temples are robbed and artefacts stolen and taken out of a country to feed the illegal trade of heritage objects.

**Theft**: Thefts are often encouraged by the illegal trade. But theft can occur for other economic reasons, such as the existence of an unregulated antique market.

**Fire**: While ignorance and neglect inflict damage little by little, accidents, such as fire, can cause great damage to a site within a very short time. Timber structures, archival and museum collections, etc., are highly vulnerable to fire dangers.

**Development work**: Construction of a new road or bridge can have a number of negative impacts on a site. Some impacts are purely visual and aesthetic, such as blocking the view of a heritage building by a new construction. But, in many cases, public works may lead to demolition of historic buildings or separation between various parts of a site.

**War**: A war can bring anarchy to a country, both of them probably allowing damage to heritage sites to happen. The looting during the 2003 war of Iraq’s National Museum, which hosted the most complete collection of artefacts from Mesopotamian Civilization, the destruction of the historic Aleppo Souk and other sites during the current civil war in Syria, are examples of damage caused by war. Moreover, CH sites are very often intentionally targeted to demoralize opponents. The destruction of the Old Bridge of Mostar during the Bosnian war is an example of such intentional targeting.

A good site management system aims for prevention rather than cure. Through constant and good monitoring, good management can identify and prevent threats and take corrective measures in time. However, in most cases, simple common sense is sufficient to identify the types of threat a site might face.
2.3 Public Participation in Cultural Heritage Site’s Management

Public participation can bring many benefits to a CH site. Due to the close relationship between CH and local communities, it is important to share the benefits with local communities. In this way, people develop a stronger attachment to the site and take care of it. Receiving benefits from Cultural Tourism is also a right of local people that should be respected.

Participatory processes help to define the problem and identify the solution drawing from a wide variety of viewpoints, increasing our understanding of the interlinked nature of problems facing society. Participatory processes can improve implementation, as a decision or a policy will be more effective if a broad coalition of stakeholders support the proposal and work together to deliver it. Participatory processes can increase public trust, as openness to conflicting claims and views increases the credibility of the final decision and stimulates an active civil society involvement.

Benefits can be shared by either direct or indirect means. The direct means include the creation of employment opportunities for the locals. However, many communities may not be ready to take up many of the Cultural Tourism-related job opportunities, as they may not have received the required training. The site managers can provide on-job training facilities for locals to increase their capacity to participate in these activities. A more useful but indirect approach is to encourage and support businesses and activities that provide greater employment opportunities for local people.

Many components of CH sites are owned and/or managed by different community members or by public bodies. The management of a CH site, therefore, requires good cooperation between the parties. However, local communities may not have the capacity to meaningfully participate in the decision-making concerning site management, which may lead to non-participation by the locals (Richard et al. 2007). Nowadays there is widespread consensus about considering public participation indispensable to project success. Various foregoing points have highlighted that the participatory approach proves beneficial; the following additional reasons apply (Van Heck, 2003):

1) **Coverage**: to reach and involve the stakeholders on a wider scale.

2) **Efficiency**: to obtain a cost-efficient design and implementation of a project. The beneficiaries will contribute more actively in project planning and implementation by providing ideas, manpower, labour and/or other resources (cost sharing) and consequently use resources more efficiently.

3) **Effectiveness**: people involved obtain a say in the determination of objectives and actions, and assist in various operations like project administration, monitoring and evaluation. They obtain also more opportunities to contribute to the project and thus facilitate the diagnosis of environmental, social and institutional constraints as well as the search for viable solutions.

4) **Adoption of innovations**: the stakeholders can develop greater responsiveness to new methods of production, technologies as well as services offered.

5) **Sustainability**: more and better outputs and impact are obtained in a project and thus longer-term viability and more solid sustainability. By stressing decentralization,
democratic processes of decision-making and self-help, various key problems can be better solved, including recurrent costs, cost-sharing with beneficiaries as well as operation and maintenance.

Only few projects attain effective participation: Only in truly participatory processes participation is seen as an end and not only as a means. Practice shows that in the long run these projects work better.

Participation becomes a must, since complex organization makes it necessary to mobilize stakeholders’ experience and skills in order to deliver effective long-term results. This is even more important if the purpose is to set up a new way of practicing, interacting and organizing, i.e., to introduce innovative processes in a given local context.

Sometimes innovative approaches or processes can fail for the following reasons:

– Difficulty in development or lack of common strategic visions;
– Goals not understood at the lower organizational levels;
– Objectives becoming “moving targets”;
– Plans encompassing too much in too little time;
– People not working toward the same specifications;
– Lack of instruments and methods to expedite real participation;
– Difficulty in communication;
– Lack of effective management and leadership;
– Competition and conflicts;
– Exclusion of key stakeholders;

These problems rise on the one hand from complexity of the project scope and, on the other hand, from lack of participation of the key stakeholders in the former design stages. Both aspects find in participation a vehicle for increasing the project effectiveness: when people have a genuine stake in a development activity and are actively involved in decision-making, they are likely to provide a greater degree of commitment, and shared objectives are more likely to be met.

Anyhow, stakeholder’s involvement and consultation is not enough: their effective participation needs methodologies, competences and rules in order to find the most appropriate strategies to manage change and innovation processes (Stra.S.S.E., 2007).

The cost-effectiveness of participatory approach is difficult to determine, as current economic and social parameters are only in part adequate to measure costs and benefits. The assessment of these is, however, important as they indicate economic and financial viability and facilitate communication with officials and experts who see development predominantly from an economic point of view.

---

**The main direct and indirect benefits**

The direct benefits:

- Employment and income generation;
- Accumulation of tangible assets;
• Development of community assets;
• Upgrading of skills.

The indirect benefits:
• On-going exchange of information, experiences and views;
• Spirit of participation, cooperation, sharing, self-confidence and hence better management of group enterprises;
• Ability to articulate and solve problems;
• Development of grassroots organizations (institution-building);
• Prevention or resolution of conflicts.

The direct benefits can be measured mostly quantitatively to a sufficiently reliable extent, whereas the indirect ones can mostly be described only qualitatively.

2.3.1 Constraints of Participation

Very often citizens do not take part in decision processes due to the following reasons:

1. The political conditions/power structures of the country and project area which influence the participation of citizens, mainly those who do not trust the decision makers.

2. Lack of funding: there is a perception that heritage is a luxury compared to dealing with issues such as education, health, employment and defence.

3. Legislative obstacles: national regulations that limit or deny the modification or construction of infrastructures (houses, bridges, roads etc) are perceived by citizens as limit to growth.

4. Administrative obstacles: complex, bureaucratic procedures impede genuine participation as well as one-way, top-down planning performed solely by professionals;

5. Socio-cultural impediments: a serious obstacle is the widespread mentality of dependence, sense of frustration as well as distrust in officials among people, who are frequently dominated by local elites to whom they have to leave key decision-making.

6. Other impediments are: exposure to non-local information, ignorance of the locals, stakeholder’s rights to self-organization and lack of leaders and know-how in order to promote their interests.
2.3.2 Participation in Planning Processes

Public participation should play a major role within any sound planning process in order enhance its effectiveness. Some typical steps to be undertaken include:

- **Stakeholder Mapping**: grouping based on different functions, capacities and activities, including specific interests and perception of the situation;

- **Integrated System and Problem Analysis**, subsequent to creating a collaborative approach with all stakeholders;

- **Development of shared vision, goals and expected results**;

- **Deficit Analysis**: to cope with the mid- to long-term impacts identified, necessary (especially remedial) actions should be defined - also with the help of a developed set of indicators for sustainability;

- **Development of Tools and Solutions**: management tools (addressing present and prospective pressures and drivers acting on the system) and innovative solutions (including application of new soft/hard technologies) should be discussed and assessed against alternatives;

- **Monitoring Success/Failure**: a set of criteria/parameters should be developed to monitor future development including qualitative and quantitative success against goals and expected results.

Several methods have been developed to put participation into practice, each having its own peculiarities as to applicability. The so-called *World Café* (www.theworldcafe.com/method.html) has been selected for use in the CHERPLAN project, due to its
widespread applicability. It is a creative process for facilitating collaborative dialogue and the sharing of knowledge and ideas. A café ambiance is created, in which participants (from 12 in numbers up to over 1000) discuss an issue in small groups around tables thus establishing a living network of conversation and action. For more information, refer to CHERPLAN publication “Participation Process in Cultural Heritage Sites – Handbook” (www.cherplan.eu).

Other methods address the cooperative analyses to be carried out with stakeholders and actors. The Soft System Methodology has been selected for application in Hallstatt, Austria (one of CHERPLAN’s pilot sites). It can eventually lead to defining/taking action to tackle the identified problem situation. The process starts with the creation of a non-structured representation of the present situation of the system to be analysed (including structures, processes, and relationships: this is the so-called “rich picture”). Subsequently, the participants work out – always bearing in mind the whole system picture – structured models of the problem situation (extensive use can be made of such tools as problem trees and cause-effect analysis), and then concept models with possible alternatives for solution.

The advantages of this method are the following:

- It is agile and not costly, and does not require extensive use of complex ICT;
- All stakeholders and actors in a region are involved;
- They are guided to develop a system picture (instead of prioritising their own interests), according to their own experience in the local context; they can define the necessary information and data sets needed (basic information is usually all relevant physical and economic data);
- They develop alternatives and check the expected impacts and with this background they can prepare, implement and monitor “informed” decisions.

For more detailed information, refer to CHERPLAN’s Cultural Heritage Environmental Planning and Management Concept (www.cherplan.eu).
3. HERITAGE SITE MANAGEMENT PLANNING

3.1 Cultural Heritage Management Plan

Cultural Heritage management involves the actions taken to identify, assess, decide and enact decisions regarding Cultural Heritage. It is undertaken to actively protect culturally significant places, objects and practices in relation to the threats they face from a wide range of cultural or natural causes. Different countries have different approaches to CH management. The most common tool consists of preparation of a management document describing the management objectives and process (www.whc.unesco.org).

The term Management Plan is commonly used for management documents for World Heritage sites. A Management Plan for a heritage site generally serves the following purposes:

- Establishes and shares the overall vision for long-term management of the site;
- Informs everyone involved/related about the management needs of the site;
- Provides guidance on how to protect and manage the site.

The contents of a Management Plan may vary greatly between various sites and between different countries. However, the most common components of a Management Plan include the following:

- Site description: location, boundaries, components, users/owners, etc., of the site;
- Historical development and cultural significance of the site;
- Existing management system;
- Management vision and objectives;
- Conservation and management issues and needs assessment;
- Expertise needed to manage the site;
- Funding;
- Training;
- Action plan and maintenance schedules.
Core issue - Inclusive Management

Ensure meaningful participation of a diverse range of stakeholders in Cultural Heritage work. Engage internally with all employees to ensure positive Cultural Heritage outcomes.

Engagement means the active exchange of information, listening to concerns and suggestions and developing an agreed way forward together. Engagement is therefore much more than consultation. Engagement should be inclusive and ongoing and used to inform and guide how Cultural Heritage management is conducted at all phases of our projects and operations.

According to the Rio Tinto Guide for integrating Cultural Heritage management into Communities work (Rio Tinto, 2011), an effective CH management involves the components and considerations set out in the following four phase framework:

![Four phases of Cultural Heritage Management](source)

**Phase 1 – Know and understand**

- Know the Cultural Heritage considerations.
- Undertake significance and impact assessments to understand the value of Cultural Heritage and report management decisions.
Integrate in social risk analysis.

Knowing the places, objects and practices that are important to communities, and understanding why these are valued, is the foundation for a sound Cultural Heritage management system.

Phase 2 – Plan and implement

- Plan and effectively implement Cultural Heritage management system.
- Integrate Cultural Heritage considerations into:
  - Policies at business level;
  - Communities strategy and multi-year plans;
  - Operational plans and communities work, including: goals, objectives, targets, indicators and actions;
  - Standard operating procedures and protocols.

Good Cultural Heritage management requires careful planning to ensure it is smoothly integrated into our operational plans and procedures.

Phase 3 – Monitor, evaluate and improve

- Monitor direct and indirect impacts to Cultural Heritage.
- Evaluate Cultural Heritage outcomes.
- Review and assess performance of Cultural Heritage management systems.
- Adjust and improve systems, programmes and operational plans.

Monitoring, evaluating and improving on the performance of an operation’s Cultural Heritage management system is essential.

Phase 4 – Report and Communicate

- Report Cultural Heritage performance and incidents internally and externally through formal reporting processes such as sustainable development reports.
- Communicate openly with external communities and stakeholders through diverse forums.

Reporting and communicating have both internal and external audiences. Internally, managers need to know how well risks are being managed, whether corporate requirements are being met, and how the Cultural Heritage management system is performing.
A modern and sustainable Cultural Heritage management approach is increasingly complemented by an Environmental Planning and Management approach and included into a legally binding master plan.

### 3.1.1 Planning and Monitoring Tools for World Heritage Sites

A Practical Manual for World Heritage Site Managers (Pedersen, 2002) was published in 2002; it shows how to balance creation of new economic opportunities and heritage protection and conservation. Carrying Capacity and Related Planning Issues (see Chapters 3.4) bear particular relevance to CHERPLAN purposes. Understanding the subject of Carrying Capacity and the related methodologies has become essential for planning and decision making. These methodologies involve generation of impact indicators and standards that are essential for determining when undesirable change is taking place at a site. Change can refer to:

i) The Environment: up to a certain point, ecosystems are able to tolerate human (specifically tourism) interference while maintaining sustainable functioning;

ii) The Society: there is a limit beyond which the number of people in an available space would cause a decline in the quality of the recreational experience and the users’ satisfaction; cultural resistance and resilience within the host communities are another key factor to consider;

iii) The Physical conditions, mostly referring to the available space for human (especially recreational) activities.

All the newer visitor management methodologies (such as the Visitor Experience and Resource Protection Process – VERP) are applicable to both natural and cultural sites and follow some basic steps:

A) **Well defined goals** for desired conditions must be set (reflecting stakeholders’ needs and concerns, management objectives and policy or vision statements); they will serve as a baseline for determining an acceptable level of impact. Desired conditions address such factors as aesthetical appearance, water and air pollution, fresh water and electricity availability, litter, crowding and so on.

B) Changes in the ecological, physical and social conditions should be adequately tracked by selected performance and impact indicators. However, indicators should not be seen as a full measure of an impact or problem, but more as an attempt to describe it. Not all problem areas and concerns are conducive to monitoring through indicators. Recommended requirements for indicators include the following features:

- **Quantitative** - measurable;
- **Easy and cheap to measure**;
- **Relevant, significant and sensitive** - genuinely reflects the concern being tracked;
- **Reliable over time** - monitoring can be repeated during each monitoring cycle.

An inventory of existing conditions provides the baseline data required for indicators, allowing at the same time to determine the degree to which existing conditions vary from
desired conditions. The inventory will test the data collection techniques and provide information needed for the monitoring phase, aiding in standardisation of surveys (e.g. preparation of evaluation forms, identification of optimum frequency of measurements).

Some examples of monitoring indicators are listed below (from Petra archaeological site, Jordan):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Standard/ Remedial Actions</th>
<th>Method of Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of surface artefacts</td>
<td>The tolerance for loss of surface artefacts is zero</td>
<td>2X2 meter monitoring plots are established at selected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active erosion of archaeological sites</td>
<td>Zero tolerance</td>
<td>Aerial surveillance techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looting of archaeological sites</td>
<td>Zero tolerance</td>
<td>Aerial surveillance techniques used to detect unauthorised excavations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual intrusion by modern or incompatible additions to the landscape element</td>
<td>An action is taken for any intrusion by an incompatible element</td>
<td>Aerial surveillance techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of people per month and per day and hour</td>
<td>Management actions are taken if visitation exceeds standards by 10%</td>
<td>Ticket sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of graffiti</td>
<td>Damage caused by vandalism will prompt a management action</td>
<td>At vulnerable locations 2x2 meter monitoring squares on the facades of monuments and tombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor satisfaction</td>
<td>A drop in an established index prompts a management action</td>
<td>Visitor and local resident surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - Monitoring indicators


C) The shift to LAC-type management methodologies has highlighted the importance of monitoring. Monitoring visitors’ likes, dislikes and travel patterns, as well as their impacts, can help identify and justify needed actions in the changing tourism industry. However, monitoring is effective only if it is done regularly; if it cannot be sustained, its usefulness is severely limited. Fewer options exist for monitoring socio-economic conditions such as crowding and community attitudes. Most socio-economic information is obtained through questionnaires or interviews, work that is labour-intensive and time-consuming. Finally, all monitoring programmes should be evaluated to determine how well they measure the indicators. Site managers should be made reasonably confident that a detected change is the result of visitor impact and not errors in measurement. Monitoring of historic monuments must take into account values of integrity and authenticity. Apart from structural or engineering conditions, decision makers should spell out the reasons for a site’s cultural and historical significance before determining objectives and standards for the purpose of monitoring.
To ensure a monitoring programme’s sustainability, consideration for the practical needs of site managers, tourism officials and private operators will improve chances of success. Local guides may be able to help with monitoring, and private travel agencies interested in tracking visitor preferences could finance surveys. With historic buildings and other built cultural sites, a simple report with notes and photos has been found to be far more useful than detailed, item-by-item reports on conditions. Thus, a simple monitoring programme is better than none at all and can be more effective than costly ones.

D) An understanding of the causes of changes in indicators can point to management solutions. Problem analysis begins with the monitoring process, during which solutions are identified to bring about desired conditions. As long as a site meets established standards, a manager’s responsibilities extend to routine maintenance and continuous monitoring. However, if ecological, physical and/or social conditions approach or reach unacceptable levels, action must be taken. Once the cause is clearly identified, corrective actions can be taken. These can be direct or indirect. Direct management actions confront problems of human behaviour through regulations that may entail enforcement, restricting activities or rationing use. Indirect methods seek to affect behaviour through education, information and persuasion. Other indirect actions include physical alterations, such as the redirection of a trail to a more resilient area of a natural site. Experts say regulations succeed when they have strong public support, are carefully explained, and when visitors have some say in how they are implemented. Visitors must understand why a behaviour change is desirable. Once implemented, of course, regulations must be enforced. Limiting regulation to the minimum necessary to effectively accomplish management objectives is usually a good policy. In practice, a combination of methods is generally used, such as in the case of vandalism, where physical protection of the resource as well as education, making a site inaccessible to vehicles, increasing admission fees, etc. are recommended. As another example, to deal with uncontrolled dumping of garbage, an educational campaign may be launched describing the problem and inviting voluntary compliance with a regulation against dumping at the site. If voluntary methods fail, a fine can be imposed. If this doesn’t work, the area may have to be closed. Managers often opt for direct methods when faced with problems such as proximity to high population centres and limited staff and finances. In these situations, the cost and time involved in implementing indirect methods is weighed against immediate problems, such as the need to prevent the rapid degradation of an archaeological site by visitors buying objects stolen from the site. So, factors to consider when selecting management actions include whether they meet objectives, their likelihood of success and difficulties of implementation, particularly cost. Awareness of the visitor profile also helps to ensure success.

3.2 Environmental Planning and Management

3.2.1 EPM Methodology

The Environmental Planning (EP) and Management (EPM) approach seeks to include a wider range of factors than those, urban and spatial planners have traditionally considered in socio-economic development (such as transportation, sanitation and other services): by interdisciplinary work with environmental planners, such important
dimensions as the natural, environmental, social, political, economic and governance are taken into account in the decision-making process, thus providing a holistic framework best suited for achieving comprehensive and sustainable outcomes.

Complex relationships exist within and between natural systems and human systems, especially in terms of impact by human activity over the environment (which can be considered as composed of three main 'spheres', the biophysical, the socio-economic and cultural, and the built and historical). EP endeavours to manage the decision-making processes addressing such relationships in an effective, orderly, transparent and equitable manner for the benefit of all constituents within such systems for the present and for the future.

The operational objectives should include provision for verifying environmental performance through information on impacts as they occur, for responding to unforeseen events (such as changes in plan implementation) and impacts, and for obtaining feedback for continual improvement in environmental performance. The management objectives to be reached during the life of the plan should be clearly defined, including the environmental objectives, aiming at enhancing benefits and minimising adverse impacts. The actions needed to achieve these objectives should be detailed, including how, by whom, when, with what resources they will be achieved, with what monitoring/assessment and to what target or performance level.

Furthermore, an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) should include the following descriptions:

1) Institutional structures, roles and communication processes required for its implementation;
2) The links to the relevant legislated/regulatory requirements;
3) Requirements for record keeping, reporting, review, auditing and updating of the EMP.

Present day EP practices are the result of continuous refinement and expansion of the scope of such decision-making processes. Some of the main elements are:

- Social & economic development;
- Urban development;
- Regional development;
- Natural resource management & integrated land use;
- Infrastructure systems;
- Governance frameworks.

Assessments to be made in the framework of EP encompass areas such as land use, socio-economics, transportation, economic and housing characteristics, air pollution, noise pollution, the wetlands, habitat of the endangered species, flood zones susceptibility, coastal zones erosion, and visual studies among others; they can be collectively referred to as an Integrated EP Assessment. Chief concerns among environmental planners include the encouragement of sustainable development, equity, environmental justice, green building technologies, and the preservation of environmentally sensitive areas.
As with other forms of planning, the processes in EP are grouped into distinct facets of organisational activity such as:

- Legislative & administrative planning framework;
- Environmental resource management planning;
- Landscape planning;
- Urban planning;
- Information and dissemination;
- Decision-making.

### 3.2.2 Implementation of EPM to Cultural Heritage Sites

No doubt the EPM approach will gain even further meaningfulness when applied to Cultural Heritage sites, as the project CHERPLAN aims to promote. As a matter of fact, CH is typically valuable, but also scarce and non-renewable. However, it is often perceived by populations as a hindrance to development. The (misleading) dilemma between loss of cultural values and loss of identity, due to non-sustainable growth, and economic decline and emigration, due to obsolete infrastructure and high cost of living. Such a perceived dilemma needs to be overcome, by showing how strong compatibility and synergy exist between CH conservation and sustainable socio-economic growth. It is clear that strong public participation is required to ensure the establishment of beneficial synergies, which can be best achieved in an EP framework.

A progressive shift of the Cultural Heritage paradigm has taken place in recent decades from a primarily monumental and aesthetic interpretation of the categories of ‘monuments’ and ‘groups of buildings’, as physical objects to be protected and conserved in relative isolation due to their ‘outstanding universal value’ (under the 1972 UNESCO World Heritage Convention; to ‘inhabited historic towns’ (as described in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, (2008). This reflects a broader understanding of historic cities and settlements as places of habitation and socio-economic activity, in which individual cultural objects are recognized as components within their wider (especially, environmental) settings and human contexts. This is the very way the EPM approach addresses the issue of CH sites.

One relevant instance of such new understanding is represented by the recent discussion about the opportunity that World Heritage sites be surrounded by carefully planned and adequately sized buffer zones (UNESCO 2009). The ensuing expert recommendations include:

- **The criteria for selection:** Buffer zones should address external threats and opportunities, so much so that the area hosting anything that impacts or could impact a WH site would need to be considered; typical criteria include views and (especially environmental) settings preservation, traffic or visitor pressure management, but, also, support of activities that enhance the WH property while benefiting the local community. Of course, different requirements exist as to the appropriate buffer zones according to the type of WH site (i.e., whether it has a landscape or an individual scale, or it is an urban or a rural area). Consequently, different zoning provisions may be considered, including visual corridors and influence zones (e.g., the watershed). Climate Change
impacts should be considered as an additional factor when addressing the requirements for and design of a buffer zone (additional space and/or connectivity to other conservation areas can allow WH settings to adapt to change or assist mitigation).

- The importance of public participation: To obtain effective operation, not only should buffer zones be clearly linked to the appropriate legal and management frameworks, but the fact should also be highlighted that buffer zones provide an important potential means to share the benefits of WH listing or respond to community needs in areas surrounding WH properties. Communities should thus become target audiences for effective communication in relation to WH issues, with special reference to sustainability. However, one should be made aware of the fact that community engagement, including all levels stakeholders and decision-makers, – as good a practice as it may be – will not always be easy, since a wide range of local cultural and social factors should be adequately reflected.

- A holistic management approach: An integrated approach is needed – as is EPM – encompassing management within a WH site together with management of a wider area including the designated buffer zone(s). Regulatory mechanisms including urban and land-use planning are important within and outside of the WH site to protect its outstanding value and make buffer zones operational. But another important requirement consists in establishing a direct connection between WH management and sustainable development use for local communities and other stakeholders, including careful consideration of traditional practices, wherever they exist.

The concept of ‘buffer zone’ sounds possibly somewhat limited when regarded in the EPM perspective; sure enough, it tends to convey the idea that all CH sites need is supplementary protection. To stress the fact that CH management should always include its wider setting and context, in order to address social and developmental, as well as protective, measures, it will probably be more appropriate if we speak in terms of an ‘extended zone’, to be coupled with the ‘core zone’, the area restricted to the CH property’s physical location.

Another set of issues refer to historic centres or settlements: they are important, for they make up a good deal of CH sites and face typical threats to their integrity and identity (UNESCO 2003, 2010). Their original inhabitants find themselves often gradually expelled to anonymous neighbourhoods under the pressure of pervasive gentrification and tertiarisation. Sometimes they can be induced to do so willingly, by the perceived attractiveness of modern lifestyles and the presupposed social prestige linked to living in a new, modern neighbourhood. In other cases such social perceptions have started a spiral of decay and public neglect for historic centres, which remain inhabited only by the most disadvantaged and marginalised population. Another dramatic impact refers to the systematic disruption of urban landscape brought about by the automobilization. In the end, what remains usually scarce among populations is a sense of collective responsibility for their CH places.

To these adverse factors and conditions, a number of remedial actions and tools have been devised and implemented, some of which deserve at least a concise mention: 

In general, historical centres should constitute just one neighbourhood among others: sometimes that means moderating their privileges and ensuring that public services and
infrastructure are balanced throughout the city; at other times, housing and infrastructure improvements (e.g., road maintenance or increased access to urban networks and services) are needed to restore the attractiveness of deteriorated historical centres.

Public participation keeps being imperative: not only are local communities the most legitimate interlocutors, as the city’s primary users, when CH and urban planning policies are discussed, but they (and especially the local associations) also are repositories of a special and valuable kind of knowledge about the place in which they live; even the genius loci, the spirit of a place, is the product of their symbolic and emotional relationship with their living space, and a key basis of social cohesion. Thus, instilling a sense of collective responsibility by involving the public in the promotion of their heritage and identity could lay the groundwork for effective CH policies. Financing the preservation of privately-owned heritage buildings is another sound tool, in that it can help avoid detrimental demolitions or modifications, and the socially disruptive appearance of real estate speculation. Heritage Houses have been created at WH sites across the world under the aegis of UNESCO: these serve as information and public relations centres for the local populations, provide project management and assistance with issues relating to services, regulations, construction permits, and host expertise exchange and transfer, offering workshops and training in CH management.

At the institutional level, on the one hand improvement of vertical coordination between responsible governmental bodies is often required, together with (including legal) recognition of the increasing role local authorities have come to play when CH is concerned. At the same time, linking CH policies and urban/spatial and development planning should be encouraged. At the international level, submission of a management plan has been made a condition of inscription on the UNESCO WH List, thus creating one operational tool for integrating conservation and spatial planning and development efforts. France stands as one good example, where housing improvement procedures have resulted in municipal authorities becoming increasingly involved in heritage protection; in turn, CH management has been made an integral part of larger even national-scale development scenarios.

Where mobility is concerned, alternative more sustainable modes of transport should be introduced, coupling increased mobility with improved quality of urban spaces and life. Reconciling heritage preservation, public health protection and mobility demand is a political choice, and a number of successes (e.g., new modern tramways) attest to its viability. Furthermore, local authorities should be granted the right to raise taxes on private transportation; the ensuing financial resources could support the increasing heritage efforts they are called to make.

The management of CH sites has already gained widespread acknowledgement as being a complex holistic task, based not on mere safeguarding of properties and tangible values, but rather encompassing a wealth of factors – many of which intangible – and places relatable to CH, with special reference to be given to the full involvement of local communities. EPM keeps on remaining an innovative approach, in that it explicitly stresses the importance of the environmental settings and factors when addressing the management of historical CH sites. Environmental Impact Studies (Petts, 1999) provide a useful consolidated framework to list the environmental factors and components to be considered; the status of the following should be assessed: Landscape and Ecosystems, including climate, flora and fauna, air, water (both surface- and ground-water), soil and land use; noise and vibrations together with other possible threats to human (and environmental) health.
3.3 Aesthetic Aspects in Management and Planning of Cultural Heritage Sites

According to the World Tourism Organization, sustainable tourism leads to the management of all resources in such a way that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems. Starting from this definition we can introduce the concept of 'aesthetic' in Cultural Heritage sites. The aesthetic value of a Cultural or Natural Heritage site is very important and is considered by the World Heritage Committee as criteria used to highlight the outstanding value of a site.

However in many historical centres world-wide, tourists and residents will be disturbed by several factors impacting the aesthetic value or visual integrity of the sites: satellite antennas visible on the front of historical buildings (often out of the windows); waste bins or plastic bags in the streets, large modern advertisement posters located in the most visible locations, aerial phone and electrical wires, cars parked in front of buildings, and lack of green areas or green belt, etc. All of these examples contribute to reduce the attractiveness of a Cultural Heritage site. Of course, people living in historical centres have the same needs and demands as people living in "non-historical" locations. They all need reliable infrastructure and services which will guarantee the functioning of their communities. People require internet connections, heating or cooling systems, TV, car parks, etc.

The main task of a Cultural Heritage Site Manager should therefore be to protect the visual integrity of the site while tending to meet local needs and demands and enabling community development. It now appears that these two conflicting goals of the past may have changed with the introduction of new technical solutions available, greatly reducing the visual impact of modern infrastructure. Together with effective regulations, political and economic support as well as adequate resources, solutions can be implemented that enable both goals to be met. Some of these technical solutions are presented in this chapter.

An important role played here is by environmental planners who need a set of skills and talents that include knowledge of land, air and water resources, employment trends, cultural diversity and associated issues, use and needs of new technologies, and conflict resolution. There are many tools, both well established and state-of-the-art, used in the planning process:

- Vision and strategy sessions of interested groups
- Idea fairs to bring together the best new concepts
- Computer simulations and scale models of plans
- Design workshops
- Social and environmental impact analysis
3.3.1 Issues and Potential Solutions

This chapter presents selected infrastructure sectors (telecommunications, solid waste management, waste water and water supply, buildings and energy and mobility), including typical aesthetic issues faced by CH sites managers, as well as possible solutions to these issues.

Telecommunication

Issue(s): Many satellite antennas or rooftop dishes are visible on the faces of buildings (often out of the windows) as well as electrical and phone wires.

Potential solution(s): Instead of having one antenna for each apartment, it could be possible to have a single centralized antenna for the whole building. This antenna could be located on top of the roof and positioned in such a way that it is less visible. The electrical and phone wires could be buried under the road pavement. For Internet, it should be possible to install Wi-Fi towers outside the historical centre.

Solid Waste

Issue(s): Wheeled bin and collection containers have a certain visual impact on the historic scenery. In some cases bins can also block the sidewalks. Plastic bags used to collect waste are sometimes being ripped open by animals which result in rubbish on the street.

Potential solution(s): Waste can be collected in underground bins. The Municipalities of Ljubljana (Slovenia), The Hague (The Netherlands) and Cambridge (Great Britain) are examples, where such collection systems have already been implemented.

![Examples of underground bins in Ljubljana and high tech waste bins in Washington](source:www.architetturaecosostenibile.it/curiosita/varie/lubiana-capitale-culturale-europea-907.html and University of Washington/TreeHugger (Abdul Vahid V)

Underground waste collection systems minimise the visual impacts of the collection infrastructure by storing waste below ground and by reducing surface requirements above ground. These systems prevent bins from littering the streets on collection day. Recycling remains possible as recyclables and non-recyclables can be collected in different bins. Underground bins can therefore strongly contribute to the improvement of cleanliness and appearance of allocation.
Two other important advantages are highlighted in an Addendum of the “Sustainable Resource and Waste Strategy of North West Cambridge” (AECOM, 2012). First, underground collection systems might be simpler for the elderly and infirm to operate, removing the need for manoeuvring heavy wheeled bins and instead require carrying small waste bags. Calculations presented in the NWC strategy paper show that such systems can be economically viable. For that particular project, it was expected that underground collection systems would enable the reduction of collection time and therefore collection costs.

There are also some disadvantages that one should be aware of. Since underground bins are usually small, the trip frequency of people bringing their wastes might be higher than with wheeled bins. This might be a source of dissatisfaction among the local population even if the underground bins are located close to dwellings (which should be the case anyway). Collection from the underground bins requires the use of a special vehicle equipped with a crane. This may be a problem in old historical centres; as such a vehicle might not be able to drive through narrow streets.

![Fig. 5 - Spittelau thermal power plant in Vienna, Austria](Source: ww.gis.com.qa/cewep)

Waste infrastructures can also be designed to prevent negative visual impacts. An example is the thermal power plant of Spittelau in Vienna, Austria. The exterior of this waste-to-energy incinerator located in the 9th district of Vienna was designed by the architect and artist Hundertwasser at the end of the 1980s. The facility has now become one of the main tourist attractions in the city.

**Waste Water and Protection of Water Bodies**

**Issue(s):** Water bodies are polluted due to inappropriate or deficient waste water management or lack of protective measures for water resources. Besides being a potential sanitary danger, this is a dramatic problem considering that water is one of our vital resources and the support of many ecosystems. Polluted water bodies can also disturb tourists and residents because they negatively impact perception of the site (visual, olfactory, etc.)

**Potential solution(s):** The solution is an efficient waste water management system and effective protection measures for water resources. Projects should be carried out to tackle existing problems which can be for example the intrusion of fresh water into
sewers, poor performance of waste water treatment plants, untreated discharge into receiving water bodies or the presence of different sources of contamination.

Pollution of water bodies can also be a direct threat to the integrity of Cultural and Natural Heritage sites. An example is given in a scientific publication published by Simsek et al (2000), which deals with the World Heritage site of Pamukkale in Turkey. The main natural feature of the site is the Pamukkale National Park, which is famous for its travertine terraces and pools filled with hot thermal spring water, all located at the foothills of the Cockelez Mountains (see Figure 6).

Simsek et al. studied the discoloration of the travertine terraces and observed that “The pure white travertines have gradually become darker, yellowish and brownish in colour since the development of tourists and hotels in the area”. The research activities showed that the phenomenon was due to algal growth partly related to the abundant presence of nutrients in the water. Several sources of contamination were identified, including visitors of the site swimming in the pool and also septic tank effluents of near-by hotels (See Figure 7).
Based on their detailed study, the authors recommended the implementation of protective measures, including the reduction or prohibition of commercial tourist activities in the most sensitive areas. The measures included the enactment of special regulations and laws as well as the design of protected zones to assist in minimizing pollution.

**Water Supply**

*Issue(s):* In flat areas, water towers might be considered as a possible alternative to develop the water supply infrastructures of a community. Water towers are very likely to impact the townscape.

*Potential solution(s):* Underground water reservoirs with pumping stations. Water towers are a key issue for CH sites in flat areas. An example is given by a project targeted at upgrading a water supply system for a community located near a Cultural Heritage site in Lao People’s Democratic Republic. Part of the upgrade consisted of building a water tower, which was not located in the UNESCO protected areas, but was still discussed because of the impact that the tower would have on the landscape (Di Stefano et al., 2012). An alternative to a water tower would be an underground water reservoir combined with a pumping station, which would be necessary for reaching design flow and pressures in the system. This solution requires a constant supply of energy for the pumps, whereas with a water tower, the pumps are in operation for only a few hours per day.

*Issue(s):* Water losses from the water supply system impacting the foundations of some buildings (e.g. Split), (Vidovic 2012).

*Potential solution(s):* Water losses reduction campaigns including the replacement of leaking pipes. Pipes can be replaced or rehabilitated using trenchless techniques. The method still requires the opening of pits (holes on each side of the pipes to be replaced) but avoids the digging of long trenches and thus reduces the impact on the townscape. Examples of methods for pipe replacement and rehabilitation are pipe ramming, pipe jacking and horizontal directional drilling, fit lining method, cured in place pipe method and pipe bursting method. More detailed information can be found in specific literature and on selected Internet websites.

**Buildings and Energy**

*Issue(s):* Low energy efficiency of old buildings. Infrastructure is required to transfer energy to houses and is sometimes visible (e.g. power line cables).

*Potential solution(s):* Old buildings can be renovated so that they progressively develop toward meeting passive house standards. The aim here is to increase the energy efficiency of the buildings and reduce their ecological footprints.

There are different ways to raise the energy efficiency of a building. The thermal envelope can be improved by adapting the foundations, roof, walls, doors and windows of a building and in each case different techniques can be applied (see Table 2). The reader will find more detailed information on each of these techniques in the deliverable “Environmental Planning Concept” of the CHERPLAN Project.
Improving the thermal envelope of a building will also involve adapting heating and ventilation systems as the heating demand is significantly reduced. Here also, different techniques are possible, including different forms of heating (space, under floor, wall or ceiling heating) and ventilation systems. Each solution has its own advantages and disadvantages that must be considered during the planning process.

As for effective use of solar energy, there are two alternatives. On the one hand there are solar thermal systems, where the sun's radiation is converted into heat and stored in a suitable medium (air, water). This is mainly used for heating or hot water. On the other hand, there are photovoltaic modules that convert solar radiation directly into electricity. Solar PV technology can be integrated into shingles. Most systems installed today are in flat-plate configurations that are typically made from solar cells combined into modules that hold about 40 cells. Building-integrated PV (BIPV) products may be appropriately suited for applications on historic buildings. The figure below shows an example of this technology integrated into shingles. Examples of BIPV include shingles, single-ply membranes, and standing seam metal roofs. In some cases BIPV can add cost and complexity to a project and may not be universally available, but may help enhance acceptance of a project on a visible surface.

### Table 2 - Possible techniques for improving the thermal envelope of buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exterior walls</td>
<td>Internal thermal insulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insulation plaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exterior insulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparent thermal insulation of external walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofs</td>
<td>Pitched roof insulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insulation of the attic floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Refurbishment of existing windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement of windows to passive house windows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Improving the thermal envelope of a building will also involve adapting heating and ventilation systems as the heating demand is significantly reduced. Here also, different techniques are possible, including different forms of heating (space, under floor, wall or ceiling heating) and ventilation systems. Each solution has its own advantages and disadvantages that must be considered during the planning process.

As for effective use of solar energy, there are two alternatives. On the one hand there are solar thermal systems, where the sun's radiation is converted into heat and stored in a suitable medium (air, water). This is mainly used for heating or hot water. On the other hand, there are photovoltaic modules that convert solar radiation directly into electricity. Solar PV technology can be integrated into shingles. Most systems installed today are in flat-plate configurations that are typically made from solar cells combined into modules that hold about 40 cells. Building-integrated PV (BIPV) products may be appropriately suited for applications on historic buildings. The figure below shows an example of this technology integrated into shingles. Examples of BIPV include shingles, single-ply membranes, and standing seam metal roofs. In some cases BIPV can add cost and complexity to a project and may not be universally available, but may help enhance acceptance of a project on a visible surface.
The use of these technologies is always to be discussed with the office of preservation of historic buildings and monuments, as it affects the visual appearance of the buildings.

An example of refurbishment to passive house standards is the "Handwerk 15" building in Görlitz, Germany (Conrad, Häupl, Petzold, Löber, 2007).

A residential building in this town was refurbished to meet passive house standards. This baroque building was built in 1728 and inscribed on the list of protected properties. Renovation works took place in 2006 and were focused on the improvement of the thermal envelope, and integration of solar panels, solid fuel boilers, self-regulating walls and floor heating and heat recovery systems. The project responsible achieved the energy efficiency class A+ under observance of all conditions for preservation of historic buildings and monuments, taking into account the environmental issues as well as durability and safety of the constructions in the house (see Figure 10).
Visual Pollution

Issue(s): There is a rising practice of huge advertising on historic monuments, pursuing business interests intruding upon cultural undertakings. This kind of visual pollution, called culture jamming by Adbusters magazine, has aroused local and international protest.

The historic heart of Venice has been invaded by large advertising billboards, placed on façades undergoing restoration (The Art Tribune, January 2013). The advertising changes periodically and appears to be permanent as some scaffoldings are even up for three years and new restoration worksites are started on a regular basis, turning the area of St. Mark’s Square into an advertising showroom. The recent changes in the Italian law allow for private-sponsored restoration work of public buildings and the huge advertisements have been authorized by both the City Council and the Superintendency of Monuments of Venice. But does the end justify the means and should we accept this type of spin-off by claiming it provides funding for the conservation of important monuments?

Having drastically reduced public funding for heritage, the Government obviously shares the largest responsibility for this situation. ‘Private sponsorship’ or ‘Patronage’ thus tends to take over the heritage governance with ensuing consequences when not thoroughly regulated. Yet, other solutions exist and some private companies and foundations are willing to fund restorations in a more respectful way, compatible with the environment, e.g. by having their names appear more discreetly on the scaffolding tarpas (Giornale dell’Arte, October 2010).

Potential solution(s): An attempt to place an advertisement of the supermarket chain Esselunga on the Ponte Vecchio in Florence last year was met by harsh criticism from the Florentines, led by the mayor himself, and lasted less than a week before it was taken down amidst protests, though not before Esselunga agreed to continue sponsoring the restoration without visible advertising, as reported by The Art Newspaper. Currently, a palace overlooking the Piazza della Signoria is being restored but without any advertising on the scaffolding tarp which, instead, simply reproduces the façade (Fig. 12).
In Athens the advertising billboards and neon banners covering rooftops and façades and obscuring views in the historical city centre were removed as part of an urban improvement project: a successful four year programme, started in 2004 in preparation of the 2004 Olympic Games overcoming resistance from advertisers and building owners. Most of the billboards were illegal, but had been ignored up to then.

The local authorities in many countries mediate through the instrument of authorization which follows strict rules for historical centres. An exemplary case is represented by the decorative store signs in the old town of Salzburg (Austria), advertising everything from where you can get your hair cut to the best place to purchase a Christmas ornament. Most signs are in traditional wrought iron and have gold-leaf embellishments. Even the McDonald's has a sign that includes golden arches.

![Fig. 13 - Shop Signs in Salzburg (Austria).](http://certaincaesura.blogspot.it/2009/11/salzburg-austria-store-signs.html)

**Mobility**

**Issue(s):** In historic cities possibilities for modifications and changes of existing spaces and structures in the urban design are limited. In old towns narrow public space and sometimes even the presence of stairs lead to difficulties in accessibility, especially for cars and other motor vehicles or for people with special mobility needs. For the same reason there is often lack of adequate parking space. Moreover, insufficient information on how to access the city centre and its cultural attractions and where to find parking space causes avoidable traffic mainly at the city entrance and in the city centre. In many areas different modes of transport are not separated and use shared space. It is distinctive for cities with Cultural Heritage that one-day visitors cause high traffic volume and peaks in demand. All of these facts may lead to conflicts between visitors and inhabitants (e.g. between users of different modes in areas of shared space) and negatively impact the perception of the site. Motorized transport may also be a threat for the historic monuments and sites (e.g. stone decay due to air pollution).

**Potential solution(s):** Regulate private motorized transport, enhance public transport and encourage bike and pedestrian traffic or introduce management measures.
**Private motorized transport:** There are several possible measures to restrict access of private motorized transport into old towns and sensitive areas. This can be achieved by introducing a general prohibition of entry, exception be made for inhabitants and overnight guests for loading and unloading (if there is no private hotel parking), or by a temporal entry restriction (e.g. during major visitor flows). In addition, the number of coaches per day can be limited so that these cannot enter the city without pre-registration.

Providing inhabitants with multi-car garages outside the city may help solving parking difficulties for those not disposing of parking facilities, but may prove to be counterproductive. Parking fees could be introduced as additional measure.

A useful travel guidance system helping visitors find their way should be set up to avoid an increase in traffic caused by seeking parking facilities.

**Public transport:** It is important to develop intermodal travel by connecting parking areas located outside the city to the city centre with an efficient shuttle service (e.g. by train or light rail, boat, bus or mini-bus connection, depending on suitability, space and travel demand.

In a city with Cultural Heritage assets, planners should focus on visitors and the origin of their travel. An attractive public transport service should be provided to visitors (even from far away) to achieve modal shift and reduce the number of private visitors’ cars in the city.

**Bicycles:** Supporting cycling in the city (in the best possible way) may help reduce also foreign motorized transport within the city. A dense urban bicycle network can be targeted, possibly separating pedestrian and bicycle traffic to avoid conflicts. Bicycle rental should be available at parking areas outside the city, at stations and other starting points for a city visit and sufficient bicycle parking areas should be provided to avoid illegal parking.

**Pedestrians:** Within old city centres pedestrians should have priority. A good walking network can be targeted, avoiding as much as possible obstacles on pedestrian routes (e.g. stairs). Resting places for pedestrians with shaded areas as well as squares may improve quality of public space.

In order to help visitors orienting, good imparting information is required: a guidance system, information boards at tourist hot spots (e.g. at shuttle bus stops, stations, parking areas, sights etc.), free city maps and specific sight information.

**Management measures:** Introducing tourist taxes for one-day visitors may help in addressing mobility problems.

### 3.3.2 Regulation, Incentives and other Tools

Of course the above-mentioned suggestions are not always feasible, but a lot can be done to improve the attractiveness of a cultural site. Effective and tailored regulations, political and economic support as well as adequate resources are essential requirements.
of the management plan, while economic incentives are instrumental in convincing inhabitants. Various tools can be used to enhance the planning processes and the communication among stakeholders. For instance, 3D simulations together with Geographic Information Systems (GIS) are effective tools to evaluate the possible impact of infrastructure projects on the visual integrity and the aesthetic of a site. Several examples can be found in the deliverable of the EU sponsored HerO - Heritage as an Opportunity – project (HerO, 2008-2011).

3.4 Defining Limits in Tourism and Planning Systems

3.4.1 Carrying Capacity

The term ‘Carrying Capacity’ refers to the number of individuals a given area can support within natural resource limits and without degrading the natural, social, cultural and economic environment for present and future generations. The Carrying Capacity for any given area is not fixed. It can be altered by improved technology, but mostly it is changed for the worse by pressures which accompany a permanent or seasonal population increase. As the environment is degraded and the various natural or cultural resources are endangered or depleted, Carrying Capacity actually shrinks, leaving the environment no longer able to support even the level of activity of the people who could formerly have lived in the area on a sustainable basis. No population can stand living beyond the environment’s Carrying Capacity in the long term.

![Carrying Capacity versus human activity](image.png)

*Fig. 14 - Carrying Capacity versus human activity
Source: Cherplan Regulatory Framework - CTI*
Figure 14 depicts the relationship between human activities in an area and its Carrying Capacity. Whenever Human Activity surpasses the Carrying Capacity, the results are adverse towards the environment and the local resources of the area and in many cases irreversible.

The term Carrying Capacity can be applied to a variety of systems and conditions. Related to tourism there are physical, economic, social, biophysical and other types of Carrying Capacity. Therefore it can be applied to different regions or areas and depict the capacity of the region or area for diverse resources including natural, tourism, cultural or social assets. 'Tourism Carrying Capacity' is defined by the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) as "the maximum number of people that may visit a tourist destination at the same time, without causing destruction of the physical, economic, socio-cultural environment and an unacceptable decrease in the quality of visitor satisfaction" Chamberlain (1997) and Middleton and Hawkins (1998). Whereas Middleton and Hawkins Chamberlain (1997) define it as "the level of human activity an area can accommodate without the area deteriorating, the resident community being adversely affected or the quality of visitors experience declining". What both these definitions pick up on, is that Carrying Capacity is the point at which a destination or attraction starts experiencing adverse effects as a result of the number of visitors. Since cultural tourism usually represents a big percentage of the total tourism for an area, Tourism Carrying Capacity is an important figure for the sustainable development of that area offering an important Cultural Heritage as part of its tourist attractions. Addressing the sustainability problem from the Cultural Heritage point of view, would thus mean that the cultural resources of an area do not face irreversible degradation problems, i.e. the Tourism Carrying Capacity of the area is not surpassed by the tourist activity in the area.

Sustainable CH management entails setting limits to growth. These limits should be set by the CH managers subsequent to consultation and agreement with CH experts, stakeholders and the host community. The underlying principle of the Carrying Capacity Model (CCM) is that thresholds exist for all sites. The model brings about the identification of such thresholds in the bio-physical, socio-cultural, psychological and managerial environments. CCM is commonly used in CH planning and often entails the definition of an optimum level for use of specific sites.

Although it is technically very difficult to establish limits or thresholds for the acceptable use of vital resources at CH sites, a good estimate and approximation should be established based on a resource review conducted professionally at the local level. Such thresholds and limits imply that CH use beyond these levels (based on current management and used parameters) could severely threaten the mid- and long-term survival of the site and the standards of living and quality of life for the host communities. For some CH sites, the Carrying Capacity limits can be relatively rigid. For others, they may change over time. Visitor management actions can also affect this. Good visitor management practices (e.g. visitors walk on designated trails or wear special shoes on fragile flooring materials) or better conservation practices can increase the CC limits.

The principal difficulty of the Carrying Capacity approach lies in determining how much impact is too much; the focus should be on determining the level of use beyond which impacts exceed acceptable levels specified by evaluative standards. Together with the environmental and tangible heritage constraints, development issues, economic and socio-cultural effects on host communities should be included into the assessment. The Carrying Capacity for an area is not fixed; it can be altered by improved technology, but mostly it is changed for the worse by pressures which accompany a permanent or
seasonal population increase; so, the Carrying Capacity actually shrinks, leaving the environment no longer able to support even the level of activity of the people who could formerly have lived in the area on a sustainable basis.

3.4.2 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment

The Framework for Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) of World Heritage sites is provided by the “Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties” elaborated by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS, 2011). The purpose of the Guidance is underlined in the following: "World Heritage sites are thus single heritage assets with an international value that has been clearly articulated. Not everything within them contributes to Outstanding Universal Value, but those attributes that do must be appropriately protected. This guidance sets out a methodology to allow HIAs to respond to the needs of World Heritage sites, through considering them as discrete entities and evaluating impact on the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value in a systematic and coherent way."

Environmental and Heritage Impact Assessments (EIA and HIA) should be carried out before visitor centres, accommodations, roads, waste treatment and disposal, heritage trails, tourist shops and other facilities are constructed.

In the event that a HIA or other forms of impact and feasibility studies are not conducted prior to the establishment of the CH site as a tourist attraction, the CH site manager is advised to address the following concerns in consultation with the host community, CH professionals and tourism operators:

**Physical concerns:** Is there enough space for development without harming the CH site (including preserving the visual setting and cultural fabric of the site) and/or the livelihood, quality of life and character of the host community?

**Ecological concerns:** Will growth or Cultural Tourism development destroy the natural system that contributes to the character of the CH site and ensure that the host community lead healthy and environmentally secure lives?

**Cultural concerns:** Are local customs, practices and traditions threatened by Cultural Tourism development? Do host communities have resilience and capacity to negotiate external cultural influences without losing their unique characters? Will immigration of tourism and CH workers from places or origins external to the CH site and host communities permanently, severely and negatively alter the local cultural fabric and structure?

**Social concerns:** Is the community able to assimilate new residents and their demands for more, new and better services? Will rising crime or health issues threaten the local community? Is there fear of losing control over new immigrants and external investors?

**Economic concerns:** Can the local resources finance additional infrastructure needed for tourism? Are local funds available? Are national funds available? Is there a potential for
other sources of funding? If so, is there a legal and practical framework for ensuring that funding be used in ways that maintain a sustainable Cultural Tourism industry and not for political or personal gain (for example, financial leakages to external investors and minimal local ‘trickling’ of economic benefits)?

3.4.3 Limits of Acceptable Change Planning System

The Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) methodology is similar, but focusing on achieving desired conditions rather than setting quantitative amounts and thresholds of use since many problems are a function not so much of people in their numbers as in their behaviours. The basic logic of the LAC is as follows:

1) Identify two goals in conflict. In the case of CH sites, the two goals can be the protection of CH (goal 1) and the unrestricted access to resources for recreational use (goal 2);

2) Establish that both goals must be compromised. If one or the other goal cannot be compromised, then the LAC is not needed – one goal must simply be compromised as necessary to meet the one that cannot be compromised;

3) Decide which goal will ultimately constrain the other. In the case of CH sites, the goal of protecting CH will usually constrain the goal of unrestricted access;

4) Define LAC quality standards for this ultimately constraining goal. LAC standards express the minimally acceptable conditions for CH protection;

5) Compromise the ultimate goal until standards are reached. Allow CH to degrade only to the minimally acceptable standard. Recreational access should not be substantially restricted until the standards are reached;

6) Compromise the other goal as much as necessary. Once standards for CH protection are reached, no more degradation is allowed, and recreational access is restricted as needed to maintain quality standards.

Once (either or both of) the above assessments carried out, it will be possible to plan the necessary tourist infrastructure without running the risk of overestimating provision.
3.5 GIS as Tool for Cultural Heritage Management

3.5.1 Introduction

Tourism and Information Technologies are among the most important driving factors in the actual global economy. Huge investments and products (both software and hardware) were developed and produced in the last decades in order to share all kinds of information (text, images, media) worldwide, using different technologies or communication protocols.

One of the most interesting perspectives in the application of these technologies involves geographical information services, i.e. geo-technologies, especially those services that use mobile devices. Taking into account the extraordinary growth of the smartphones market (more than 40% only in the first period of 2012), exceeding one billion devices in the world (http://www.strategyanalitics.com) it is easy to perceive the importance of such technologies in the daily life as well as their potential in the future.

On the other hand, tourism industry still records globally positive annual growth in employment and GDP, demonstrating its resilience and underlying strength despite significant social unrest and economic instability (WTTC, 2011).

Given the relevance of geo-technologies for people, it is fundamental to recognize its importance and to better understand the role of such technologies in the future planning and management of tourism infrastructures.

3.5.2 About Geographic Information Systems

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) are suites of software implemented to manage and analyze geographic data, information correlated to a spatial reference, i.e., a specific position on the earth surface.

A modern GIS is structured in a modular manner where the User Interface (UI) gives the user the possibility to access different parts of the software: data management, spatial and data analysis, and output management. The management of data can be done both in file system with standard formats, and using a Relational Data Base Management System (RDBMS) centralized in a single host or distributed over multiple hosts.

The planning process and the subsequent implementation of the database are the most important phases in GIS planning. One usually starts from the final user’s point of view, exploring his expected outputs. This phase, commonly named ‘requirements analysis’, starts with a question and answer session between data base planner and stakeholders. The specification of the algorithms to be implemented and the data to be collected, are used to formalize a conceptual design (see Fig. 15) and an on-going database structure.

The subsequent phase concerns the choice of the software and software libraries and the implementation of the data base structure, using a specific Relational Data Base Management System (RDBMS) (Navathe & Elmasri, 2010).
An important step (despite its obviousness) is the data collection. Building tourist maps implies the storing and the management of both alphanumeric and cartographic (vector and raster) data. The choice of the right scale of the base-map and the optimal resolution of all data is fundamental.

A GIS thematic layer is created for each of these data-types, as roads and buildings (vector layers), Digital Terrain Models (raster layer), or any information related to tourism (alphanumeric data).

A step-by-step procedure in data collecting can be summarized as follows:

- a base-map of the region must be chosen and digitized, on the basis of the scale ratio necessary for the subsequent analysis;
- all required information must be collected (and digitized) taking into account the resolution of the base-map;
- all the collected layers must be geo-referenced taking into account the coordinates system and the projection used in the base-map;
- topologies must be created to establish relationships between the map features.

Every spatial feature can be connected with extra information (e.g., the timetable of a bus associated with bus-stops, or the opening hours of a museum linked to its position on the map). This information must be collected and compiled, also media (e.g., pictures, audio, movies) must be stored in the system and linked to features.

All the data stored in the database or directly linked to the features can be managed to assure the final user a satisfying visit experience.

Besides the spatial database the nucleus of the data storage is part of a GIS is its analytical capabilities bound to spatial analysis functions. Spatial analysis tools
implemented in a GIS help to identify trends on the data as well as to create relationships between the data stored in the spatial database, making use of attributes (both spatial and non-spatial), to give the user a whole view of the real world scenario and to answer questions about it.

The aim of spatial analysis tools is to transform data into different kinds of information useful for decision-makers.

Through spatial analysis tools GIS can carry out many types of geometric queries, e.g., different attributes can be shown using different graphics, the size of the graphic can qualitatively suggest the dimension of a specific number associated to the feature. Features can be pointed out on the base of their position in connection with other features (proximity, inclusion, exclusion, etc.).

One of the most useful (and used) applications is related to network analysis capabilities. Through specific queries performed on vector lines data, the best route from a feature (place) to another can be found, taking into account spatial (routes, distances, crossroads) and non-spatial (traffic, roadbed status) features.

**Advantages of GIS Application**

The advantages of using a GIS environment to manage tourism data are multiple:

1) GIS provides a mapping environment where a large number of information can be correlated to a place and inter-correlated between themselves in terms of data type and geographic position.

2) Making use of the fundamental features of databases, like multi-user functionality, multiple user interfaces or roles, privileges management: a centralized data repository can be used by multiple users with different roles and/or different technical skills. Different users can access and process different data on the same system, depending on their role or the project they are working on.

3) A GIS platform can provide user-friendly GUIs (Graphical User Interfaces) published on a website (WebGIS) to meet the requirements of a huge number of users.

4) A large amount of information is available for tourists all over the World Wide Web in a countless number of websites. An advantage of GIS (and a WebGIS) is the centralization of all interesting data from different sources, in a unified environment and the visualization of data on maps. Maps are the most natural way to present data and the most user-friendly way to present tourist information.

5) Maps and information on natural and cultural heritage connected to tourism application are an excellent contribution to capacity building and awareness-raising of visitors.
3.5.3 Tourism planning: GIS data collection and analysis

Two aspects regarding management of tourism data have to be taken into consideration: the data set and the algorithms to be implemented (Jovanovic V, Njegus A, 2008).

Basically the following general data have to be collected:

- a topographic base-map (raster or vector format);
- orthophoto maps (raster);
- administrative bounds (vector);
- Digital Terrain Model (DTM) (raster);
- Road network (vector): roads, waterways, parking areas, bicycle and foot paths;
- public transport network (vector): railways, underground lines, bus lines;
- buildings (vector);
- historic buildings and monuments (vector);
- parks and natural treasures (vector);
- facilities and Points of Interests (POIs) (vector): hotels, restaurants, clubs, medical facilities, car rentals, gas stations, info points, museums, sport centres, shopping centres;
- waste collection facilities (vector): recycling banks, collection sites;
- water supply facilities (vector): water sources, fountains, customer network.
GIS is a unique instrument to visualize multiple kinds of information on one map. This means that all layers can be correlated and integrated with non-geographical information such as:

- public transport time-tables;
- opening hours of museums and other attractions;
- hotels and restaurants rates and costs;
- local rules/timetable for waste collection;
- events calendar;
- historic data, intangible heritage, flora and fauna;
- information regarding society and economy.

3.5.4 Application Scenarios

The application scenarios are multiple. Some examples will be made below considering both the tourist and the local administrator point of view. The tourist will be interested to collect information for making his cultural trail through the site simpler and satisfying, while the administrator will generally be interested in enhancing the quantity and quality of cultural attractions, planning interventions to make the site more attractive to a larger public and, at the same time, preventing any effect that might cause any Cultural Heritage degradation.

The following examples take account of a GIS implemented with a Web interfaces, i.e., a WebGIS. This technology presents the advantage to be more user-friendly for non-technical skilled users at the cost of disposing of a minor number of tools.

The Tourist Point of View

Three different phases can be distinguished in a tourist visit:

1. choosing the Cultural Heritage site to visit;
2. planning the visit;
3. the visit itself.

The aim of planning a visitor information service is to assist tourists in all these phases.

GIS can help in the first phase: maps can evidence in a prompt manner the cultural assets of the entire region and the proximity to other tourist attractions and can indicate the associated services.

It is in the second phase that a WebGIS starts to show its real potential, offering easy and essential information to the visitor, e.g. by means of a search tool for accommodation facilities based on different criteria/data:
The next step concerns the assistance to the visitor during his cultural trail.

A wizard tool, asking the visitor his proper preferences, can be implemented so that the spatial database can elaborate the specific itinerary requested and illustrate it on a map. Besides the preferences expressed by the visitor, the tool should also take account of data as public transport timetables and opening times of the sites and should offer additional documentation by means of printable maps, route indications and comprehensive video/audio-guides which can be downloaded through a podcast service and used on mobile devices like smart phones and tablets. An interesting example of a similar implementation can be found on the Aquileia Forum website: http://www.aquileiaforum.org.

The Administrator Point of View

All the operations and choices made by the visitors on the WebGIS/website constitute valuable information for the local administrator. The statistical treatment of these data can highlight the preferences of the visitors and can be used, together with the results of on purpose implemented satisfaction surveys, to plan future investments.

To make a proper environmental planning, the above-mentioned data should be coupled with all data reported in paragraph 3.5.3 (GIS data collection and analysis) as well as with data regarding infrastructures information and environmental hazards of the area where the Cultural Heritage site is located.

Without entering into details, which would fall outside the scope of this work, some examples can be listed:

- information regarding energy sources (electricity, gas);
- information on waste collection areas (capacity, access ways);
- data regarding flooding hazards (flood areas, depressed areas);
- weather data (precipitations, mean seasonal temperatures);
- data regarding seismic hazards (seismic microzonation, historical seismicity);
- data regarding sinkholes phenomena (man-made cavities, karst cavities);
- data regarding land subsidence phenomena;
- data regarding volcanic and post-volcanic phenomena (volcanic activity, gas-hazard);
- data regarding the proximity of (dangerous) industrial clusters;
- data regarding fire-hazards (neighbouring wooded areas, wooden buildings).
A proper land planning for a sustainable tourism development must take account of a thorough knowledge of the above-listed information data (Boers and Cottrell, 2007), and should give special consideration to the inputs received from the visitors, like the most frequently chosen itineraries (involuntary input) or the suggestions derived from forums and appreciation questionnaires.

Specific attention must be paid to the development of communication routes, favouring the non-motorized ways like foot and cycle paths. In this field the analytical tools for GIS network analysis can give the planners a unique instrument capable of elaborating reliable predictive models if provided with all necessary data.
4. STRATEGIC GOALS OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

4.1 The Global Framework

Tourism is today one of the most important economic sectors worldwide. UNWTO (the UN World Tourism Organization) estimated in 2011 a continuous growing of ca. 4% per year, with 982 million tourist arrivals and 740 billion Euro export earnings generated. One billion tourists have traveled the world in 2012, marking a new record for international tourism – a sector that accounts for one in every 12 jobs and 30% of the world’s services exports. The figure cements tourism’s position as one of the world’s largest economic sectors, accounting for 9% of global GDP (direct, indirect and induced impact), one in every 12 jobs and up to 8% of the total exports of the world’s Least Developed Countries (LDCs). But tourism is also very demanding regarding use of natural resources and impact on nature and culture. The objective of Sustainable Development will only be attained if tourism becomes compatible with the social, cultural and ecological environment.

The post Rio+20 Strategic Orientations

The Rio+20 Conference (2012) reconfirmed the strong willingness to strengthen Sustainable Tourism to achieve the targets of sustainable development. The commitment of the parties has been summarized in the final document “The Future we want” (UN, 2012) as follows:

130. We emphasize that well-designed and managed tourism can make a significant contribution to the three dimensions of sustainable development, has close linkages to other sectors, and can create decent jobs and generate trade opportunities. We recognize the need to support sustainable tourism activities and relevant capacity building that promote environmental awareness, conserve and protect the environment, respect wildlife, flora, biodiversity, ecosystems and cultural diversity, and improve the welfare and livelihoods of local communities by supporting their local economies and the human and natural environment as a whole. We call for enhanced support for sustainable tourism activities and relevant capacity-building in developing countries in order to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

131. We encourage the promotion of investment in sustainable tourism, including eco-tourism and cultural tourism, which may include creating small and medium sized enterprises and facilitating access to finance, including through micro credit initiatives for the poor, indigenous peoples and local communities in areas with high eco-tourism potential. In this regard, we underline the importance of establishing, where necessary, appropriate guidelines and regulations in accordance with national priorities and legislation for promoting and supporting sustainable tourism.

Previous steps and elaborations on the matter include the ones illustrated below.
Global Initiatives of Sustainable Tourism

UNWTO adopted in 2001 the “Global Code of Ethics for Tourism” (UMWTO, 2001) which can be considered as a basis for Sustainable Tourism (ST). This Resolution is coherent with the targets of Sustainable Development; several articles refer directly to the key points of cultural and eco-tourism: A1) Tourism contribution to mutual understanding and respect between peoples and societies; A3) Tourism, a factor of sustainable development; A4) Tourism, a user of the Cultural Heritage of mankind and contributor to its enhancement. A5) As regards the carrying capacity and the impact on the sites, the Code emphasizes that local populations should have an equitable share in economic, social and cultural benefits that tourism activities generate. The Code of Ethics has been elaborated more in-depth as it has been more in-depth elaborated by UNESCO, UNEP, European Commission and other institutions in their respective fields and is hence highly relevant for responsible tourism development in heritage sites.

UNWTO has further defined sustainable tourism as follows:

"Sustainable tourism development meets the needs of present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing opportunities for the future. It is envisaged as leading to management of all resources in such a way that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, and biological diversity and life support systems".

This definition takes a further step forward by recognizing the importance of aesthetic needs, ecological processes and life support systems for Sustainable Tourism development. Such a holistic approach poses a big challenge: clear objectives and strategies as well as a strict implementation are required if a balanced tourism system is to be achieved.

The UNWTO definition considers tourism quality development and respect for nature and culture, including the needs of both tourists and local populations.

UNWTO stated in 2004 the following with regard to sustainable business practices:

Sustainable tourism development guidelines and management practices are applicable to all forms of tourism in all types of destinations, including mass tourism and the various niche tourism segments. Sustainability principles refer to the environmental, economic and socio-cultural aspects of tourism development, and a suitable balance must be established between these three dimensions to guarantee its long term sustainability.

Since tourism involves a large number of people including local population, stakeholders and tourists, UNWTO considers participation a key process for achieving sustainable development:

Sustainable Development requires the informed participation of all relevant stakeholders, as well as strong political leadership to ensure wide participation and consensus-building. Achieving sustainable tourism is a continuous process and it requires the constant monitoring of impacts, introducing the necessary preventive and/or corrective measures whenever necessary.
Sustainable tourism should also maintain a high level of tourist satisfaction and ensure a meaningful experience to the tourists, raising their awareness about sustainability issues and promoting sustainable tourism practices amongst them.

In this context, sustainable development should focus on a tourism compatible with the natural, social and cultural environment, involving the whole tourism business and infrastructure as well as the tourist behaviours. Hence, sustainable tourism principles should be applied to the whole action chain from strategy and goal setting, integrated planning, participatory processes development and implementation, to monitoring and feedback. This implies a major transformation of all key factors of tourism including a new investment policy. Mass and professional tourism destinations will certainly face considerable challenges so as to meet the required changes. On the other hand, eco- and cultural tourism addressing quite specific tourist needs have a real opportunity to manage these transformations rather quickly. The adoption of this new tourism policy should be a must for middle income countries featuring a growing tourism and market coupled with a high need for balanced development and efficient use of natural resources.

The aims of sustainable development in tourism jointly defined by UNEP (the United Nations Environment Programme) and UNWTO in 2006 are the following: economic viability, local prosperity, employment quality, social equity, visitor fulfilment, local control, community wellbeing, cultural richness, physical integrity, biological diversity, environmental purity, resource efficiency.

2012 was the first year to see one billion tourists travel internationally. To celebrate this milestone, UNWTO launched the "One Billion Tourists: One Billion Opportunities" campaign, showing tourists that respecting local culture, preserving heritage or buying local goods when travelling can make a big difference. The public was asked to vote for the Travel Tip that would have the greatest benefit for the people and places they visit and to pledge to follow that tip when travelling.

The winning tip, revealed on the arrival date of the one-billionth tourist (13th December 2012), was Buy Local, encouraging tourists to buy food and souvenirs locally, or hire local guides, to ensure their spending translates into jobs and income for host communities. A close second, Respect Local Culture calling on tourists to learn more about their destination’s traditions or some words in the local language before leaving home, was followed by Protect Heritage, Save Energy and Use Public Transport.

4.2 UNESCO World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Initiative

In 2001, UNESCO World Heritage Centre established a Tourism Programme, with the specific objective to address “growing threats on World Heritage Sites from tourism which, if sustainable managed could offer socio-economic development opportunities”. The programme focused on capacity building at sites to derive lessons, which could then be used for improving conservation methodologies. The proposed objectives include:

- Developing overarching principles with supporting implementation approaches for sustainable tourism within the framework of the World Heritage Convention; securing their adoption by States Parties, travel and tourism industry, and World Heritage site managers and their related agencies and ministries.
• Developing an effective capacity building programme through training materials and delivery systems, leveraged off the establishment of a series of World Heritage ‘learning platform’ sites.

Conceptual Framework

The meeting of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, held at Mogao (China) in 2009, articulated a set of Principles for Sustainable Tourism at World Heritage Properties (Mogao Report 2010) together with policy recommendations and expected effects of implementation.

Tourism at World Heritage sites has implications for all aspects of protection of World Heritage properties. World Heritage Listing almost always results in an increase in tourism; this increase provides opportunities to tell the story of World Heritage properties more widely, to garner public support for and appreciation of the values domestically and internationally, and to augment the amount of funding and assistance available for the protection and conservation of the property. This process and period of initial identification, assessment and listing is crucial to establishing a management framework to safeguard the identified values for the benefit of current and future generations, and consider the likely impacts on local populations arising from the inscription.

The impacts of visitation are created irrespective of whether those visiting sites are local, national or international; independent travellers or part of a group. Protection depends on the prevention of inappropriate use and development, both within the site’s boundary, in the buffer zone and in the surrounding area. The relationship between site managers and tourism is dynamic, often complex, and can positively assist to sustain or enhance the values of both these zones. The development of a sympathetic and locally sustaining tourism sector can contribute strongly to the ongoing protection of a site and the provision of benefits for its immediate stakeholders.

Long-term conservation and enhancement of a property’s values require careful planning – including tourism impact studies, appropriate response to demand pressure, and the establishment of a monitoring system.

Tourism is intimately linked to site presentation. The stories which are told to visitors will profoundly influence their attitude to the property, and their appreciation of it.

An ongoing robust and successful tourism operation, fundamentally aligned to the values of the site and their conservation, will ensure their transmission.

Managing the Visitor Experience

Interpretation is the primary way to convey values to a wider public. Tourism is not the only means to engage with heritage – public use of heritage sites encompasses a wide range of local, national and international audiences, each of which creates opportunities and threats for sites. Conveying the meaning of a site is connected to every phase of the tourism/visitor chain. The encounter between the physical reality of the site and the individual should be a dialogue not a monologue. Another concern is that the past may become a theme park. Heritage Site managers therefore need to safeguard integrity and authenticity; their responses need to take account of the visitors’ experiences.

In general, properties should base their planning mechanisms on the solid foundations of understanding the heritage values of the site and the visitors’ needs. Conservation of the
physical and intangible resources and values of a site are the building blocks of heritage interpretation. It is imperative that organisations employ and develop staff with the appropriate expertise, commitment and vision.

The development of infrastructure for visitors must be subject to adequate planning. Delivery needs quality assurance and involvement of the community, stakeholders and associated people.

**Benefiting Communities**

Benefits that derive from tourism activities should seek to improve the quality of life and generate income with a fair distribution of benefits, particularly for host communities.

The *World Heritage brand* should be used as a mechanism to support sustainable development; it has more impact upon tourism to lesser known properties than to iconic properties. However, many WH properties do not identify themselves as such, or do not adequately present their Outstanding Universal Value.

Local community values, both tangible and intangible, and uses of the heritage site can contribute to enhancing the visitor experience. However tourism markets and products must have buy-in from the local communities. Local people and cultural tourism need each other, so capacity building is important to gain confidence in traditional and local knowledge and practices (UNESCO, 2012).

Planning should address both tangible and intangible heritage, including the historical and contemporary social, cultural and environmental context. The need to be careful, realistic, patient in managing everyone’s expectations should be recognised.

*Working with the local community* is essential to improve conservation and effective management of the site. There is a need to effectively and equitably involve/engage communities, recognising the challenge of identifying and including all stakeholders and their potentially conflicting interests. Local companies often need assistance in the form of (micro) loans and other areas of business practices.

Weak governance erases the effectiveness of good policy and guidelines. Support may be needed to empower communities for equitable decision-making and ensure that local planning and development supports heritage conservation.

Access to heritage site management should be provided so that local people and tourism operators can fully understand the responsibilities and provide advice. Dialogue is essential to negotiating conflicting values, and to demystify conservation.

**The Principles of World Heritage Tourism**

*Contribution to WH objectives:* Tourism must contribute to the protection, conservation, presentation and transmission of heritage values. It should also generate sustainable socio-economic development and equitably contribute benefits to local communities in ways that are consistent with the conservation of the properties.

*Cooperative partnerships:* WH properties should be places where all stakeholders cooperate through effective partnerships to maximise conservation and presentation outcomes, whilst minimising threats and adverse impacts from tourism.
Public awareness and support: The promotion, presentation and interpretation of heritage properties should be effective, honest, comprehensive and engaging. It should mobilise awareness and support for their conservation and sustainable use.

Proactive tourism management: The contribution of tourism to the protection, conservation and presentation of heritage properties requires continuing and proactive planning and monitoring. Tourism planning and management, including cooperative partnerships, should be an integral aspect of the site management system.

Stakeholder empowerment: Planning for tourism development should be undertaken in an inclusive and participatory manner, respecting and empowering the local community, while taking account of their capacity and willingness to participate in visitor activity.

Tourism infrastructure and visitor facilities: These should be carefully planned, sited, designed, constructed and periodically upgraded to maximise the quality of visitor experiences while ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on heritage values and the surrounding environmental, social and cultural context.

Site management capacity: Management systems should have sufficient skills, capacities and resources available to ensure the protection and presentation of their heritage values and respect for local communities.

Application of tourism generated revenue: Relevant public agencies and Site Management should apply a sufficient proportion of the revenue derived from tourism to ensure the conservation and management of their heritage values.

Contribution to local community development: Tourism development should contribute to local community socio-economic development in an effective and equitable manner.

The Principles are intended to be adopted and embraced by all stakeholders involved in tourism associated with the world’s heritage places. They can be used to undertake the evaluation of existing and proposed tourism development and visitor programmes at heritage places in a consistent and comparable manner.

Responsibilities and Implementation

The above described principles will provide a new framework coherently steering the different actors involved in World Heritage and Tourism towards sustainable development. Roles and Responsibilities of the various actors in the adoption and implementation of these policy guidelines can be outlined as follows:

The WH Convention will have an agreed framework for cooperation in the development of best practice tourism management at places of heritage significance and will have the following responsibilities:

- set frameworks and policy approaches;
- develop guidance and subsequently assure that properties have adequate mechanisms to address tourism before they are inscribed on the WH List;
- monitor the impact upon heritage values of tourism activities at inscribed sites, also by means of indicators;
• cooperate with other international organisations to enable mutual integration of their respective concerns;
• assist State Parties and sites to access support and advice on good practices.

*Individual States Parties* will have a consistent framework to meet their obligations vis-à-vis the Convention and will:

• develop national policies for protection and promotion;
• provide and enable support to their sites, and ensure that the promotion and the tourism objectives and practices respect heritage values and are appropriate and sustainable;

*Government agencies* at national, regional and local levels will have a consistent framework and a clear set of objectives to facilitate cooperation and coordination both within government and with the private sector.

*Consent authorities* will be able to evaluate tourism development proposals at heritage sites against a widely recognised and consistent set of Principles.

*Site managers* and those who design or implement tourism programs and projects at heritage places will have a soundly based methodology for evaluating, benchmarking and monitoring the performance of their site, leading to improved conservation and visitor management. Site managers will:

• manage the impact of tourism upon the heritage values of properties (using tools such as fees, charges, opening schedules and access restrictions);
• lead onsite presentation and provide meaningful visitor experiences;
• work with the tourist sector, and be aware of the needs and experiences of visitors, to best protect the property;
• engage with communities and business on conservation and development.

*Tourism operators and promoters* have a strong basis for cooperation and participation in the delivery of responsible and sustainable tourism activities that communicate and protect heritage values and enhance the visitor experience. The tourism sector will:

• work with site managers to help protect heritage values;
• recognise and engage in shared responsibility to sustain heritage properties as tourism resources;
• work on authentic presentation and quality experiences.

*Researchers* will be able to use a consistent methodology when assessing the tourism impacts at heritage sites.

*Conservation Practitioners* will be able to confidently undertake and present their work to the public, knowing there exists a strong basis for visitor management.

*Funding Providers* for tourism projects at heritage sites will have a set of criteria against which to evaluate applications for funding, giving them added security.
**Local Communities, Civil Society and NGOs** will have a set of agreed Principles with which to encourage responsible government agencies to develop good practice tourism management.

*Visitors* can be encouraged with the help of site managers and the tourism sector to appreciate and protect the values and significance of heritage properties.

### 4.3 The Tourism Industry's Involvement

Tourists/visitors are increasingly culturally sophisticated travellers who are connected to information technology, are often less fit, and are interested in experiences not just destinations (UNESCO Mogao 2009). The tourism market is expected to double to 1.6 billion international arrivals a year by 2020, with domestic tourism adding perhaps five times that number. The *tourism sector is diverse and dynamic* in its business models and organisational or governance structures, and composed of many sizes and types of players. Visitors themselves are also diverse in terms of their national and cultural background, interests, behaviour, economic power, awareness and expectations. This is also, importantly, true for the communities in or near heritage sites. It is important to *clarify the roles of the various stakeholders* to develop a better understanding between sectors. The two-way relationship between tourism and heritage industries should be recognised: tourist/visitor operators have an interest in safeguarding heritage assets. Good _marketing_ is a useful tool, as is linking sustainable tourism into existing industry processes. The local level is where innovation, partnerships and improved benefits often emerge.

Engaging with the tourism industry is difficult (UNESCO 2002): the industry is characterised by long marketing and distribution channels. This can lead to situations where local tourism business managers at the site level are not in a position to commit support, and where remote market commitments do not always filter down to the site level.

An assessment carried out at the local level observed: "Although the tourism industry has contributed grants for restoration and infrastructure, such as visitor centres and education activities, engaging the tourism industry to contribute to site protection and community development is more difficult". Industry funding requires a set of local actions for the industry to support as well as systematic media promotion. The World Heritage Centre has established a series of partnerships to promote the sites; agreements with tourism-related enterprises and private institutions (e.g. WHC cooperation with TripAdvisor) have the potential to create responsibility towards heritage resources.

The key tourism organizations, under the guidance of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP, 2002), have summarized the challenges in the relationship between tourism industry and sustainable development as follows: "The challenge is to move from the existing ad hoc approach, to one that can integrate the current social, economic and environmental programmes, funds and initiatives, and evolve new patterns of managing travel and tourism businesses in a more systematic and dynamic way. The inevitable
transition to sustainable development strategies gives the travel and tourism industry an opportunity to confirm itself as a solution, rather than a contributor to the economical, social and environmental challenges facing the future.

The way forward for travel and tourism is to create strong partnerships between the private and public sectors, NGOs, institutional bodies, and local communities, in order to ensure effective active participation by all stakeholders. Governments are only just beginning to take a more decisive role in developing sustainable, economically successful tourism. But, strong partnerships by all players will bring valuable networking processes, workable policies and logical planning and development, transforming travel and tourism’s sometimes negative environmental image to one of sustainability and stewardship.”

4.4 Managing and Monitoring of Tourism in World Heritage Sites

International organisations and institutions have developed in the past decades frameworks and guidelines covering their respective fields of responsibility. Eco- and cultural tourism were focused on values connected to the protection and safeguarding of nature and culture which were clearly dominating the interests of these tourism businesses. Today, the diverging interests have been increasingly incorporated by UNWTO and tourism institutions into a holistic approach with a strong focus on tourism business respecting nature and culture.

UNESCO has elaborated a series of concepts regarding tourism in World Heritage sites with focus on cultural tourism. Such sites are often exposed to mass tourism and hence endangered because people do not fully understand the implications of heritage having outstanding universal value. It is the national authorities’ responsibility to identify threats and define limitations in order to protect heritage for future generations. A Practical Manual for World Heritage Site Managers was published in 2002.

The development of site-level tourism plans is not in itself sufficient to achieve conservation or economic impact. This can be acknowledged by developing planning approaches that improve the implementation prospects (UNESCO, 2010).

Furthermore, tourism/public use planning may best be addressed as part of an integrated approach to site management – i.e., incorporated into wider planning arrangements. A factor in the effective adoption of public use plans may, indeed, be their formal adoption as part of a broader site management plan approval.

A further issue related to site-level planning is that often the major impacts can stem from developments around the site which may be outside the control of site managers. There may be opportunities in the future to foster collaboration between site managers and other local authorities on this issue.
ICT Applications for Tourism: a Contribution to Sustainability

Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) provide interesting and increasingly effective means to support tourism development. The internet is used as a channel to obtain and share information on tourism destinations. Furthermore, local managers or communities can develop participatory websites offering online services through tour operators and on-demand information paths. Such sites act as ‘demand observatories’, enabling tourism providers to align tourism supply to demand fluctuations by collecting information on visitor profiles, tastes and preferences.

The internet may also be used as a capacity-building tool, where local actors can receive online training (vocational courses offered in a variety of tourism- and CH conservation-related disciplines). Moreover, ICT applications can help raise awareness for site conservation; to this purpose, tourism advertising should not overlook appropriate conveying of the conservation message and related good practice (ethics, etiquette, etc.); in addition, sharing rules should be set up between communities and tourism managers and operators so as to provide correct tourist information and services.

Webpages can help in the search for CH conservation financing and volunteering, though not many examples of the former exist.

Services offered by local communities can take advantage of the internet initiated contacts on institutional site promotion websites, since these are better positioned on the web search engines. On the other hand, local businesses should carefully consider efficient marketing of their products/services: this usually requires complex websites linked to databases and a virtual bank for payments; pooling of enterprises, especially small companies, would often be advisable.

In the framework of the project CHERPLAN it is worth mentioning that some interesting ICT applications specifically suited for CH environment are being developed. Nomadic environment applications fall into this category: they address the needs of economic sectors featuring high mobility rates of people, such as tourism. Also the provision of category-specific semantic information as well as customization to the end-users’ individual backgrounds and preferences, are considered appropriate tools for use in cultural tourism. To make such services readily accessible to tourists, also while visiting a CH site, their usage on various types of mobile devices (e.g., mobile phones, portable computers) and in different communication environments (e.g., 3G networks, Wi-Fi hotspots, ICT kiosks) must be ensured. These applications can range from web portals and other interactive tools to systems addressed to professionals (e.g., tourist guides).

Furthermore, ICTs provide a non-intrusive instrument to monitor the quality of CH sites and the impacts from tourism, thus aiding in both assessing the sites’ Carrying Capacity and/or Limits of Acceptable Change, and especially, in recording their current position within these established standards. We are specifically referring to (indoor and outdoor) sensor network applications, to be developed in the CHERPLAN framework: environmental parameters such as air temperature, humidity, pollutants, etc. will be measured over time and effectively visualised through augmented reality applications, allowing an immediate recognition of the actual situation.
Developing alternative Livelihoods for local Communities

The development of livelihoods for local communities contributes to the State Parties’ desire for economic growth, it potentially increases support for site conservation, and can in some circumstances directly reduce pressure on site resources.

There are, however, a number of strategic questions that need to be considered:

• To what extent can interventions be targeted at communities most adjacent to the site, and is it possible to target those whose activities have the most significant adverse impacts?

• Are tourism based alternatives the most promising form of livelihoods?

• To what extent are interventions aligned with accepted models of livelihoods and micro-enterprise development? Is it appropriate or effective to provide this from a tourism perspective?

• What are the opportunities to leverage off other enterprise development activities? For example, it may be more effective to support larger scale enterprise development that provides employment opportunities than to directly support community livelihoods.

• How can local guides be organized efficiently and beyond the site management system in order to guarantee the creation of value added? Training local guides is a valid method to ensure that communities benefit from tourism and is mostly coupled with awareness-raising and the creation of job opportunities for young people.

Managing a Programme Life-cycle

Life-cycle management is critical to the success of any future tourism programme. The life-cycle of any intervention or a programme of interventions can generally be described in four phases: understanding the problem (problem definition; environmental scan), developing a response (strategy or policy initiative), implementing the response (implementation) and reflecting on and learning from the intervention (monitoring and evaluation).

For each phase, a number of elements of success can be identified. The following caveats are important:

• If the elements of success are in place, they will not necessarily guarantee the desired effect.

• If the elements of success are not all in place, it may still be possible to have a successful intervention.

Understanding the problem

In underpinning the programme’s strategies and interventions, there needs to be a very clear understanding of what the problems and issues are that need to be addressed and why:
• Understand the mechanisms by which tourism has adverse impacts.
• Identify through indicators the kind of sites most at risk.
• Assess why existing mechanisms and institutional arrangements are inadequate.

Developing a strategic response

In a complex context, strategy is as important as objectives in order to ensure that the programme works to its comparative advantage, avoids duplication, and fills gaps where appropriate.

• Have a clear sense and articulation of the goal or outcome that the responsible organisation is working towards and the means by which it will be achieved. The response needs to be matched to available and potential resourcing and the scale of activities matched to what can reasonably be expected.
• Set out a ‘theory of change’ (i.e., an articulation as to how the interventions proposed will lead to the outcomes sought).
• In order to help anticipate concerns, provide a full description of strategies ex ante, including the foreseen actors’ roles, and ensure exposure to wide review and discussion by stakeholders.

Implementing the solution

Implementation of the strategic response refers to the process by which it is translated into activities.

• Clarify how the programme will engage with stakeholders.

Monitor and evaluate

In the context of a tourism programme, monitoring and evaluation are particularly important because of the complex environment in which the programme operates and the extent of the challenges it faces. Monitoring and evaluation in conservation are also difficult due to issues of attribution and lead times from implementation to impact.

• Understand the level and rate of change in the desired outcome.
• Assess whether actions are having the impact intended.
• Identify what is not working well, and why.

4.5 Sustainable Tourism in Large Protected Areas

In the last 20 years the ‘landscape’ focused programmes have fostered the eco- and cultural tourism, leading to the Sustainable Tourism concept, integrating tangible and intangible Cultural Heritage as well as Natural Heritage. Such a holistic territorial approach has been mainly taken up in Regional and National Parks, Natural World Heritage sites, Ramsar sites and UNESCO Biosphere Reserves.
Natural World Heritage Sites

A study elaborated by the International Union for Conservation of Nature IUCN (Borges et al., 2011) regarding Tourism in Natural World Heritage sites aims to examine the gaps in view of supporting the development of sustainable tourism in natural World Heritage Sites. Gaps exist in the perception of how tourism development affects the protected sites including the nature and extent of different types of impacts from tourism in and around sites, and the underlying reasons for these. A further question is how the different players (tourism industry, tourists, local authorities…) contribute to such impacts and which of these groups can be considered the drivers of change? Better knowledge of the level of integration (e.g. in terms of governance, management, funding, land-use planning, tourism development and destination management) of World Heritage sites in the wider landscape would be beneficial.

An increased understanding of the risks and opportunities associated to tourism development and growth in World Heritage basically encourages tourism development, that while protecting the integrity of the site, also generates income opportunities for local communities, offers financial and other support for the conservation of the site, and contributes to visitors’ awareness about the values of nature. According to IUCN, the key negative issues for Natural World Heritage sites are associated with visitor pressure, inappropriate infrastructure development and key benefits related to community development and revenue for conservation. For successful and sustainable tourism development there is a common need for:

- Effective tourism planning within and outside the site;
- Good governance of tourism that considers the site in the context of a destination;
- Involvement and participation of stakeholders and especially collaboration between the private sector, local communities and the site management;
- Effective and innovative communication tools that add value to the site.

Biosphere Reserves, Models for Sustainable Development

The UNESCO’s Man and the Biosphere programme (MAB) has established the World Network of Biosphere Reserves (WNBR) which in 2012 included a total of 610 sites in 117 countries. The MAB programme was created as a network of protected areas, dedicated to Research and Education only. In 1995 an international conference in Seville, Spain, started a new era for the WNBR, whereby the Seville Strategy and the Statutory Framework of the World Network of Biosphere Reserves identified the specific role of Biosphere Reserves in relation to Sustainable Development. The Madrid Action Plan (MAP, 2008) was elaborated at the 3rd World Congress of Biosphere Reserves in Madrid in February 2008. The MAP aims to capitalize on the strategic advantages of the Seville instruments and “raise Biosphere Reserves to be the principal internationally-designated areas dedicated to sustainable development in the 21st century” and to “focus on developing models for global, national and local sustainability”. Sustainable tourism and especially eco- and cultural tourism are for the most Biosphere Reserves a key means to create new opportunities for local people and to create a market for their local products and handicrafts.

Ecological Tourism in Europe (ETE, 2008), in cooperation with GEF (Global Environment Facility), UNEP and UNESCO, has elaborated the methodology guide “Sustainable Tourism Management Planning in Biosphere Reserves” which addresses the ecosystem approach, a strategy for the integrated management of land, water and
living resources. Besides the guidelines focused on stakeholder involvement and decision processes, this document includes a comprehensive impact assessment with compendiums regarding impacts of tourism and impact management. Balancing impacts and needs is paramount when tourism focusing on the balanced integration of the three dimensions of Sustainable Development is pursued. The impact management and assessment should follow the Convention on Biological Diversity-Guidelines (CBD-Guidelines, 2004) and concentrate on the following policies and good practices:

- Controlling impacts of major tourist flows;
- Reducing impacts of activities outside tourism areas;
- Responsible use of natural resources (e.g., land, soil, energy, water);
- Reducing, minimizing and preventing pollution and waste (e.g. solid and liquid waste, emissions to air, transport);
- Promoting the design of facilities that are more eco-efficient;
- Conserving flora, fauna and ecosystems;
- Preventing the introduction of alien species;
- Conserving landscapes, cultural and natural heritage;
- Respecting the integrity of local cultures and avoiding negative effects on social structures;
- Using local products and skills, and providing local employment;
- Promoting appropriate tourist behaviour;
- Alignment of marketing strategies/messages with the principles of sustainable tourism;
- Contingency planning for handling accidents or emergencies and avoiding use of facilities which may threaten the environment and the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity;
- Environmental and cultural sustainability audits and review of existing tourism activities;
- Mitigation measures for existing impacts, and appropriate funding to support them.

The guidelines recommend developing tourism management plans with feedback mechanisms and an adaptive management approach to facilitate early reactions on inappropriate and unexpected impacts of tourism development.

**Sustainable Coastal Tourism**

A very particular issue of sustainable tourism is related to coastal tourism since the coasts and beaches are the most frequent targets of mass tourism, with considerable profit and short term growth for economy and long lasting impact on environment and society. It can be considered as the most unsustainable form of tourism. Achieving sustainable coastal tourism is therefore a real challenge. Only with an accurate long term strategy and planning as well as a consequent management of the construction activities and monitoring of the tourist flows, a decrease in social, environmental and hence also economic quality of these coastal areas can be avoided. Some of the world’s most vulnerable heritage places can be found along the coasts and the conflict between tourism and heritage is therefore inevitable. The predictions regarding Climate Change at coastal sites make even more evident how dramatic the impact on coastal areas in future will be. UNESCO has thus established a programme focusing on small islands and coastal areas aiming to adequately protect and develop the most vulnerable places in and along the Oceans. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) has
elaborated a priority action programme that focuses on Integrated Coastal Zone management (ICZM) and has issued in addition a handbook that addresses “Sustainable Coastal Tourism; an integrated planning and management approach” providing inclusive approaches to low impact tourism development (UNEP, 2009) The purpose of the handbook is to explain how the tourism sector can coordinate effectively in the overall development of coastal zones and contribute to the sustainability of these areas. The main targets are to facilitate sustainable tourism, to promote participatory management, to enrich operational capacities of institutions and professionals operating in the sector, and to raise awareness about the importance of sustainable tourism in coastal areas. UNEP bases its strategies for tourism development on the Carrying Capacity Assessment which is highly important for cultural and natural heritage sites and focuses on the three basic components or dimensions of Sustainable Development: physical-ecological-environmental, socio-demographic and economic-political.

The most important result of regional development and heritage protection activities in the coastal area has been the recognition that there is a need for cooperation among all stakeholders to be able to solve growing environmental problems. Furthermore, preparation of a fully integrated approach towards sustainable development is essential.

In South East Europe a concrete action within ICZM regarding coastal tourism planning has been implemented in Slovenia (www.biodiversity.ru/coastlearn/tourism-eng/casestudies_sloveniancoast.html) within the CoastLearn project, achieving the valorisation of extensive protected areas of natural and historical sites near to tourism destinations along the coast. Nature reserves include cliffs, lagoons, underwater habitats, salt marshes, salt-panes, reserves of Mediterranean terrestrial flora and fauna, as well as freshwater lakes. Particular attention is given to protected Natural Heritage sites such as the Secovlje natural resort, a Ramsar locality that encompasses salt-panes and the Seca peninsula; the Strunjan natural resort with its steep cliffs along the seashore; and the natural wetland reserve of Skocjanski Zatok. These sites have not only an intrinsic ecological value, they are also part of a valuable network of attractive areas that are used for diversifying the tourism attractions.

The “Steps to Sustainable Tourism”, (TTF Australia, 2004) an Australian comprehensive initiative to foster sustainable tourism, offers a practical, step-by-step approach to achieve benefits for both tourism and conservation concerns. The guidelines have been developed in 2004 by the Tourism & Transport Forum Australia together with the Australian Government Department of the Environment and Heritage, and with the assistance of the tourism industry, academics and heritage managers. It is a 10-step practical tool to build new opportunities and obtain benefits for tourism, communities, environment and heritage alike. The guiding principles at the basis of this planning process for the development of such a controlled and balanced tourism are outlined in the following: inclusive decision-making, sustainable development, appropriate tourism development and tourism and heritage principles. The set of tourism and heritage principles focus on: recognising the importance of heritage places, developing mutually beneficial partnerships, incorporating heritage issues into business planning, investing in people and places, responsible product marketing and promotion, providing high-quality visitor experience and respecting indigenous rights and obligations. These guidelines are an excellent example of how to integrate the World Heritage principles into national long term tourism strategies.
5. SUSTAINABLE TOURISM VERSUS HIT AND RUN TOURISM

5.1 Dynamic Interactions between Tourism and Cultural Heritage

Domestic and international tourism continues to be among the foremost vehicles for cultural exchange, providing a personal experience, not only of historic cultural expressions, but of the contemporary life and society of other cultures and people. It is increasingly appreciated as a positive force supporting natural and cultural conservation. Tourism can capture the economic characteristics of the heritage and harness these for conservation by generating funding, educating the community and influencing policy. It is an essential part of many national and regional economies and can be an important factor in development, when managed successfully.

The link between culture and tourism is the most visible contribution to local development: 37% of the global tourism has a cultural motivation. When tourism is identified as part of an overall development strategy, the identification, protection, and enhancement of cultural resources is vital for any sustainable effort. Heritage visitors stay longer, visit twice as many places, and spend two-and-a-half times more than other visitors at the site. Worldwide, wherever heritage tourism has been evaluated, this basic tendency is observed: heritage visitors stay longer, spend more per day, and have a significantly greater per trip economic impact.

The tourism sector is the 'industry' that uses Cultural Heritage to the greatest extent as support for its backbone activities like hotel accommodation, transport and catering. Tourism itself has become an increasingly complex phenomenon, with political, economic, social, cultural, educational, bio-physical, ecological and aesthetic dimensions. The achievement of a beneficial inter-action between the potentially conflicting expectations and aspirations of visitors and host or local communities, presents many challenges and opportunities.

The Natural and Cultural Heritage, diversities and living cultures are major tourism attractions. Excessive or poorly-managed tourism and tourism related development can threaten their physical nature, integrity and significant characteristics. The ecological setting, culture and lifestyles of host communities may also be degraded, along with the visitor's experience of the place.

Tourism should bring benefits to host communities and provide an important means and motivation for them to care for and maintain their heritage and cultural practices. The involvement and co-operation of local and/or indigenous community representatives, conservationists, tourism operators, property owners, policy makers, those preparing national development plans and site managers is necessary to achieve a sustainable tourism industry and enhance the protection of heritage resources as capital for future generations.

Tourism is in a special position in the contribution it can make to sustainable development and the challenges it presents. Firstly, this is because of the dynamism and growth of the sector, and the major contribution that it makes to the economies of many countries and local destinations. Secondly, it is because tourism is an activity which
involves a special relationship between consumers (visitors), the industry, the environment and local communities.

The special relationship arises because, unlike most other sectors, the consumer of tourism (the tourist) travels to the producer and the product. This leads to three important and unique aspects of the relationship between tourism and sustainable development:

• **Interaction**: The nature of tourism, as a service industry that is based on delivering an experience of new places, means that it involves a considerable amount of interaction, both direct and indirect, between visitors, host communities and their local environments.

• **Awareness**: Tourism makes people (visitors and hosts) become far more conscious of environmental issues and differences between nations and cultures. This can affect attitudes and concerns for sustainability issues not only while travelling but throughout people’s lives.

• **Dependency**: Much of tourism is based on visitors seeking to experience intact and clean environments, attractive natural areas, authentic historic and cultural traditions, and welcoming hosts with whom they have a good relationship. The industry depends on these attributes being in place.

Sustainable development not only ensures that consumption of tourism does not exceed the agility of the host destination to prosper, but also provides for the freedom, education and welfare of the host community. It has become common knowledge that it is unethical to save nature at the expense of the local people. The host community should be given the opportunity to act as partner in the sustainable development of its land, not as enemy of it. Recreational facilities are frequently developed to meet visitor demand, but also open up access for local residents. The use of these recreational facilities by visitors is frequently seasonal or on weekends, but the local residents get to use them year-round or mid-week.

### 5.1.1 Culture and Eco Tourism as Driving Forces

Culture and eco-tourism are considered as niche tourism with a enormous potential for growth. There is an increasing request and a growing market for targeted tourism with strong interactions in the triangle nature, culture and people. Cultural tourism is currently 35-40% of all international trips and is growing by 15% each year. Eco-tourism is also increasing from 20% by 10-12% of arrivals each year (Mogao 2009). Eco-tourism and cultural tourism are coherent regarding the standards of tourism but different in their targets. Therefore sustainable tourism is going a step beyond, interlinking the focus nature and culture in a holistic approach for development.

The influence of tourists on the societies they visit is generally more pronounced than vice versa. The majority of global tourists come from a few affluent countries (dominant cultures), which are relatively unaffected by visitors from smaller local cultures. On the other hand, tourism increases the risk of irreversible cultural and eco-systemic disruptions in smaller societies.
Cultural Tourism is focused on history and culture of mankind and therefore concerns the common interest of the world population; it also has to comply with the requests for environmentally compatible services and infrastructures and respect limits where carrying capacities are reached. It is a form of tourism that focuses on the culture, and the cultural environments (including landscapes), the values and lifestyles, heritage, visual and performing arts, traditions and leisure assets of the host community; it can include attendance at cultural events, visits to museums and heritage places and mixing with the local population; it should not only be regarded as a definable economic niche within the broad range of tourism activities, but rather as encompassing all experiences absorbed by the visitors to a place that is beyond their own living environment. Local people need tourism: tourism takes part in the life and the development of the local community, especially in historical centres, and can help keep cultural and social interests alive.

Eco-tourism, which began as a left-wing offshoot of the adventure travel business, is the fastest growing sector in the tourism industry, worth well over $200 billion a year (Mühlbauer, 2005). It is loosely described as tourism which has a “low impact” on the environment and which contributes to the local economy. Eco-tourism is limiting itself since the offered services and infrastructures are often poor and also the destinations generally focus less on the local population and their traditional cultural background. The difficulty in accessing many eco-tourism locations, which leads primarily to individual and overnight tourism, may also be an influencing factor.

Eco-tourism, by its very nature, builds up expectations and raises the risk of hit-and-run tourism; this is described as an influx of nature lovers and culture addicts to the latest wild spot, followed by its abandonment once discovered and degraded. Moreover, eco-tourism attractions can be located in the most remote and rural areas. Therefore, ancient cultures and economies may be harmed or disrupted. These challenges, among others, need to be met.

Eco-tourism should:

• provide first-hand, participatory and enlightened experiences;
• involve educational components;
• involve acceptance of resources on its own terms, recognise limits;
• promote awareness and understanding;
• promote moral & ethical behaviour;
• provide long term benefit to the resources.

5.2 Challenges of Sustainable Tourism Development

Tourism Development in Cultural and Natural Heritage sites has always been controversial and some countries often hesitate to expose endangered sites to tourism. On the other hand, Governments often neglect the potential impact of an uncontrolled tourism development. At the 2009 workshop meeting in Mogao, the UNESCO World Heritage Committee has identified a list of potential risks related to tourism at World
Heritage sites. In the resulting 2010 report, the Committee emphasizes that Tourism is critical in relation to:

- the potential of tourism infrastructure to damage heritage values;
- the threat that heritage properties may be unsustainably managed in relation to their adjoining communities;
- sustaining the conservation objectives whilst engaging with economic development;
- realistic aspirations that heritage can attract tourism.

Concerns about the threats posed by the fast-growing tourism industry identified at the Mogao workshop include:

- alteration of social structures;
- loss of physical fabric by uncontrolled development within and nearby sites;
- quality of visits and values at risk;
- impacts on local cultures;
- low suitability of some sites with living heritage for large scale tourism;
- benefits of mass tourism not trickling down to local communities.

Planning for sustainable tourism development requires integrating heritage site planning with other planning instruments at the local, national and regional levels. Additionally, governance mechanisms need to be strengthened for effective policy implementation. It is important to bridge the gap between official policy and sustainable tourism.

Initiatives can furthermore be driven by short-term benefits with insufficient focus on sustainability, e.g.:

- links between sustainable site conservation and use may not be clearly understood by all stakeholders, often with a lack of shared values;
- there is no consensus on what management means or entails;
- the balance between use and conservation requirements needs to be better achieved.

Managing the tangible and intangible heritage values of a site (including conflicting values) is an essential tool in planning for sustainable tourism. This management approach can empower the various stakeholders, representing a variety of interests and values, and can create equitable conditions for decision making. It should be used to encourage broad participation in both decision-making and implementation. Indicators should be developed to monitor visitor management actions, to anticipate problems and to manage change.

Best practice in heritage management must include meaningful visitor experiences and should convey conservation messages and the spirit of the place. Education plays a key role in achieving a better balance between use and conservation. Visitors aren’t the problem; rather negative impacts are created through a lack of adequate visitor management.
5.2.1 Impact of Tourism

Tourism impacts are often grouped into economic, environmental, social and cultural categories; these are somewhat arbitrary and overlapping, and are frequently combined together.

Locally, tourism is seen as a development opportunity and a way to create employment and bring in hard currency for local business. Nevertheless, tourism also involves costs. First of all, it entails a considerable financial cost to authorities, who must invest massively in infrastructure to support the new influx of visitors. There are also environmental costs, and tourism can occasionally cause irreversible damage to the natural environment and to cultural heritage, impossible to ignore in so many places; tourism development has gradually reduced historical centres to inauthentic shells of their former, living selves. Tourism is also very unstable, and fluctuates dramatically with seasons, fashion and the geopolitical situation, making it difficult for authorities to control and to plan for. Moreover, an excessive tourist presence can end up hurting the character of a site and driving tourists away, a phenomenon known as the ‘site exhaustion cycle’. Finally, tourism development does not benefit the population in a uniform manner, and can sometimes contribute to deepening social inequalities; for instance, it often puts intense pressure on local businesses and trades serving the needs of permanent residents.

Therefore tourism can have negative direct and indirect, short term and long term impacts. Immediate impact can be increased pressure on Cultural Heritage resources and infrastructure in the form of overcrowding, congestion and higher demand. Slower and indirect impact may be higher prices for housing and other commodities and deterioration of the natural environment. The negative impacts very often create conflicts between local populations and authorities. More and more Cultural Heritage sites are overexploited (Venice is the most famous example): hence, the Carrying Capacity of a Cultural Heritage site is a topic which needs particular attention.

In numerous reports (Mühlbauer, 2005 and Moreno et al. 2011) the following potential positive and negative impacts are listed:

+ Positive economic impact (improvement of infrastructure) for shops, theme parks, gaming, restaurants, and for the community (taxes from non-residents) etc.
+ Providing a growing source of opportunities for enterprise development and employment creation as well as stimulating investment and support for local services, even in quite remote communities.
+ Bringing tangible economic value to natural and cultural resources, e.g. direct income from visitor spending for their conservation, and increase in support for conservation from local communities;
+ Providing funding for site preservation and management;
+ Possibility for economic growth: tourism can stabilize and diversify economy; the tourism industry is labour intensive and creates jobs;
+ Maximization of accessibility of existing cultural resources;
+ Training people from the local community to serve as host interpreters of the heritage values of the area;
+ Increase in cultural activities, not only for tourists;
+ Encouraging revival or maintenance of traditional crafts;
+ Enhancing local and external appreciation and support for Cultural Heritage;
+ Building community pride;
+ Enhancing the sense of identity of a community or region;
+ Promoting intercultural/international understanding;
+ Enhancing external support for minority groups and preservation of their culture;
+ Broadening community horizons;
− Vulnerable and unstable source of income;
− Alienation and loss of cultural identity;
− Undermining of local traditions and ways of life;
− Foreign culture possibly making tourists and residents uncomfortable;
− Possible increased risk of disease (e.g. SARS);
− Increased crime and corruption, prostitution and trafficking;
− Creating pressure on host communities, leading to dislocation of traditional societies as well as displacements of traditional residents;
− Increased division between those who do and do not benefit from tourism;
− Conflict over (and at times loss of) land rights and access to resources (including to the attractions themselves);
− Physical damage to attractions and facilities as well as environment;
− Loss of authenticity and historical accuracy in interpretation;
− Selectivity in which heritage attractions are developed
− Putting direct pressure on fragile ecosystems causing degradation of the physical environment and disruption in wildlife.
− Competition for the use of scarce resources, notably land and water
− Significant contributor to local and global pollution and nutrient enrichment
− Overexploitation of natural resources

Given the fundamental role that Cultural Heritage plays in society and individual lives, the potential positive and negative impacts can be profoundly important and need special consideration for defining sustainable tourism strategies. Minimizing negative impact and enhancing positive impact is certainly the main goal in defining sustainable tourism strategies.

5.3 Hit and Run Tourism and its Consequences

The so-called ‘Hit-and-Run tourism’ is leading to mass tourism in short periods, producing negative socio-economic and environmental impacts. Many expressions as e.g. ‘in and out’, ‘if it’s Tuesday, we must be in Rome’, ‘eat and run’, ‘quick trip’ or ‘touch and go’ give a clear idea of the phenomenon.

The major threats of this kind of tourism are the mass tourism processes of alienation and ‘Disneylandification’ which are highly damaging the future of a tourism destination. Destinations with a good accessibility give the tourists the opportunity to visit the place in one day. Cruise destinations and sites that can easily be reached by plane, train or car are more endangered than places that are difficult to reach or traditional holiday locations. The major factors influencing the future development of the destinations are:
• High number of day tourists, mainly day trippers from the surrounding area, or e.g. cruise passengers visiting popular locations along the coast
• Limited opportunities to adapt the historic centre to the changing needs (increasing demand for water, renewable energy, waste management services, business facilities)
• High impact on environment, flora and fauna, and cultural heritage (incl. vandalism); pollution caused by private and public transport, damage caused by cruisers to environment and built heritage
• Limited opportunities to integrate locations provided with effective ICT infrastructure into the modern business sector
• Limited opportunities for growth due to their geographical location and bad accessibility
• Population decline in the city centres due to modern living needs
• Increase in foreign ownership of houses, shops and businesses
• Price level of the tourism infrastructure (accommodation, services, transport etc.)
• High costs for maintenance and restoration of the monuments
• High living costs and decreasing public services
• Limited financial resources for maintenance of the infrastructure and services
• Limited financial contributions of tourism to the cultural tourism destinations
• Decreasing interrelations between tourists and the resident population and thus less intercultural contacts.

5.3.1 High Costs versus Low Value Added

Even though tourists remain only for a few hours on the site, the whole tourism business chain with infrastructure and services has to be built up. Moreover, visitor flows are generally subject to seasonal changes or peaks during the day, whereas in marginal periods the infrastructure and services remain unused. During the low season the costs are mainly charged on the local residents and also the infrastructure has to be maintained by the often decreasing local population.

Tourism statistics often do not collect data regarding critical factors such as expenditures of the tourists, number of day tourists, overhead costs carried over to local people, supplementary costs for services (e.g. police, waste management, health care services). Therefore a quantification of costs and value added connected to tourism is very difficult.

Day tourists generally spend very little during the visit and their main expenditures are often made outside the heritage sites. A study on cruise tourism (WHC unpublished) illustrates that a cruise tourist spends on average $200 per day, $132 of which on board and less than $70 during the site visit. A study conducted in 2006 on cruise traffic in Venice (University Ca’ Foscari, 2006) calculated that a cruise passenger spends around €107 a day in the city, which in 2005 resulted in a turnover of over €148 million directly generated from cruise ship tourism.

A research on the Entlebuch Biosphere Reserve (UBE, 2012), an important eco-tourism destination in Switzerland, calculated that day visitors spend around €26 per day while hotel guests have a spending power of about €90 per day, and that guests in rent apartments spend in average €56 per day whereas guests in private accommodations only €36 a day. These expenditures mainly include accommodation, meals and local products and souvenirs.
Day tourists do not have to pay taxes for their stay, since these taxes are mostly linked to the overnight. This means that a day tourist spends only about one fourth of the amount of an overnight tourist. In this way day tourists create very little value added in the sites they visited and thus contribute very little to the general management and maintenance of the infrastructure as well as to the conservation and restoration of the historic and natural sites.

The Example of Austria

Austria has very detailed statistics regarding tourism industry that allow quantifying the expenditure of day and overnight tourism at national level (see Table 3). The averages over the last 6 - 7 years show the discrepancy between the expenditures of day tourists and overnight guests: the 31.9 million overnight guests spend around €21.416 million each year, day tourists instead only €7.466 million a year. The number of day visitors is difficult to estimate and therefore not quantified, but the number of day tourists from within the country is certainly much higher than from abroad; therefore also the spending of Austrian day trippers is much higher than the expenditures by foreign day tourists. The total tourist expenditure amounts to €28.881 million: €21.312 million spent by overnight guests and €7.466 million by day tourists. This means that a day tourist spends around one third compared to an overnight guest and usually does not pay the overnight tax. There is also a difference between the seasons, e.g. a ski tourist in winter usually spends much more than a hiking tourist in summer. In addition, the shorter a stay in a Cultural Heritage site, is the less tourists spend during their visit. Sites with a high amount of visitors with visits of one - two hours will have very little value added.

Table 3 - Average Tourism expenditure in Austria over the period 2005-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourists</th>
<th>Arrivals*</th>
<th>Overnights*</th>
<th>Expenditures in million €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Foreign Guests</td>
<td>15.087</td>
<td>21.6, 89.5</td>
<td>12.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight Guests</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day tourists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inland Guests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight Guests</td>
<td>10.8, 33.6</td>
<td>8.654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>11.354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight Guests</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day tourists</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2.367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day tourists</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para Hotellery</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.9, 123.1</td>
<td>28.881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistic Austria, Tourismus Satellitenkonto fuer Oesterreich (* average 2005 – 2010)
The tourist spending in Austria is mainly linked to accommodation (29,9%) and restaurants (25,7%), followed by tourism related products and services (19,2%), transportation (15,6%) and cultural events and activities (9,2%), while tourism agencies and operators account only for 0,3%. Even after deduction of the accommodation costs, an overnight guest still spends one third more than a day tourist. The expenditures for cultural events and visits can be considered equal.

Even though the data are still not very precise, the three examples demonstrate that a day tourist spends around one fifth to one third of an overnight tourist and does not pay taxes related to his stay. Reducing the Hit-and-Run Tourism and increasing the overnight tourism would certainly boost job opportunities and contribute to the creation of value added. Possibilities of enhancing financial support for maintenance and restoration of Cultural Heritage should also be further developed.

5.3.2 Towards City Museum Tourism

Two examples of the increasing challenge of a balanced development in the Adriatic Sea area are Venice (Italy) and Dubrovnik (Croatia).

Both historic cities are famous for their history and their well preserved Cultural Heritage and are recognized as UNESCO World Heritage sites. They both follow very strict regulations regarding their conservation and restoration and enjoy therefore high recognition worldwide. Both cities have reached their carrying capacity and the impact of tourism on environment and social development has reached a critical level.
5.3.3 Venice: a Global Brand

‘Venice and its Lagoon’ have been inscribed in 1987 on the UNESCO World Heritage List (http://whc.unesco.org) as a unique artistic achievement. The city is built on 118 small islands and seems to float on the waters of the lagoon. The influence of Venice on the development of architecture and monumental arts has been considerable. Venice possesses an incomparable series of architectural ensembles illustrating the age of its splendour. The whole city is an extraordinary architectural masterpiece in which even the smallest building contains works by some world’s greatest artists such as Giorgione, Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese and others. Venice presents a complete typology which exemplary value goes hand-in-hand with the outstanding character of an urban setting that had to adapt to the special requirements of the site.

In the Venice Lagoon, nature and history have been so closely linked ever since the 5th century AD when Venetian populations found refuge on the sandy islands of Torcello, Jesolo and Malamocco, to escape barbarian raids. These temporary settlements gradually became permanent and the initial refuge of the land-dwelling peasants and fishermen became a maritime power. The small island of Rialto was chosen as the headquarters of the new city. In 1000 AD, Venice controlled the Dalmatian coast and in 1112 a trading market was founded in the Levantine port of Sidon. During the Middle Ages, a maritime empire of unequalled power extended over the entire length of the shores around the eastern Mediterranean up to the islands of the Ionian Sea and to Crete, culminating in the conquest of Byzantium in 1204. During the entire period of its expansion over the centuries, Venice never ceased to consolidate its position in the lagoon.

In this inland sea, that has continuously been under threat, rises amid a tiny archipelago at the very edge of the waves one of the most extraordinary built-up areas of the Middle Ages. From Torcello to the north to Chioggia to the south, almost every small island had its own settlement, town, fishing village and artisan village (Murano). However, at the heart of the lagoon, Venice itself stood as one of the greatest capitals in the medieval world.

Approximately 22 million tourists a year visit Venice. In 2011, the Venice Municipality counted 4,167,171 arrivals, 774,005 stayed in private accommodations and 3,393,166 in hotels. They accounted for 9,417,872 nights spent in town, 7,245,725 in hotels and 2,172,147 in other accommodations (ISTAT). The number of tourists arriving in Venice by ship amounted in 2011 to nearly 2.240 million (of which 1.777 million cruise passengers). Venice is the Venice is the leading Mediterranean homeport for cruise ships, about 80% of the passengers start and end their journey in Venice, the other 20% are transit tourists. This means that nearly 1.8 million cruise passengers may be considered day tourists reaching the Venice port from the holiday resorts along the Adriatic coast or from other areas in Northern Italy.
It is to be emphasized that the long stays are mostly concentrated at the Lido of Venice, a popular summer holiday destination, while the Venice historic centre and lagoon, which offer one of the best opportunities for cultural tourism in Italy (see also Massiani & Santoro, 2012), are much more subject to a Hit-and-Run Tourism.

An expert meeting organized by the UNESCO Venice Office (2011c) discussed in detail interlinks between tourism and culture in Venice and summarized some conclusions and recommendations for the sustainable development of the city and its resources (The Future of Venice and its Lagoon in the Context of Global Change; Culture and Development in Venice: From Restoration to Revitalization).

"Venice is in clear and urgent need of a rich, diversified and sustainable cultural tourism policy and better tourism management that considers, first and foremost, the wellbeing of the local community." Out of the approximately 22 million tourists visiting Venice every year, just four million stay in Venice overnight, and only two million visit one or more cultural attractions, such as museums or art exhibitions. It was thus pointed out that tourism in Venice is not to be considered as ‘cultural’ at all; in fact, tourism in Venice could be better described as “free-riding on the city’s cultural beauty”.

“In all art cities, tourism is a key economic factor, but it needs to be dealt with wisely to avoid the devastating effects of mass tourism, which include, among others, pollution, congestion, gentrification and the crowding out of residents and non-touristic activities. With the rise in ‘do-it-yourself’ tourism, facilitated by varied accommodation offers and low-cost flights, and coupled with the lack of proper planning and management of tourism flows, Venice is attracting an unsustainable quantity of visitors that harms the city’s wellbeing. During ten days of the year, total demand amounts to more than
100,000 visitors per day. Peaks of 200,000 visitors on special occasions are no exception. In fact, during two-thirds of the year the number of visitors easily surpasses the social-economic carrying capacity of the city.

Modelling analysis shows that instead of an ideal weight of 60%, tourists represent slightly more than 30% of the actual total tourism demand. In the absence of fluctuations in demand, the total carrying capacity of Venice is slightly less than 11 million visitors, while the city is yearly visited by 22 million people. The development of effective planning and administrative instruments, as well as of suitable governance mechanisms and strategic policies for managing tourism, should thus be considered as top priority for the future of Venice. One-day visitors, who constitute the vast majority of total visitors, pose a particular problem because they do not use any central services and consequently do not bring any revenue into the city. Furthermore, their arrival is hardly predictable and therefore very difficult to manage. To address this issue, the new Special Law for Venice under preparation introduces a new tax for visitors.” In 2011, the local authorities instituted a new tourist tax for visitors staying overnight.

“To deal with low-budget and short-term tourism inflicting high costs on the municipality, new visitor management systems were introduced, but have so far been only moderately successful. A particular issue is the seasonal nature of visitor flows to Venice, experiencing in certain days of the year mass tourism that by far exceeds the city’s carrying capacity. One way forward could be to make Venice more attractive during non-peak seasons, e.g. by making special offers and lowering prices. In this context reference was made to a new internet-based pre-booking system for certain cultural magnets of the city, such as the Ducal Palace, in order to achieve a more balanced number of visitors throughout the year. Moreover, the municipality is trying to attract tourists from different regions and emerging countries, and encourage them to consider travel in off-peak seasons. This initiative could for instance include cooperation with travel businesses in Asia, from where large numbers of tourists come to Venice every year.

The Chamber of Commerce commitments to promote sustainable tourism focus on support to the local economy, especially through collaboration with small and micro-enterprises, promotion of cultural and creative industries, and endorsement of local food and wine production. Besides promoting worldwide ‘a Venetian way of life’, the Chamber of Commerce also seeks to encourage tourists to explore the mainland, as implied in their campaign “Venice is not an island”. This initiative is in line with the hoped-for reduction of one-day ‘touch-and-go’ tourism. By bringing tourists in closer contact with local communities and enterprises, the Chamber of Commerce seeks a deeper interaction between tourists and visitors and the city, and works towards a major sustainability of their activities.

Supporting public policies for a renewed sustainable tourism, with a refreshed emphasis on the ‘culture-based economy’ will be decisive for investing in art and creativity. The Arsenal of Venice represents a ‘best practice’, where more than 50,000 square meters of the southeast area of the Arsenal complex have become the permanent basis for the Biennale activities. Furthermore, among the instruments to promote competitiveness of the ‘Venice City System’, particular impulse should be given to infrastructural development, such as the Port of Chioggia, constituting a strategic gateway between Italy and the Venice lagoon. Another particular interest which deserves attention is the original high-quality craftsmanship, which has a strong tradition in Venice and could attract more foreign interest.
A critical approach towards the current state of Venice concerns the progressive decrease of the Venetian population which in the second half of the 19th Century resulted in an exodus of local commercial activities. With tourism remaining the one and only major industry in the city, visitors have little chance to interact with the local community or to admire and purchase original Venetian products. The MOSE (Experimental Electromechanical Module) flood defence system left little money for the general maintenance of the city, including the regular cleaning of the canals required for the proper functioning of the specialized sewer system. Before completing the MOSE, this sewer system needs modernizing, yet none of this work has been achieved. The planned subway under the lagoon (sub-lagunare) to connect Venice with the mainland has been primarily conceived for tourist transportation, but may in fact become a means of transport for the local population who can no longer afford housing in Venice. However, the danger of these large-scale urban works is that Venice might become a “monumental cemetery of incomplete infrastructures”. On the other hand, there is an urgent need to invest in creativity and to facilitate the residence of students and young couples for attracting younger generations. To counter the mass tourism processes of alienation and “Disneylandification”, Venice should also promote genuine artisan shops, theatres and small family-run hotels.

The topic of quality tourism in Venice generates animated discussions among experts, which demonstrate the relevance and complexity of the issue. Educational tourism demands emerge as one of the key factors to create quality tourism in Venice. Visitors should be sensitized to quality products made in Venice and buy originality instead of kitsch. Venice should offer its visitors opportunities to engage more closely with the city and its residents. Innovative digital technology could be employed to help visitors discover the more hidden and interesting sites of the city.

The experts agreed that Venice needs better tourism policies and integrated visitor management tools to cope with tourist flows throughout the year and make them sustainable. The ideal number of visitors per day is estimated around 30,000 while the daily ‘carrying capacity’ should not exceed the number of residents (currently less than 60,000).

It was also noted that strengthening activities of cultural interest in the winter period, e.g. in the period from December to February, could help to reduce peak tourism during the summer. The question of how revenues could be collected to cover the costs of mass tourism remains still open. Some experts argue in favour of a generic ‘entry ticket’ of €10 to visit the city, as opposed to the criticized “soggiorno tax” that only targets overnight tourists. Yet it would be precisely initiatives like this one that could reinforce the image of “Veniceland”, of a historic theme park that closes after nightfall. The experts participating in the UNESCO workshop concluded that while tourism certainly represents the city’s main source of economic income, Venice has to primarily address the needs of its citizens and attract young people”.

The draft Management Plan 2012 – 2018 for the World Heritage site of Venice and its Lagoon (elaborated by the Venice Municipality, 2012) defines a vision based on four pillars:

1. Sustainable use: Cooperation between the Municipalities sharing the territory of the World Heritage site jointly promoting the universal values of the site.
2. Conservation and Revitalization: The environmental, architectural and cultural heritage will be protected and revitalized.

3. Updating the values: Conservation and rehabilitation of public goods and spaces aimed at keeping the resident population in Venice.

4. The Lagoon as archipelago of creativity and research: The lagoon and the historic safeguarding techniques, creating job opportunities and interactions between local, national and international research centres.


5.3.4 Dubrovnik, the Pearl of the Adriatic

The city of Dubrovnik on the Dalmatian Coast was an important Mediterranean sea power from the 13th century onwards. Dubrovnik is the centre of the Dubrovnik-Neretva County. The city encompass an area of 143,35 square kilometres with 43,770 inhabitants (in 2001) (Beban & Ok, 2006). The economic profile of the County is determined by its geographical location, a longitudinal and indented coast of outstanding beauty, and by its rich cultural and historical heritage. The coastal zone and the agricultural land constitute the main production resources (CCE Dubrovnik 2006).

Dubrovnik has been included on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1979 (www.whc.unesco.org/en/list/95). It is a city of outstanding cultural and artistic life, which makes it an interesting tourist destination. The original World Heritage site consisted solely of the defences and the intra-mural city. In 1994 it was extended to include the Pile medieval industrial suburb, a planned development of the 15th century, and the Lovrijenac Fortress, located on a cliff, which was probably begun as early as the 11th century but owes its present appearance to the 15th and 16th centuries. Also included were the Lazarets, built in the early 17th century to house potential plague-carriers from abroad, the late 15th-century Kase moles, built to protect the port against south-easterly gales, and the Revelin Fortress, dating from 1449, which was built to command the town moat on its northern side. The site has an extension of 97 hectares with a buffer zone of 54 hectares.
History in brief

Dubrovnik was founded in the first half of the 7th century by a group of refugees from Epidaurum, who established their settlement at the island and named it Laus. The Latin name Ragusa (Rausa), in use until the 15th century, originated from the rock (Lat. lausa = rock). Opposite that location, at the foot of Srđ Mountain, the Slavs developed their own settlement under the name of Dubrovnik, derived from the Croatian word dubrava, which means oak woods. Both locations were united when the channel separating these two settlements was filled in the 12th century. From the time of its establishment the town was under the protection of the Byzantine Empire; after the Fourth Crusade the city came under the sovereignty of Venice (1205-1358), and by the Treaty of Zadar in 1358 it became part of the Hungarian-Croatian Kingdom, when it was effectively a republican free state that reached its peak in the 15th and 16th centuries. An economic crisis in Mediterranean shipping and, more particularly, a catastrophic earthquake in April 1667 that levelled most of the public buildings, destroyed the well-being of the Republic. This powerful earthquake came as a turning point in the city’s development.

Dubrovnik is a remarkably well-preserved example of a late-medieval walled city, with a regular street layout. Among the outstanding medieval, Renaissance and Baroque monuments within the magnificent fortifications and the monumental gates to the city are the Town Hall (now the Rector’s Palace) dating from the 11th century; the Franciscan Monastery (completed in the 14th century, but now largely Baroque in appearance) with its imposing church; the extensive Dominican Monastery; the cathedral (rebuilt after the 1667 earthquake); the customs house (Sponza), which eclectic appearance reveals the work of several hands over many years; and a number of other Baroque churches, such as that of St Blaise (patron saint of the city).
The 1979 earthquake at Montenegro affected also Dubrovnik with an intensity of 7 magnitude (MSC). A total of 1,071 structures, registered as monuments of high cultural value and including also the fortifications, had been damaged to a varying extent.

During the Croatian war for independence (in 1991-1992 Dubrovnik was occupied by the Serbian-Montenegrin army), 382 residential, 19 religious and about 10 public buildings involving a total area of 192,338 square meters in the Old City were damaged, representing 86% of the total built surface area within the city walls. Although severely damaged, Dubrovnik managed to preserve and restore its beautiful Gothic, Renaissance and Baroque churches, monasteries, palaces and fountains.

Tourism Development

In the very beginning, visitors were mostly traders coming from the inland or neighbouring countries, as well as diplomats, pilgrims, explorers and adventurers. It is interesting to note that Dubrovnik has recognized the importance to take care of its guests as early as the 14th century when a shelter for visitors was built in 1347. In the beginning of the 15th century, several private restaurants were opened. The second half of the 19th century, brought a more significant number of visitors to Dubrovnik, when the steamships were introduced. The period between the two world wars experienced a huge growth in tourist traffic and in a very short time the city developed into an international tourist destination. The pre-war statistics show that the number of tourists had more than doubled from 23,260 tourists in 1925, to 58,050 tourists in 1938. After the Second World War there has been an even greater increase: by 1959 the number of tourists had risen to 99,138 and in 1969 there were already 242,000 tourists. As part of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the period from 1963 to 1990, Dubrovnik experienced a fast and continuous tourism development culminating in 596,776 tourists visiting the city in 1988, more than half coming from abroad (Croatian Central Bureau for Statistics, 1988). The Croatian war in 1991-1992 caused a stagnation in the tourism development due to the bad reputation as dangerous destination, resulting in a loss in tourists over a long period of time. “After the war Dubrovnik faced a radically new situation, as Croatia’s southernmost city and the southernmost County capital, with an interrupted road connection to the rest of the country and without realistic possibilities for improving the communication routes in the near future and an inherited tourist infrastructure for mass tourism based on charter flights”.

Over the last years there has been a rapid growth in tourism, especially of day visitors, transforming the historic city centre with its small resident population into a City Museum.

In 2010, Dubrovnik hosted 588,534 guests who spent a total of 2,192,254 nights in the city, representing a 13-14 % increase with respect to the previous year (Croatian Times). Tourists visiting Dubrovnik were mainly British (66,195 visitors), followed by Spanish (53,608) and French nationals (52,807), while the number of domestic visitors came in fourth, numbering 45,608.

The period from January to August 2012 counted 502,899 arrivals and 1,955,108 overnight stays, with respective increases of 8% and 11% compared to the same period in 2011. Tourists staying in hotels in this period accounted for 1,331,755 nights spent in the city (corresponding to a 9 % increase), while those taking advantage of private accommodation facilities summed 341,418 overnight stays (31% increase). It is important to note that the private accommodation sector registered an increase of 1,000 beds in just one year, totalling now an accommodation capacity of 8,900 beds.
Guest occupancy over this eight-month period increased by an overall 3% both in hotel and private accommodation. The occupancy rate reached 49.7% for hotels and 19.2% for private accommodation.

A significant increase in day tourists resulted from the arrival of cruise ships. The number of cruise passenger arrivals went up from 296,958 passengers in 2002 to 1,025,429 passengers in 2010 (CLIA: Cruise Market Overview 2010), thus accounting for 2809 passengers per day, calculated over the whole year. Considering that most cruise ships operate only during the summer half-year, we may presume that in the peak summer season about 5000-6000 passengers visit Dubrovnik each day.

Tourism is also providing new sources of revenue to the municipality, without having local citizens to pay for more taxes. Revenues are raised through tourism-based activities e.g. parking fees, tourism taxes, visitor entrance tickets, sale of local products etc. A major source of income is constituted by the arts and cultural sector. Dubrovnik has numerous important cultural institutions, such as museums, art galleries, theatre companies, a symphony orchestra, the Dubrovnik Summer Festival, performing arts venues and many others. However, the prime attractions of Dubrovnik are its physical heritage assets, such as the Dominican and Franciscan Monasteries, the Rector's Palace, the Bell Tower, the Orlando Column and the City Walls.

The most significant cultural event in the city is the annual Dubrovnik Summer Festival (10th of July – 25th of August), traditionally held since 1950: a theatre and music festival included on the calendar of the most famous world festivals since 1956. Another important event is the annual festivity of Saint Blaise, celebrating the patron of the city since more than thousand years. In 2009 this festivity has been included on the UNESCO “Intangible Cultural Heritage” List.

The 2006 SWOT analysis carried out by Ana Beban and Huseyin Ok has identified the following Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats for the city of Dubrovnik:

**Strengths:**

- Natural resources: Richness and diversity of the landscape (indent coast, islands)
- Human resources- skilled labor in the tourism sector
- Economy resources: Possibility of development of the agriculture, trade and enterprise in the service of tourism and increasing tourism business
- Existence of the basic infrastructural network (roads, international port, international airport, railway stations, bridges, water pipes, telecommunication networks, etc.)
- Tourist, sport and recreational potential regarding types of the tourism (hunting, fishing, recreational tourism, rural, thematic tourism, etc.) excellent tourism business (infrastructure and services)
- Rich tangible and intangible Cultural Heritage and cultural diversity

**Weaknesses:**

- Insufficient transportation infrastructure and traffic connections:
- due to a weak entrepreneurial spirit inefficient environmental protection (pollution of the water sources, waste management) and weak usage of county’s resources (sea, islands, elite tourism, etc.)
- War consequences: destroyed economic facilities not renovated, areas with landmines
Seasonality of the tourism
Problems of water supply and drainage

Opportunities:

- very good geo-strategic and traffic location (reachable by sea, air, car) and closeness of markets of BiH, Montenegro, Albania and Italy
- Domestic and foreign entrepreneurial encouragement: e.g. renewal of the traditional crafts
- Positive changes in the surrounding: political and economic stabilization in the Balkans and increasing cooperation, EU membership of Croatia by 2013, improving traffic system (Airport in Dubrovnik, Railway connections, Highway)
- Mediterranean climate with rich natural resources and cultural diversity

Threats:

- Natural disasters: Earthquakes, summer fires, strong winds, summer rain showers and inadequate disaster prevention
- Migrations: Depopulation of the autochthonic population and emigrations of the young and educated people
- Social impact: crime, corruption, alcohol, drugs, prostitution

City For All Seasons

In December 2011, the Dubrovnik-Neretva County registered 12,652 visitors staying a total of 31,374 nights, accounting for a 20% increase in visitors and a 25% increase in overnight stays compared to the previous year. This is certainly a step in the right direction, given the efforts to promote the city of Dubrovnik as a year-round destination advertised in the campaign “A City for All Seasons”. According to the Vjesnik newspaper (Nov. 2011), 13 hotels are to remain open in Dubrovnik during winter and also regular flights from the UK will make the city easily accessible in winter time.

Tourists Spending

A survey on the spending habits of tourists in Croatia undertaken by the Visa credit card company on 500 foreign tourists visiting Dubrovnik, Split, Zadar and Zagreb in August, showed that the majority of foreign tourists spend between €16 and €50 per day, which includes their spending on accommodation (reported by Croatian newspapers, Oct. 3, 2011): 34% of the respondents spent between €31 and €50 per day; 33.5% between €16 and €31, while only 4.5% claimed to spend more than €100 a day, with the remaining 28% mostly spending between €50 and €100 per day. Private rental was the most popular type of accommodation for those surveyed: 37% took advantage of private accommodation, whilst 30% stayed in hotels.

The same survey asked the travellers also why they choose Croatia as holiday destination and how they organized their travel. More than half of the respondents said they relied on recommendations from friends or family, while 22.5% based their choice on internet research and 10.5% stated they had been influenced by the media in the selection of their holiday destination. 76.5% of those surveyed affirmed they organized
their holiday on their own, while only 16% booked their travel through an agency (HRT, Vecernji).

**Good Revenue from City Wall Visitors**

In 2002, 390,000 tourists visited the City Walls and the estimated ticket revenue was about € 540 000 (Sinković 2002). In 2011, the historical walls were visited by 241,716 people, while the first six months of 2012 counted already 233,606 visitors. In this period of 2012 the “Society of Friends of Dubrovnik Antiquities” has made 12,323,479 Croatian Kuna on ticket sales of the City Walls and will earmark half of this amount to heritage renovation projects, while the other half will go to the Municipality of Dubrovnik. The Society has already allocated 8,209,055 Kuna of these funds to the implementation of planned renovation projects; some of these renovations will be executed during the summer months as they do not interfere with the tourist season.

**Historic City Museum**

Dubrovnik has become one of the top tourist destinations in the Mediterranean. After the Croatian war, the city centre has been nicely restored and is now visited daily by thousands of people. The number of tourists is increasing every year and also the efforts to extend the tourist season to the winter months starts to take root.

This development has been possible thanks to the improvement in the tourism business with a wide range of offers and to the excellent accessibility by car, ship and plane.

On the other hand, in the city’s core area the quality of life is decreasing, the infrastructure is no longer satisfying business or private needs, the gentrification process causes an increase in living costs and local people are unable to pay increased house rents or property taxes and cannot afford real property. The centre is crowded during the day and empty in the evening. Hence, the local population starts to migrate to the suburban area and in the historic centre tourism-related business and shops are dominating. People arriving in the morning and leaving in the evening is a clear sign of the inevitable transformation.

The County has boosted the tourism business and infrastructure and has, in parallel, taken care of the cultural heritage. Thanks to the national and the County’s governments’ support and the increased revenues from tourists, cruise ships and City Wall entrance fees, the conservation and restoration of the historic centre seems to be assured.

But the massive influx of tourists is without any doubt approaching the limits, especially in the historic centre, and strategic decisions as to whether the core area should remain a living centre or be slowly transformed into a Historic City Museum need to be taken. The strategic planning should focus on ‘quality tourism’ and set limits on visitors for the most vulnerable Cultural Heritage sites. The point of no return has already been passed and the Historic City Museum is already a reality. Radical changes are needed to bring local people and businesses back, but considering the present tourism development there is no interest for such a change.

The EU membership of Croatia will certainly re-enhance the opportunities but also the pressure on Dubrovnik. A clear strategic orientation and an effective planning policy for managing tourism can much contribute to the sustainable development of the entire County. Some measures to foster a quality development could be the following:
• Clearer identification of Dubrovnik as festival and congress destination
• Involving stakeholders and local people in the decision making and implementation process
• Establishing a quality brand for tourism business including environmental and social criteria
• Extending the tourist season to establish a year-round destination
• Improving the transportation system and infrastructure in line with environmentally and socially compatible solutions. Mainly public transport needs improvement.
• Diversification of tourism-related businesses and creation of incentives encouraging local employment
• Fostering local intangible heritage and creating new business opportunities for artisans
• Creating new opportunities for the marketing of local products to enhance benefits to the surrounding rural area.

In only two decades Dubrovnik has made an incredible transformation and has become a top destination in the Mediterranean. The challenges for its future development, such as the economic crisis, natural hazards and climate change, require a concise strategy focused on a long-term benefit for the local culture and population.
6. CHERPLAN PROJECT

6.1 Overview

The CHERPLAN project has been co-financed by the South-East Europe Transnational Cooperation Programme in the framework of the Regional Policy’s Territorial Cooperation Objective with the aim of improving integration and competitiveness in an area which is as complex as it is diverse.

The CHERPLAN transnational partnership is composed by the following 11 partners and 2 observers:

- Friuli Venezia Giulia Region (Italy)
- National Research Council - Institute of Environmental Geology and Geo-Engineering (CNR/IGAG, Italy)
- University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences - Institute of Sanitary Engineering and Water Pollution Control (BOKU-SIG, Austria)
- Municipality of Hallstatt (Austria)
- Region of Western Greece (Greece)
- Computer Technology Institute & Press (CTI, Greece)
- Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Science and Arts (ZRC-SAzu, Slovenia)
- Municipality of Idrija (Slovenia)
- Ministry of Culture (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)
- Ministry of Culture (Montenegro)
- Ministry of Culture, Tourism, Youth and Sports (Albania)

Observers:

UNESCO Venice Office
Federal Ministry for Education, the Arts and Culture (Austria)

The CHERPLAN project aims to provide a strong basis for ensuring compatibility and synergy between Cultural Heritage (CH) conservation and socio-economic growth by fostering the adoption of a modern Environmental Planning approach across South East Europe. A multilevel and comprehensive Partnership ensures effective achievement of these goals: the project partners will organize workshops and training, develop Pilot Projects, prepare Action, Business, Management and Environmental Plans; to promote efficient participatory management of CH sites, they will establish Cultural Site Management Partnerships. Finally, an Environmental Planning Model will be developed as a strategic tool for lasting transferability of project results.

The rapidly changing contexts in our modern times pose a big challenge over the management of historic centres in South East Europe. Cultural Heritage sites face problems in combining heritage conservation and modern infrastructure and services such as ICT networks, energy management, building restoration, traffic and transportation, water supply and sewage systems, waste management etc. The lack of multi-level exchange between responsible managing authorities and the missing integrated sustainable development strategies fully acknowledging the opportunities
offered by the uniqueness of Cultural Heritage will eventually result in non-competitive historic areas affected by low amenity values for inhabitants and visitors alike. Transfer of knowledge and best practices from experienced countries is lacking. International conventions on Cultural Heritage, signed by the governments of CHERPLAN Partners, strengthen the need to adopt a general strategy aiming to give CH a proper function in the life of the communities and integrate heritage protection into comprehensive planning programmes. South East Europe counts more than 40 World Heritage sites, but only some of those inscribed after 2002 can rely on a Management Plan where the environmental aspects are often badly addressed or altogether missing. Cultural Heritage sites located in both rural and urban areas often face the dilemma between losses of cultural values and hence loss of identity, due to non-sustainable growth, and economic decline and emigration, due to inappropriate infrastructure and high living costs (especially, buildings maintenance). In addition, Cultural Heritage cannot be seen as a mere accumulation of significant monuments, but rather needs to be considered as a vital living space for its inhabitants: for this reason it is crucial to elaborate a shared strategy among SEE countries based on application of Environmental Planning (EP) techniques coupled with a sound management of the historical sites. The aim of EP is to integrate traditional urban/spatial planning with the concerns of environmentalism to ensure sustainable development, when innovatively applied to CH sites. EP’s comprehensive perspective will couple preservation and enhancement of Cultural Heritage and its environmental setting with implementation of modern infrastructure and services. Furthermore, the Project contributes to job creation through appropriate financial tools (Business Plans) and training aimed at improving the capacity of national/local stakeholders.

Fig. 20 - CHERPLAN web site (www.cherplan.eu)

Some of the main issues elaborated within the CHERPLAN project constitute the foundation of sustainable development in heritage sites. Legal framework, typology of Cultural Heritage, strategic assessment, environmental planning and management concept as well as participatory processes and techniques will be the major contributions of CHERPLAN to the further improvement of the economic, social and environmental situation of the pilot sites in South East Europe.
6.2 Processes and Outputs

The project is structured in six Work Packages:

WP 0 has been dedicated to preparatory activities, while

WP 1 addressed the Transnational Project and related financial management.

WP 2 focuses on Communication and Dissemination activities conducted throughout the project lifespan. Noteworthy are the web platform and the seminars informing the public of the progress of the project, with the particular aim to increase awareness within civil society and among experts about the importance of linking protection of CH sites with their sustainable development. To achieve this result, the communication strategy is impact-oriented and addresses different target groups since the project start. The communication milestones have been illustrated in the Communication Plan. Particular attention has been given to the project web site which is continuously updated with project outputs.

A glossary of project technical terms and expressions, as well as various dissemination materials, including project brochure, leaflets, booklets, articles and a Final CD-ROM presenting the project results, will be issued. Several events will be organised at national and international level. The most relevant is the Mid-Term Transnational Conference which will be held in Montenegro aimed at promoting the EP concept among other neighbouring countries and capitalizing on possible feedbacks. A Transnational Conference in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia will endorse the Environmental Protection approach and result in the signing of an Inter-ministerial Memorandum of Understanding. A Final Transnational Event with participation of all partners will be organized by the Lead Partner to disseminate project results among relevant target groups, apt to support the transfer and follow-up of the project; a specific session will be dedicated to tourism operators, focusing on outputs aimed at enhancing sustainable development. Furthermore, a Transnational Conference in Albania will specifically deal with UNESCO World Heritage sites, either existing, candidate or potential.

WP 3 deals with Analysis of Cultural Heritage sites which includes data collection of regulatory frameworks, existing relevant planning tools and traditional knowledge related to restoration and land/settlement management at CH sites. The survey and analysis will be carried out in each country in order to identify the various national states-of-the-art of CH planning and management, as well as possibly related participation processes. The work includes preparation of a CH taxonomic tree-like structure, providing a solid and unified conceptual framework for utilization in WP4 and WP5. A strategic and comprehensive assessment of CH sites will follow. A model will be set up for human-induced impacts (e.g., tourism, transports etc.), allowing identification and use of suitable indicators. The main outputs will consist in issuing a Regulatory Framework Report, a Cultural Heritage Typologies Report and a Sites Strategic Assessment Report.

WP 4 focuses on the development of an Environmental Planning and Management (EPM) methodology specifically tailored to CH sites (to be practically applied and tested in WP5 Pilot Projects). The innovative aspect of this approach lies in the integration of
the concerns of environmentalism into CH planning and management in order to pursue a sustainable development. EPM includes collaborative processes involving all stakeholders, reconciles conflicting interests and different values and perspectives by showing that the idea of ‘conservation being against development’ indeed represents a false and out-of-date belief, especially for CH sites. A GIS platform tailored to Environmental Planning requirements will be developed as a support tool. Furthermore, the foreseen four training sessions will build capacity in Environmental Planning and Management.

A main focus of WP 5 addressing Environmental Planning and Pilot Projects lies on participation. This process will be implemented through the establishment of Cultural Site Management Partnerships (CSMPs), the core of the participation process, and the organisation of thematic Workshops aimed at ensuring stakeholder involvement in the Project. Another key focus lies on the development of Pilot Projects in each country. Different types of CH sites and environmental settings have been selected: Aquileia (Italy), Hallstatt (Austria), Nafpaktos (Greece), Idrija (Slovenia), Bitola (F.Y.R.O.M.), Cetinje (Montenegro) and Berat (Albania), located in rural or urban areas, included on the UNESCO World Heritage Site List or tentative list, and featuring different problems/assets. The Environmental Planning Concept developed in WP4 will be tested in these areas, meeting the specific conditions governing its practical application. SWOT analyses, Action and Business Plans, aimed at providing concrete responses and investment estimates to the identified needs, will be prepared for each Pilot Site within the Cultural Site Management Partnerships, thus building a shared vision and consensus on future actions.

WP 6, dedicated to Revitalization of Cultural Heritage sites, will integrate the results of WPs 3, 4 and 5 into a comprehensive transferable Model for South East Europe. Particular emphasis will be given to CH site revitalization; concrete examples will be provided deriving from both the Pilot Projects experience and collection of third-party Best Practices. The EP Model will contain applicable indications for sustainable and efficient integrated management of CH sites. A Transnational Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), signed by the involved Ministries, will recommend the adoption of the CHERPLAN methodology to other South East European CH sites. Thanks to the growing application of the EP concept, UNESCO's recommendations on the introduction of Environmental Management Plans for World Heritage sites will gain new strength, as will the spirit of the International Convention on Cultural Heritage.

Most of the information contained in the Pilot Sites section is drawn from the project reports issued by partners as specified in the box below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Framework Report</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Strategic Assessment Report</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Planning and Supporting GIS Platform</td>
<td>BOKU-SIG</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Process Handbook</td>
<td>CNR/IGAG</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 The Pilot Sites

AQUILEIA - ITALY

History

Aquileia was founded by the Romans in 181 BC in a strategic location to control the two critical boundaries of the second century, the so-called "Amber Route", connecting the transalpine world with the sea and the Karst area, which could be subject to invasions from the East. The settlement was also located at the convergence of three important Roman roads: the Via Postumia, connecting the city to Genoa, the Via Annia, going to Padua and the Via Popilia, leading to Rimini. It communicated with the sea by means of the Natissa river, once navigable as evidenced by the presence of the fluvial port. Conceived as an outpost against barbarian invasions, Aquileia quickly became a major trading link between the imperial capital and the North-East. It was founded as a colony of Latin Law (i.e. a city with its own Senate, but depending on foreign policy from Rome), to which a large number of soldiers were transferred together with their families.

In the Augustan Age (27 BC - 14 AD), the town became the capital of the “X Regio Venetia et Histria”. This was the most flourishing period for the city, which was totally renovated with the construction of imposing public buildings. In Roman times the city featured a forum, an amphitheatre, a circus, a theatre and several small and large thermae.

In 169 AD Aquileia was besieged by barbarians from the North-East, the Quads and the Marcomans, putting a hard pressure on the town after a long period of peace. A patriarchate was founded in Aquileia as early as the 4th century AD and the city maintained its religious importance in spite of repeated barbarian assaults in the following centuries. In 452 the town was utterly destroyed by the Huns, led by Attila, who set the city on fire. From this moment onwards, Aquileia was devastated by continual invasions, including the Lombard incursions, after which the Patriarch and the inhabitants moved to the little island of Grado under the protection of the Byzantines. In 606 AD the Schism of the Three Chapters divided the Diocese into two parts, with the mainland Patriarchate of Aquileia being protected by the Lombards and the insular Patriarchate of Aquileia seated in Grado being protected by the Doges of Venice; the schism continued until 699.

In 1027 and 1044 Patriarch Poppo of Aquileia, who rebuilt the cathedral, entered and sacked the neighbouring town of Grado. In the 14th century the Patriarchate reached its largest extension, stretching from the Piave river to the Julian Alps and northern Istria.

The seat of the Patriarchate had been transferred to Udine in 1238 but returned to Aquileia in 1420 when Venice annexed the territory of Udine. It was officially suppressed in 1751.
Location and Surroundings

Aquilieia is situated at the northern end of the Adriatic, about 10 km from the sea at the edge of the Grado and Marano lagoons, on the river Natissa. Today it is a small city with only 3,500 inhabitants, but in antiquity it was the ninth largest city of the Roman Empire, and fourth in Italy.

Grado

Nowadays Grado is an operational fishing port with a lovely historic town centre. It is also a major tourist resort with kilometres of highly-equipped sandy beaches. For years this area belonged to the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and during that time Grado developed into a SPA resort. The town is situated very close to Trieste (only 40 km) and Venice (about 100 km).

Trieste

Trieste, located about 40 km from Aquileia, is the capital of the Friuli Venezia Giulia Region. For a long time this major port was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The Slovenian border is only a few kilometres away, curving round to the north and east. The main square, Piazza dell'Unità d'Italia, is a large and elegant space opposite the waterfront with impressive buildings and outdoor cafes. The wide quay promenade offers interesting strolls along the docks and old warehouses near the sea. A visit uphill to the San Giusto Castle and ancient Cathedral provides one of the most beautiful views over the city and the gulf of Trieste.

Venice

At a distance of about 100 km, it is possible to visit the World Heritage site of Venice and its Lagoon.

Marano and Grado Lagoons

The Lagoons host unique fauna and flora and constitute an important ecological system, both for the habitats of numerous vegetal and animal species.

Cultural Heritage Value

World Heritage site: Aquileia has been inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage Sites List in 1998 on the basis of the following Criteria:

Criterion (iii): Aquileia was one of the largest and most wealthy cities of the early Roman Empire;

Criterion (iv): By virtue of the fact that most of ancient Aquileia survives intact and unexcavated, it is the most complete example of an Early Roman city in the Mediterranean world;

Criterion (vi): The Patriarchal Basilican Complex of Aquileia played a decisive role in the spread of Christianity into central Europe in the early Middle Ages.
Site Description

Archaeological area: Much of ancient Aquileia was exploited as a stone quarry for use in new buildings: some important areas have partly been reconstructed and many archaeological findings are displayed in the museums. The tracks of the ancient roads are still in use, with the portico and forum at the main crossroads. The excavated Roman Basilica Civile and baths can be visited, as well as the large and magnificent River Port, the city walls, several private buildings and a large mausoleum. Most of the ruins still lie unexcavated beneath the fields, and as such constitute the greatest archaeological reserve of its kind.

Patriarchal Basilica: The present basilica is essentially Romanesque, dating back to the 11th century, but it conserves magnificent floor mosaics of the former 4th century Basilica Complex.

The 73 meter high Campanile, reputedly built in 1031 as a watchtower, contains the remains of a 4th century mosaic pavement. Aquileia has also two major museums housing collections and remains related to the religious history of the city.
BERAT - ALBANIA

History

Berat is one of the oldest towns in Albania, the earliest traces of settlement dating from 2600-1800 BC, and ceramic findings from the 7th or 6th century BC. The Berat people were first called Illyrians, then Arbër, and finally Albanians. The castle area had stone fortifications by the middle of the 4th century. In Antiquity, Berat was known as Antipatreia, a fortified settlement which succeeded in resisting the Roman legions for a time. The town is mentioned by Polybius and Livy, and in the list of fortifications of Emperor Justinian. In 533, during the Byzantine period, the city took the name of Pulcheriopolis, after the 5th century Byzantine Empress Pulcheria. It developed at the summit of the hill and the castle and its fortifications were rebuilt.

In the Middle Ages, the town was under Bulgarian occupation (860-1018), and grew in importance. The name Berat is first mentioned in 1018. From the Crusader period onward (13th century), Berat had various occupants, including the Angevins, the Serbs, and the Muzakaj Princedom. Much of the fortification system was rebuilt in the 13th century, assuming its present overall plan, and many features of this period have been conserved.

At the start of the 15th century, Berat was occupied by the Ottomans. Substantial alterations were made at this time; the fortifications were repaired and new towers were built to strengthen them. The town remained part of the Ottoman Empire for a long period of time, characterized by peace and prosperity. Located as it was on a major communication route between the capital and the Adriatic, the city spread beyond its fortifications and assumed its present layout in three different quarters: Kala (the castle) situated on the north bank of the Osum river, and Mangalem and Gorica on the opposite river bank. The communities of inhabitants built many mosques, several of outstanding architectural quality (such as Leaden Mosque and Teqeja Helvetive mosque).

The Ottoman period was notable for its remarkable religious tolerance, and for the conservation of the Orthodox Christian heritage within a sizeable Muslim population. Christian arts developed in the form of illuminated manuscripts and other stylized iconographies (School of Onufri, 16th century) and the Orthodox Cathedral was restored (18th century).

After the insurrection against the Turks in 1834, the Castle of Berat was damaged, and lost its defensive function, but much of the historic fabric has been preserved. The condition of Berat remained practically unchanged until 1961, when the historic town was recognised as an important heritage property by the Albanian Government.

Location and Surroundings

The town is located in south-central Albania, 120 km from Tirana, 92 km from Durres and 85 km from Vlora. It has a population of around 64,000 people. It is a remarkable scenic town, with beautiful buildings of high architectural and historic interest. The city has a mountainous and hilly relief - the Tomori mountain (2,416 m) and the Shpiragu
mountain (1,218 m) constituting its highest peaks - which together with the Osumi valley create a beautiful landscape in the town. In addition, the Illyric ruins of Krotina, Margellic and Clos can be visited in the neighbourhood.

**Cultural Heritage Value**

*World Heritage site:* The old town of Berat was inscribed in 2008 on the UNESCO World Heritage Sites List, together with the other Albanian town of Gjirokastra, according to the following criteria:

**Criterion (iii):** Berat and Gjirokastra bear outstanding testimony to the diversity of urban societies in the Balkans, and to longstanding ways of life which today have almost vanished. The town planning and housing of Gjirokastra are those of a citadel town built by notable landowners whose interests were directly linked to those of the central power. Berat bears the imprint of a more independent life style, linked to its handicraft and merchant functions.

**Criterion (iv):** Together, the two towns of Gjirokastra and Berat bear outstanding testimony to various types of monument and vernacular urban housing during the Classical Ottoman period, in continuity with the various Medieval cultures which preceded it, and in a state of peaceful coexistence with a large Christian minority, particularly at Berat.

Furthermore, the town was declared a City Museum in 1961 by the Government of Albania.

Handicraft, as a value of tradition, is today re-valorised in the following artisanal productions: woodcarving, embroidery, silversmith and other metal works, straw works, stone carving and stone decorative works.

**Site Description**

Berat bears witness to the coexistence of various religious and cultural communities down the centuries. It features a castle, locally known as the Kala, most of which was built in the 13th century, although its origins date back to the 4th century BC. The citadel area numbers many Byzantine churches, mainly from the 13th century, as well as several mosques built under the Ottoman era which began in 1417.

The Onufri National Museum of Icons is located within the old Cathedral of Dormition of St. Mary (18th century), a Byzantine style church characterized by a marvellous golden wooden iconostasis. The collection of the icons dating back to the 14th -19th centuries include important works by the great artist Onufri and his school of painters.

The Ethnographic museum is since 1979 housed inside a characteristic ancient Berat building.

Berat is evocatively called the “Town of a Thousand Windows”, for the many large windows of the old Ottoman houses overlooking the town.
BITOLA – FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

History
Bitola has a long and culturally rich history dating from the Neolithic Period. Various cultures and conquerors have lived and ruled in this ancient and beautiful area. During the 4th century BC the settlement of Heraclea Lyncestis, 2 km south of the present-day town of Bitola, was founded by Phillip II of Macedonia, the father of Alexander the Great; and was later a stop along the Roman Via Ignatia. During the Medieval period, the Bitola area was inhabited by Slavic tribes. In the 14th century, Bitola was part of Serbia and in 1382 it passed under the Ottoman rule which lasted more than five centuries.

The Ottomans named the city Monastir, due to the number of monasteries in the surrounding hills. For several centuries Moslems were the majority in the city, while the adjacent villages were mostly inhabited by Macedonian Slavs. In the 16th century the town was populated by Jews coming from Portugal and Spain, fleeing the persecution of the Inquisition. By the end of the 18th century the ethnic group of the Vlachs settled in the city and its surroundings.

The long period of Turkish occupation ended as World War I was beginning. Bitola was subsequently part of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in the period between the two world wars. During these wars, the footprints of many Balkan and European armies were left on Bitola’s soil. After World War II Macedonia became the southern-most state of Yugoslavia. A new era began with the Constitution of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in 1991. The country became an independent, sovereign and social state, which brought a revival to Bitola with resurgence of arts and cultural activities, social and infrastructure improvements and business expansion (www.bitolatourist.info).

Location and Surroundings
Bitola is located in the south-western part of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, only 13 km from the Greek border. Bitola is the second largest city in the country; the town and its surrounding 64 villages count approximately 100,000 residents. The city is situated on the banks of the Drinor river, at an average altitude of 617 meters. It opens to the vast Pelagonia plain, one of the largest and most fertile plains in Macedonia, at the foothills of the Baba Mountain range, which includes Mount Pelister (2,601 meters).

Heraclea
Only 2 km south of Bitola are the remnants of the ancient town of Heraclea Lyncestis, founded by the Macedonian King Philip II in the 4th century BC. Heraclea was a settlement of strategic importance at that time due to its location on the Via Egnatia, which stretched from Albania across the Republic of Macedonia and Greece, all the way to Turkey. In the early Christian period (4th century AD) Heraclea was an important Episcopal seat. It is assumed that the town occupied approximately 70 hectares, only a few buildings have been excavated so far.
Pelister National Park

The National Park of Pelister is located only 15 km from Bitola. The Park is characterized by lush, well-watered forests and unique geological formations, which include Paleozoic and Mesozoic magmatic rock and quartz. The core of the mountain is made of granite, some even 465 million years old. The mountain has numerous peaks higher than 2,000 meters, separated by deep valleys. The park is also rich in springs, streams and rivers, and contains two glacial lakes locally known as the Mountain’s Eyes.

Lake Prespa

Lake Prespa is the second largest natural lake in the country. Situated at an altitude of 853 meters, it covers an area of 284 square kilometres, sharing its borders with Greece and Albania. It lies in a tectonic valley, and as the Lake Ohrid, it was formed in the Pliocene age. Lake Prespa is rich with 24 endemic taxa, 13 fish species, 6 of which are endemic. Due to its relative shallowness (its depth reaches only 50 m), the lake can get quite warm, up to 25°C degrees in summer. Since 1995 the lake is included on the Ramsar list of important wetlands.

Cultural Heritage Value

The Court Register Books constitute an irreplaceable source of knowledge for studying the history of the Ottoman Empire and the non-Turkish population in the Balkans, from the early 17th to the beginning of the 20th century. They are also considered as a basis for research on legislation, society, economy, culture, lifestyle, social care, health care, religion, women’s and children’s status and many other subjects relating to the geographic region. They furthermore reveal the social status of the Muslim and the Christian military personnel and its privileges. And last, but not least, they contain old Moslem and Christian anthroponym, toponym and microtoponym data, which cannot even be found on old maps of the region.

Icon painting: In the whole country there are hundred square meters of excellently preserved floor mosaics abounding in iconography and showing a high level of technical expertise.

Site Description

Bitola, also known as the “city of consuls” is an important industrial, agricultural, commercial, educational and cultural centre. Bitola has both Christian and Islamic sacral monuments. Notorious are respectively the cathedral of St. Dimitrija (1830), the churches of Sv. Nedela and Sv. Bogorodica, as well as the Isak Mosque, Yeni Mosque and Haydar Kadi Mosque (all three dating back to the 16th century). Famous profane architecture includes the Yeni Bath, the Clock tower and the Prison Tower (all from the 17th century). The most renowned places in Bitola are without doubt the old market place or Old Bazaar “Stara Carsija” and the covered market “Bezisten”. Night life in town takes mainly place at Sirok Sokak, one of the most representative streets downtown, and also at the Old Bazaar; the area is also very vivid during the day.
CETINJE - MONTENEGRO

History

The first communities settled in Cetinje some 12,000 years ago, as evidenced by traces found in the Koronjina cave. Cetinje is mentioned in the Kotor archives for the first time in 1440. In that period, the Crnojevics were one of the most powerful families in Zeta, the former name of Montenegro. In 1482, Ivan Crnojevic constructed a royal residence and a monastery in Cetinje which turned out to be not only the centre of secular life but also the spiritual centre of the country. The rule of the Crnojevic dynasty was interrupted at the very end of the 15th century. During the 15th and 16th centuries the city was very often under the attack of Venice and the Turks and stagnated in its development. It was only by the end of the 17th century, in 1697, when the office of Metropolitan of Cetinje was occupied by Danilo Petrovic, founder of the Petrovic dynasty ruling the country for two centuries, that the city started to flourish again resulting in an increase in population.

In 1852, under Danilo I Petrovic-Njegos, Montenegro was declared Principedom (1852-1910). The Montenegrin independence was recognized by decision of the Berlin Congress in 1878, and Cetinje became the capital of a European State with all the relevant attributes (embassies, palaces, Government House etc). The proclamation of the Kingdom of Montenegro in 1910 had a direct effect on the further development of its capital city.

The interlude between 1878 and 1914 was the most flourishing period for Cetinje. In 1946 the Parliament of Montenegro decided that the seat of the new government should be located in Titograd (now Podgorica). The construction of certain industrial facilities and the serious negligence of the city’s traditional and potential cultural-educational and tourist functions contributed to the decline of Cetinje.

At the referendum held in May 2006, Montenegro renewed its independence.

Location and Surroundings

Cetinje Royal Capital covers an area of 910 square kilometres, which equals 6.6% of the total surface area of the State of Montenegro. It is situated in between Boka Kotorska Bay to the West, Budva's Riviera to the South, Skadar Lake basin and Zeta-Bjelopavlici plain to the East, Nikšić plain and Bijele Rudine to the North. It borders seven municipalities (Kotor, Tivat, Budva, Bar, Podgorica, Danilovgrad and Nikšić). Generally speaking, the Cetinje region can be divided into three larger, spatially independent areas: ‘Katunska površ’ or ‘Katunski krš’, Mount Lovćen range and its continental piedmont area and Skadar Lake basin’s Western ridge.

Cetinje town occupies an area of approximately 5 square kilometres. The population census of 2011 registered 13,991 inhabitants in the town and 16,757 inhabitants in the whole municipality.

National Park Lovcen

Mountain Lovcen was proclaimed National Park in 1952 for its specific natural and anthropological characteristics. The park has a rich flora with 1158 plant species - four of
which are endemic, autochthonous forest units and geomorphologic phenomena (valleys, holes, caves). Other attractions are the Mausoleum of Petar II Petrovic Njegos and the church of Ivanova Korita.

**Skadar Lake**

The lake is 15 km far from Cetinje. It is the largest lake in the Balkan area and one of the last sweet water swamps, the last habitat of pelicans and the largest bird reserve in Europe, reasons for its proclamation as National Park. Bird watching (270 species) is the main recreational attraction.

There are also several monasteries, churches and buildings from the Montenegrin past.

**Crnojevic' River and Lipska Cave**

The winter palace of the Petrovic dynasty was located at Crnojevic' River due to its mild and windless climate. Before the Balkan wars, River had a lot of manufacture stores. Lipska cave, which is situated in this area has a beautiful lake and stone ornaments, small vineyards and a waterfall at the source of the river.

**Cultural Heritage Value**

Cultural continuity in the development of Cetinje can be followed through the preserved immovable, movable and intangible Cultural Heritage, where each generation left more or less recognizable traces. Cultural and historical values of this area have been the foundations of creative motions through many centuries. The rich publishing and printing tradition is of great importance both for the Montenegrin and other Balkan cultures. The printing house of Crnojevici (1492-1496) and the books published there are testimony of this tradition.

The diversity of Cetinje's Cultural Heritage, which offers insight into the history of this area, is a proof of the specific cultural milieu and represents a sort of symbiosis of inestimable material and spiritual values, both urban-architectural and cultural-artistic.

In 2010 the Ministry of Culture moved from Podgorica to Cetinje, thus emphasizing the important role of the Royal Capital in the Montenegrin culture. The town is now renewing its image implementing a great number of revitalization processes and projects, organising various cultural events, opening museums, setting up exhibitions and ateliers. Cetinje is currently developing its application for inscription of the historic centre on the UNESCO World Heritage List in relation to the exceptional values of the urban agglomeration and the artistic and cultural-historical qualities of the individual monuments. The historic core of the town is composed of first category cultural monuments which constitute a heritage ensemble of exceptional importance, characteristic for its harmonious unity of heterogeneous elements, individually protected monuments, parks and a regular urban matrix.

**Site Description**

The most significant unmoving Cultural Heritage monuments in Cetinje's historic centre are the following: the Cetinje Monastery with the Church of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the 'Biljarda', King Nicola's Palace, the remains of the Crnojevićs' Monastery
at Čipur, the Government House, the theatre building 'Zetski dom', the hospital 'Danilo I',
the residence of the Heir to the Throne Danilo known as Blue Palace, the Royal Chapel
Čipur, the buildings of the English, Russian, Italian, French and Turkish diplomatic
missions to the former Kingdom of Montenegro, the Tomb of Bishop Prince Danilo at
'Orlov krš' (Eagle's rock), the Relief of Montenegro, the Vlach Church, the edifice of the
State Archives of Montenegro, the Pharmacy in Njegoševa Street, Ivan Crnojević's Mill,
'Tablja' Tower. Particular value of the Cultural Heritage of Cetinje is attributed to the
three most revered Christian relics, being the authentic testimonies of history, culture
and human civilization in that area: Saint John the Baptist's Right Hand and a Particle of
the Holy Cross, as well as the Icon of Our Lady of Phileremos.

The most important part of the movable Cultural Heritage of Montenegro is located in
Cetinje, housed within the National Museum of Montenegro, the Treasury of Cetinje
Monastery, the Central National Library 'Đurđa Crnojević' and in the State Archives of
Montenegro.
History

Human activity in the magnificent natural landscape of the Salzkammergut began in prehistoric times, with the salt deposits being exploited as early as the 2nd millennium BC. The name of the medieval town, derived from the West German hal (salt) and the Old High German stat (settlement), first recorded in a deed of 1305, testifies to its primary function. This resource formed the basis of the area’s prosperity until the mid-20th century, a prosperity that is reflected in the fine architecture of the town of Hallstatt.

The prehistoric cemetery associated with these industrial operations and discovered in the 1840s is the type-site for the first phase of the Early Iron Age in Europe, known to archaeologists as the Hallstatt Culture.

Salt extraction continued in the region well into the Roman period, and a Roman industrial settlement has been identified in the Echterntal. Thereafter there is no evidence of the salt being exploited until the early 14th century. Until the early 16th century salt-mining licenses were generally leased to independent burghers, but these were systematically eliminated and in 1524 mining and forestry operations came under direct Crown management. This resulted in the construction of a number of important engineering features, such as the wooden brine pipeline begun in 1595.

During the Reformation, Protestantism acquired many adherents among the miners and foresters of the Hallstatt region, but they were not permitted to exercise their faith publicly until the Edict of Toleration of 1781.

A disastrous fire in 1750 destroyed most of the medieval core of Hallstatt. This was followed by massive rebuilding in Late Baroque style, which distinguished the town centre up to the present day. Despite technical innovations, such as the introduction of electric power and the construction of a rail link, which permitted the import of coal (1877), the salterns finally closed down in 1965. Salt production, however, remains as high as ever, though the brine is now piped down the valley to a modern treatment plant at Ebersee; only sixty men are now employed in a very efficient mining operation which has become highly mechanized and computerized. Some parts of the mine are now accessible to visitors, including areas made safe for displays arising from the continuing programme of archaeological investigation. Nowadays the region has steadily increased its popularity as a major tourist resort.

Location and Surroundings

Hallstatt is located on the foothills of the Dachstein Mountains, which rise up to 3,000 m and form the highest karst massif in the northern limestone Alps. The village of Hallstatt has a surface of 59.7 square kilometres and counts 864 inhabitants with a density of
14.5 inhabitants per square kilometre. Within the World Heritage site zone other three villages Gosau, Bad Goisern am Hallstattersee and Obertraun are rich of Natural and Cultural Heritage.

**Salt mine**

A three minute ride in a funicular railway brings visitors to the path that will lead them to the world’s oldest salt mine. Organised tours show salt mining through the ages. A particular feature of the tour is the ‘Man in Salt’. In 1734 a corpse was discovered perfectly preserved, with his tools.

**Dachstein ice cave**

A short cable car ride and a twenty minutes’ walk, offering spectacular views on Hallstatt and the lake, take the visitors to the entrance of the ice cave. Here one can admire the natural wonders of the ice forms as well as the man-made ice sculptures including the ‘Grais Castle’, the ‘Parsifal Cathedral’ and the ‘Tristian Cathedral’. This wonder of the Alps is visited every year by more than 150,000 people.

**Mammut Cave**

The cave features a difference in altitude of 1,199 m between the highest located entrance and the lowest ever reached point. To date 60 km of passageways have been explored.

**Cultural Heritage Value**

*World Heritage site:* The Hallstatt-Dachstein alpine landscape was inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage Sites List in 1997 according to the following criteria:

**Criterion (iii):** Humankind has inhabited the valleys between huge mountains for over three millennia. It is the mining and processing of salt, a natural resource essential to human and animal life, which has given this area its prosperity and individuality as a result of a profound association between intensive human activity in the midst of a largely untamed landscape.

**Criterion (iv):** The Hallstatt-Dachstein/Salzkammergut alpine region is an outstanding example of a natural landscape of great beauty and scientific interest which also contains evidence of fundamental human economic activity. The cultural landscape of the region boasts a continuing evolution covering 2,500 years. Its history is since the very beginning primarily linked to the economic history of salt extraction. Salt mining has always determined all aspects of life as well as the architectural and artistic material evidence. Salt production on a major scale can be traced back in Hallstatt to the Middle Bronze Age.

**Site Description**

The Hallstatt-Dachstein alpine landscape, part of the Salzkammergut region in the Eastern Alps, is characterized by huge mountains rising abruptly from narrow valleys.
The Beinhaus (bone house) in Hallstatt dates back to the 12th century AC. Over 1,200 skulls are preserved in this charnel; they are neatly stacked in rows together with their next of kin and have the date of decease written on them. Several have been symbolically painted with flower designs.

The 15th century Romantchurch in Hallstatt is a beautiful gem in the midst of the World Cultural Heritage village. This small Catholic parish church has its origins in the late 1100s, its powerful 12th century tower bearing witness to this fact. The church is daringly built high up on a rock cliff that steeply drops off to the lake.
Idrija, the oldest mining town in Slovenia, represents one of the largest mercury mines in the world, operational until recent times. The town has been renowned for over 500 years for its mining technology and metallurgy and played for several centuries a significant role in international economic relations. According to legend, the mining in Idrija started in 1490 when mercury was first discovered in 1490 by a local bucket maker. The town is one of the few places in the world where mercury occurs in both its elemental liquid state and as the cinnabar ore (mercury sulfide). In the first decades of its development, the town was governed by associations of private entrepreneurs who were not very prolific in their investments in pit and machinery. The nationalization of the mining productions in 1575, when the mine passed under the direct supervision of the Hapsburg Court, was followed by a period of great expansion and modernization. By 1600, all production units were well equipped and quicksilver started to travel to Venice, Amsterdam and South America. The facilities maintained a high production level, achieving in 1913 a record production of 820 tons of mercury. After the Second World War, the mine declined due to a drop in mercury prices on the world market and a decline in ore quality. Ore extraction lasted until 1990, when the procedure for the shutdown of the mercury mine was initiated and the clean-up process started.

The Idrija mine was the second largest mercury mine in the world, with mercury extractions accounting for a more than 13% share of world production. It was second only to Almedén, Spain, where mercury was extracted since antiquity (Leskovec & Peljhan 2009). Nowadays, miners in Idrija are extinct but they left an exceptionally rich heritage which is well preserved in technical infrastructure and artefacts, cultural and historical monuments, archival documentation, museum collections etc, illustrating the various aspects associated with mercury extraction.

Today, Idrija counts not more than 2,000 inhabitants but the city detains solid economic foundations, particularly in modern electro-metal processing. Having attained the nomination as a UNESCO World Heritage site, the town can now boost the tourism development.

Location and Surroundings

Idrija is a small town located in the Goriska region in Slovenia and it is known for the mercury mine and the lace production. The town lies in a valley along the tectonic fault where Pre-Alpine and Karst worlds meet.

Wild lake

The Wild Lake, two km south from Idrija, belongs to the jewels of Slovenian Natural Heritage. Since 1967 it is protected as a natural monument and in 1972 it opened as the first Slovenian natural museum.
Zgornja Idrijca Natural Park

The park, covering an area of 4,230 hectares, was inaugurated in 1992 and features a luxurious and diverse floral world with Dinaric, Alpine and Mediterranean plant species.

Klavze – Slovenian Pyramids

The so-called ‘pyramids of Slovenia’ or Klavze are intrinsically connected with Idrija’s mining history. These wooden water barriers were built as early as the 16th century for timber transport on the rivers surrounding Idrija to satisfy the needs of the mine and the city over the centuries. The flood dams guaranteed sufficient accumulations of water for floating timber. The first Grablje (rakes), oblique wooden barriers across the river holding up the drifting woods, were constructed near Idrija close to the mine. In 1770 the wooden barriers were replaced with new monumental dams in stone and brick.

Cultural Heritage Value

**World Heritage site**: Idrija has been inscribed in 2012 on the UNESCO World Heritage Sites List as Heritage of Mercury, together with Almadén (Spain), according to the following criteria:

**Criterion (ii)**: Mercury extraction took place in a very limited number of mines. From the Renaissance period in Europe, the activity took on an international dimension. Its worldwide strategic importance increased steadily, particularly because of its role in the working of gold and silver mines in America. The interchanges were at once economic, financial and related to technical expertise.

**Criterion (iv)**: The mining site of Idrija, along with Almadén, constitutes the most important heritage left behind by the intensive extraction of mercury, particularly in the modern and contemporary periods. This testimony is unique, and it illustrates the various industrial, territorial, urban and social elements of a specific socio-technical system in the mining and metal production industries.

Idrija has also a long tradition in lace (since 1696). In 1876 in the town was established a lace school. In 1990s new sales galleries and studios were established for designing, making and selling lace and lace products.

Site Description

The town has several cultural attractions, the most important are obviously related to the mine’s history.

Anthony’s shaft (Antonijev rov), dug back in 1500 soon after mercury was first discovered, is one of the oldest preserved mine entrances in Europe. The shaft, which is the oldest part of the Idrija mine, has been transformed into a museum and opened to the public in 1994. The museum tour starts in the 18th century Šeštev House, where miners used to take their equipment before entering the mine, and continues with a visit to the upper levels of the mining shaft and galleries, complete with life-sized mannequins illustrating the various mining jobs. The lower levels of the mine are situated as deep as 400 meters below the surface and have been closed and flooded with water.
The administration of the Idrija mercury mine was housed in the Gewerkenegg Castle, built as a warehouse for mercury and wheat. Today the Castle houses the Idrija Municipal Museum and a music school. The picturesque historic town notably features a restored miner’s house, the miner’s theatre – the oldest stone theatre in Slovenia – the miner’s warehouse, the town hall and the old town square, as well as various lace shops and the monumental building of a school, today housing the Idrija lace-making School and the Idrija Lace Centre.
NAFPAKTOS - GREECE

History

The history of Nafpaktos begins in 1104 BC when, according to evidence given by Apollodorus and Paphsanias, Doric tribes constructed ships and crossed the sea to Peloponese. In Greek legend, Naupactos is the place where the Heraclidae built a fleet to invade the Peloponese. In 454 BC, Athenian general Tolmides occupied Nafpaktos and the city became part of the Athenian Alliance. Thucydides mentions that several important naval battles took place in Nafpaktos Bay during the Peloponnesian War (431-404 BC). In 396 BC the city was occupied by the people of Lokris, then by the people of Theva and later on by the people of Aetolia. In 338 BC Nafpaktos came to Macedonians, while during the period of the Aetolian Confederation it was still an important commercial and strategic centre. In 217 BC Agelaos of Nafpaktos, while being in Koila, near the city, issued a proclamation and called the Greek people to unite in view of the oncoming Roman attack. Romans finally occupied the city as well as the wider region of Nafpaktos. The historian Procopius mentions the castle of Nafpaktos in the 6th century. In 553 AD and again in the 8th century the city was destroyed by earthquakes.

In 860 AD Nafpaktos became capital of a great Byzantine Province with 9 episcopates. In that period Nafpaktos became one of the most important ports of the Byzantine fleet, being used as a connection between the west Europe to the Holy land and for diplomatic communications to the West and at to Costantinople. In addition its position was useful for the defence of Eolía – on the north coast of the Corinthian bay. In 1204 Nafpaktos started to be ruled by the Venetians and was recorded as “Nepanto” or “Lepanto” on their documents, a name that became popular for this site, due to the famous battle.

In 1210 the city was part of the Epirus Domain, in 1338 Venetians occupied the city and in 1449 Nafpaktos was seized by the Turks. On 7th October 1571 one of the greatest naval battles of all times in world history took place in Nafpaktos Bay, the naval battle of Nafpaktos. The threatening spreading of Turks during the 16th century, their sovereignty in the Aegean Sea and the occupation of Cyprus in 1571 obliged the Christian forces of the West to react decisively. Among the fighters was Miguel Cervantes. On 20th May, Pope Pio V achieved the cooperation of the two Great Forces of the time in the Mediterranean, i.e Spain and Venice and formed the ‘Holy Alliance’ (Sacra Liga).

In 1687 Venetian Morosini occupied the city. In 1699 following the Treaty of Karlowitz Nafpaktos was given away to the Turks. On 18th April 1829 came the liberation of the city from the Turks. During the War of Independence which started in 1821 Nafpaktos lived the revolutionary movement. The Greek revolutionary government, considering the city as a strategic point in the area, ordered the army to besiege it from land and sea in May 1821, but the attempt was unsuccessful. The liberation of the city became reality on 18th April 1829, when following a siege, Ibrahim pasha turned over the city to Governor Ioannis Kapodistrias.

Location and Surroundings

Nafpaktos is the administrative seat of the Municipality of Nafpaktia and is one of the oldest towns in Greece (3,500 years). It is situated on a bay along the north coast of the
Corinthian Gulf between Messolonghi and Delphi. The city is amphitheatrically built on the southern side of a hill overlooking the port.

**Messolonghi Lagoon**

Part of the Messolonghi Lagoon has been designated as an area of Special Protection according to the EU Directive for the protection of bird fauna. It is a demarcated wetland of international importance, according to the Ramsar convention and Natura 2000.

**Delphi**

Delphi represents one of the most beautiful and impressing landscapes in Greece. The settlement had origins in prehistoric times and achieved great historic importance, especially during the classical period, for the worship of the God Apollo and the Oracle of Delphi, the most revered oracle in antiquity. Today the visitors can admire the remains of various architectural monuments, including the sanctuary of Apollo, the site of the famous oracle.

*Beaches:* The pebbled beach in front of the old port is the most beautiful seashore of Nafpaktos. The crystal water and the medieval surroundings make this beach a popular place to relax.

**Cultural Heritage Value**

The town with its medieval port and the castle and traces of Neolithic settlements coupled with the rich Cultural and Natural Heritage resources in the surroundings has a high potential for cultural tourism development. In 1973, the Ministry of Culture designated Nafpaktos as a place of historic value and particular natural beauty.

**Site Description**

The port along with the Venetian fortifications and the medieval castle make up the main attractions of Nafpaktos. The castle is located on the top of a hill that overlooks the town at an altitude of 200 m. In 1407 the Venetians built fortifications to the castle and brought it to its current form. During summer season the castle hosts various cultural events. The construction of the *Charilaos Trikoupis* bridge in 2004 (the world’s longest multi-span cable-stayed suspended bridge) connects Rio, Patras’ easternmost suburb, to the town of Antirrio, linking the Peloponnese peninsula to the Greek mainland. The 2,880 m long bridge dramatically improves access to and from the Peloponnese, which could previously only be reached by ferry or via the isthmus of Corinth at its extreme east end.

The town has two museums: the *Farmaki Museum* dedicated to the Greek Revolution, which took place between 1821 and 1829, and liberated Greeks from the Ottoman rule and the *Botsaris Tower* which hosts items from the Greek War of Independence, the Battle of Lepanto and some rare pieces from abroad.
7 CHERPLAN’S HOLISTIC APPROACH

7.1 Governance and Tourism Business

Most countries engaged in CHERPLAN have not yet made sufficient use of legal and strategic tools to define the objectives and action plans for the future tourism development. They still need to define key questions regarding tourism related to Cultural Heritage:

- What kind of tourism should be addressed in future?
- What are the limits in order to protect the Natural and Cultural Heritage?
- Who is funding what with regard to the conservation, restoration, revitalization and maintenance of Cultural Heritage?
- What kind of incentives have to be established to steer tourism in the defined direction?
- How to avoid Hit-and-Run tourism creating quality tourism?

A targeted strategy needs well established laws on protection and conservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage tourism, environmental protection, energy and sustainable development. More and more legal frameworks or strategies define limits, participation and decision processes, funding, incentives and assessments in order to assure the sustainability of the endeavour. A clear tourism framework creates a climate of trust and transparency which will attract new investments and resources for the tourism business as well as for the conservation of the natural and cultural values. Creating win-win-win situations regarding the dimensions of sustainable development will result in added values for all partners involved.

7.2. Environmental Aspects

In addition to their Cultural Heritage assets, all CHERPLAN pilot sites have attractive alternative recreation opportunities which could be increasingly valorised within a sustainable tourism concept. None of the sites has high environmental impact or major problems which cannot be solved within the short term. Considering the accelerated tourism development, the need for resources and infrastructure connected to environmental management is evident and measures to assure economic development and social welfare are required.

Water and energy supply still seems adequate in the places analysed but measures are needed to decrease consumption and to increase resource availability. Services such as waste and water treatment mostly need to be enhanced in relation to the rapid tourism development. Modern ICT and TV systems assure the standards required for the tourism...
business and for the local population. Most of the pilot sites are situated in remote areas, therefore major impacts such as air pollution, noise or water pollution have not yet become major concerns. They can still enjoy large green space both within the sites and the surrounding area.

The tools summarized in this publication will certainly be critical to achieving sustainable growth in tourism without damaging Natural and Cultural Heritage.

Relevant tools for CHERPLAN include:

- Regulatory frameworks at international, national, regional and local level
- Public Participation processes in planning and management
- Management planning of heritage sites
- Environmental Planning and Management (EPM)
- Planning and Monitoring Tools for World Heritage sites
- Carrying Capacity (CC)
- Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA/HIA)
- Limits of Acceptable Change Planning System (LAC)
- ICT applications for tourism
- GIS as Management Tool for Sustainable Tourism

The CHERPLAN pilot sites are still in the phase where environmental planning at a very early moment is possible and where new obstacles for the development of the tourism destination can be avoided. The specificities of the environmental situation and ecosystem services are important factors in achieving sustainable tourism.

### 7.3 Socio-Cultural Environment

Besides the economic and environmental issues, also the social and cultural factors are crucial, as they link heritage protection to sustainable development. The history of society, social cohesion, education, involvement in decision processes, as well as economic opportunities for local people are significant aspects in the development of a successful Heritage Tourism. The socio-cultural aspects can be summarized in three main issues:

**Awareness**

In defining new strategies, one should take account of the past social development, which is decisive for the values of local people today and their identification with tangible and intangible Cultural and Natural Heritage. The traditional knowledge can be important to understand sustainable land use systems and vulnerability of the site. The cultural landscape links human development and Cultural Heritage with the surrounding environment and is highly reliant on the use of local resources and economy.
Stakeholders and decision makers have to be aware of the complexity of such systems and have to include socio-cultural and environmental considerations into their planning and implementation of new concepts. Existing knowledge of the system including the interactions and the transfer of this knowledge to all people involved in the processes is crucial in achieving shared strategies. On this basis, the necessary changes and the possible solutions will become clear and transparent and the goals will be accepted sooner and achieved earlier.

**Readiness**

People have to accept regulations related to site protection and conservation as well as limits regarding site development. The need for changes has to be clear and people have to see opportunities for their involvement and consultation in the planning and management of the heritage sites. Sustainable development is a permanent learning process, therefore the readiness to change and accept new solutions will depend on capacity building and training opportunities. Visualization of scenarios and solutions with modern technology (e.g. Internet, GIS, 3D visualization) could accelerate participatory processes. Under such circumstances people are ready to progress and change.

**Willingness**

People aware of the processes and consequences and ready to change will engage in development processes. Questions of participants have to be answered and their added values and benefit need to be clarified. Local people and institutions are those who have to implement regulations, accept limits, support implementation of decisions and adapt to new situations. Therefore, willingness to stick to the visions, strategies and targets is the only way to achieve a development which will offer future generations the same opportunities and quality of life.

The CHERPLAN sites are rich in social and cultural assets and local people and institutions are testimony to the cultural and religious diversity. Success of heritage conservation and tourism development depends on their attitude, awareness, readiness and willingness to protect, maintain, change and support the site’s development.

### 7.4 Key Success Factors of Heritage Tourism Destinations

In the report “Sustainable tourism based on natural and cultural heritage”, financed by the European Commission, strategic factors for sustainable tourism are presented and the key success factors discussed. The factors focus mainly on cultural and natural assets and less on tourism business aspects of the single sites. The following key factors were considered instrumental in enhancing/limiting success:

1) **Significance**: The importance of the Cultural or Natural Heritage.

2) **Distinctiveness**: This refers to all that makes one particular area distinct from another, giving it a unique selling position.
3) Clustering: Natural and Cultural Heritage is often scattered. If sites can be pooled together, they may collectively provide interest to attract a critical mass of tourists.

4) Branding and Networking: potential tourists have to be attracted. Branding is a way to encourage the customer to buy a particular 'product' by creating an image around it.

5) Access: The distance and the weather are deciding factors for many tourists when choosing a destination.

6) Seasonality: Heritage-based tourism should be seen as an opportunity to overcome seasonality of visitors flow and should focus on periods with low tourism.

7) Partnership: Often development starts thanks to the initiative of one particular body, whether public, private or an organization, interested in the conservation of the Natural or Cultural Heritage.

8) Strategic planning: Elaborating an overall tourism strategy involving all key players is an essential tool for developing a successful and sustainable tourism product.

9) Accessibility: is distinct from access, and concerns presenting the Natural and Cultural Heritage of the area in an understandable and enjoyable way so that the tourists will be able to learn from their visit.

10) Sustainability: Conclusively, conserving Natural and Cultural Heritage is fundamental to sustainable tourism.

Besides these success factors, the complementary development of tourism business, infrastructure and services need to be considered. Tourists travelling today combine learning, fun and recreation, therefore the development of tourism business and the products offered are much interlinked. Building up new infrastructure and services should go hand in hand with the promotion of heritage sites. Standards regarding accommodations, energy availability, clean water, clean air, security, sewage and waste management systems, modern telecommunication systems, easy accessible booking tools, public transport etc. are equally important.
8. ANALYSIS OF THE CHERPLAN PILOT SITES

AQUILEIA - ITALY

Governance and Tourism Business

In Italy four levels of governance – state, regions, provinces and municipalities - share responsibilities in the cultural field. The most important administrative and legislative functions lie at the State level. The “Heritage and Landscape Codex” (Delegated Decree 2004) constitutes a rationalisation of the huge pre-existing legislation regulating the heritage and landscape since 1939. The Codex aims at ensuring a homogenous and complete safeguarding of the Italian Cultural Heritage, Arts and Landscape.

Even though Friuli Venezia Giulia is an Autonomous Region, the heritage protection jurisdiction remains mainly at State level. Nevertheless, the FVG Region has enacted a special regional law recognising the extraordinary value of Aquileia, promoting the enhancement of the site and creating a specific organisation for its management, the Fondazione Aquileia.

Establishment of the Foundation for the enhancement of the archaeological heritage of Aquileia" operating on funding from the tourism development in the area (Regional Law 2006). The aim of the law is the valorisation of Aquileia’s Cultural Heritage as an added value for the development of the whole area, its promotion and participation in an Italian Archaeological Park network. In addition, Fondazione Aquileia is preparing the CH Management Plan according to the UNESCO recommendations. The plan will include a section dedicated to the application of the Environmental Planning principles elaborated by the CHERPLAN project team. Finally, considering that Aquileia hosts also a Site of Community Importance (SCI IT3320037 Marano and Grado Lagoons), each intervention and planning initiative has to comply with the national Law n. 394/91 on natural protected areas.

A Tourist Information Centre has been set up at Aquileia, providing tourists with promotional material. An interesting initiative is the Aquileia Forum project which uses the most advanced technology of computer-generated virtual 3D representation to exalt the historical heritage of Roman Aquileia. The idea is to develop a project that makes use of this virtual reality in a variety of ways:

✓ Virtual Exploration - online
✓ Mobile Guide - on site
✓ 3D Holograms - museums
Through these innovative methods, Aquileia Forum can provide a unique learning experience of 'edu-tainment', which combines education and entertainment, with an appeal for the wide public and a special attractiveness to the youngest ones. More info is available on [www.aquileiaforum.org](http://www.aquileiaforum.org).

A survey on tourist profiles and satisfaction, carried out by the association Civita in 2011, collected and processed 2,020 questionnaires. The most important results can be summarized in the following:

- 97% of the visitors reached the site by private car/bus, only 3% by public transport;
- 40% of tourists visited the site in 30 minutes - 1 hour; 35% in 1-2 hours and only 17% in more than 2 hours;
- 42% did not stay one night in the surrounding area;
- 51% was visiting also other sites/places in the surrounding area;
- 65% visited the site without any supporting documentation; 35% used a printed guide; 4.6% an audio-guide; 2.7% ICT tools and 2.2% visited the site with a tour guide;
- 35% did not buy anything during their visit; 30% bought a guide of the site; 13% typical food and beverage products; 7% local handicraft products; 6% gadgets;
- 23.5% tourists came from an Italian region different from Friuli Venezia Giulia; 65% were foreigners coming from EU countries and 4% came from extra EU countries.
The tourism infrastructures (hotels, restaurants, bars etc.) and services need some improvement and diversification.

Table 4 - Tourism business in Aquileia - 2012 (*2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism AQUILEIA 2012</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total accommodations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels/Rooms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para hotel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other B&amp;B, Private, hostels</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arrivals** 25,765

**Overnights** 149,384

**Expenditures/day** € 10

**National tourists** 31 %

**International tourists** 69 %

** The high number of overnights is due to the beach resorts with camping and does not reflect the visitors of the site.

**Environmental Aspects**

The main problem perceived by inhabitants and local authorities is the traffic, caused by a road cutting the town centre in two parts and ending in front of the Basilica. Several proposals for an alternative traffic circuit have been advanced but at the moment the situation remains unchanged. In addition, due to strict public road regulations, the highway signs to the Aquileia sites are missing, thus reducing the opportunities for a tourist stopover in the area.

Another important aspect is the conflict with the farmers. The entire area is dedicated to agricultural production and archaeological findings in the fields lead to interruption of the cultivation. Moreover, the area is subject to subsidence phenomena and the Basilica shows signs of movement through several cracks and rifts.

The environmental services (waste management, water supply and sewage system) and the ICT networks based on optic fibre networks are well developed. CAFC S.p.A. manages the entire water cycle. The annual urban waste generation increased in the last years from 1,500 to 2,500 kg, or from 501 to 700 kg per inhabitant. The recycling process has been introduced in the waste management and in 2010 the recycling rate reached 65%.

**Socio-Cultural Environment**

The website of the Municipality of Aquileia registers forty associations, of which a dozen are concerned with culture or Cultural Heritage (one is dedicated to theatre and one to the Friulian language, four are choral societies and six associations are involved with historic and archaeological heritage). The Fondazione Aquileia has been established in 2004 as the instrument for the elaboration of strategic plans, with the aim of enhancing cultural tourism, promoting the valorisation of the area and improving the conservation
and rehabilitation of the site (see www.fondazioneaquileia.it). The organisation is the driver of the Aquileia site development and has embraced the path of innovation in the cultural tourism field through the organisation of cultural events (Aquileia Film Festival), projects and workshops and recently also by the virtual reconstruction of the Basilica (realized by Altair4 for the Fondazione Aquileia), published on the website and on YouTube.

On the other hand, a lot needs to be done with regard to employment in the tourism sector. Aquileia is a real Hit-and-Run tourism destination, resulting in little economic benefit for the local economy and few employees in the tourism sector.

Key Success Factors

Significance: Aquileia has a high cultural value and significance for is very ancient and rich history. The Basilica, the Roman Forum, the Fluvial Port and the Archaeological Museum constitute, together with the undiscovered area, factors of significance.

Distinctiveness: The site couples a Roman settlement with a Patriarchal Basilica and was the seat of the Patriarchate until 1751.

Clustering: The nearby summer holiday resort of Grado, famous for its beaches, and the proximity to Trieste and Venice can facilitate a tourist visit to Aquileia but at the same time it encourages only a short stop-over of few hours at the cultural site.


Access: Aquileia can be easily accessed from the Venice-Trieste and Udine highway. The town is situated at 15km from the Ronchi dei Legionari (15 minutes by car) and 114 km from the Venice International airport. The nearest railway is Cervignano, located at 10 km from the site, with regular bus connections to Aquileia (1 trip every hour).

Seasonality: The summer period from July to September is at present the principal tourist season, related to the coastal tourism which is concentrated on the beaches and cultural towns such as Venice and Trieste. There is high potential year-round tourism.

Partnerships: The Fondazione Aquileia is co-financed by the Ministry of Culture, the Friuli Venezia Giulia Region, the Municipality of Aquileia, the Province of Udine and the Archdiocese of Gorizia. This statutory partnership works in cooperation with several local, national and international institutions.

Strategic Planning: The new Management Plan for the site (under preparation) will be the main tool for the short- and long-term development of the area.

Accessibility of sites: All Cultural Heritage sites are easily accessible, itineraries and ICT guides are available.

Sustainability: The activities promoted by the Fondazione Aquileia and other regional institutions (e.g. in the framework of the CHERPLAN project, the FVG Region is developing the environmental plan adopted for cultural sites) are introducing a new approach to plan and manage historical centres. The recent project EXPO AUS - Extension of Potentiality of Adriatic UNESCO sites, approved under the IPA Adriatic
Programme, will make a compared analysis of the Management Plans of UNESCO sites in the Adriatic area to valorise the shared heritage.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

Aquileia is a typical Hit-and-Run tourism destination as resulted from the analysis carried out. Even if several initiatives aimed at improving the tourism attractions have been implemented, the site suffers under the strong competition in the region and the attractions offered by the neighbouring towns. Strategic planning, long-term funding schemes, defining limits and establishing assessment processes are important to manage the development.

Tourism cannot be the main source of income, but it is possible to create new value added by including the town into a cultural route or itinerary as already promoted by the project TECH-TOUR - *Technology and Tourism: augmented reality for the promotion of the Roman and Byzantine itineraries*.

Tourism in Aquileia could also be enhanced through tourism packages focused on integrated products such as enogastronomy, archaeology, photography, nature and education as well as by the organisation of annual or biannual cultural events using the archaeological ruins as background setting. More visitors could be attracted by promoting the site in the neighbouring towns.

It is important to establish funding mechanisms and partnerships which assure conservation and restoration of the heritage in the long term. Participatory processes with stakeholders’ involvement should support the creation of a specific tourism business focused on Cultural Heritage. Cultural Tourism would create new job opportunities and supplementary income for local people.

Aquileia will certainly remain a Hit-and-Run destination, since the tourism business is missing and the competition in the region is severe. Efforts to increase visitor experiences and tourism activities should be considered a contribution to the tourism offers in the region.
Governance and Tourism Business

The Law on Cultural Heritage approved in 2003 (and amended in 2006 and 2008) provides the most important legal framework for all the activities related to preserving, promoting and managing the Albanian national tangible and intangible heritage.

Major progress in the field of Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Tourism has been achieved in the framework of the MDG-F project “Culture and Heritage for Social and Economic Development” implemented by UNESCO and UNDP (2008 - 2011). The project has contributed to the amendment of the Law on Intangible Heritage, the government's strategy on culture, policies for the Archaeological Park System and the National History Museum, and risk mitigation plans for the two National Archaeological Parks of Antigonea and Apollonia. Four key policy documents have been developed and ideas have been shared on conservation and protection of cultural monuments. Visitor information and facilities have been improved, which includes the Cultural Heritage signage project in the historic centre of Gjirokastra and the publication of a series of map guides of Antigonea in Albanian language. A master’s programme in Cultural Resources Management has been established. Capacity building in the cultural diplomacy field has increased awareness of Albania's Cultural Heritage internationally.

The Management Plan of the Berat – Gjirokaster World Heritage site (currently under preparation) will provide the framework defining further actions related to the heritage site.

Tourism is considered one of the main pillars in the economic development of Berat. In the Strategic Plan for Social and Economic Development 2010 – 2020, tourism is defined a priority objective boosting job creation and small business development. The Municipality of Berat has therefore launched a Tourism Strategy and Action Plan 2011-2021 (TSAP), with technical assistance in the preparation from the SNV Netherlands Development Organisation. A Tourism Action Committee (TAC) with representatives from public institutions, business and civil society and chaired by the Mayor of Berat has been established in May 2010 to support this strategic planning process: “The TSAP will be the operational framework for our institution, leading tourism development in the region and aiming to maximize the sustainable use of our resources. This document defines projects and future actions we will undertake together to develop Berat into a high quality, well known, international tourist destination.”

The task of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, Youth and Sports (MTCYS) is to support, protect, develop and promote the tourism resources, culture, material and spiritual heritage of Albanian people in cooperation with other central governmental institutions, with local governments, with the tourism private sector and civil society. The National Agency of Tourism, a public entity under the jurisdiction of the Minister responsible for Tourism, takes on the marketing and promotional aspects of tourism, as well as other functions provided for in the Law, and stimulates, supports and facilitates the access to funds for individuals and companies engaging or that intend to engage in tourism activities. The Regional Tourism Assistance Offices (TAO), recently (2010) established in each of the 12 regions of Albania including Berat, provide tourist information.
concerning entry requirements, available services and facilities, sightseeing information on tourist attractions, etc. and handle also claims made by Albanian or foreign citizens against hoteliers, restaurant owners, tourist guides, travel agents, tour operators and other tourism enterprises in relation to the products and services offered.

Local government units, in compliance with the provisions of the Cultural Heritage Law, have the responsibility to:

a. make an inventory of the main tourism resources and of the local tourism businesses present on the local territory;

b. send the above-mentioned inventories periodically (twice a year) to the Minister responsible for Tourism, in order to create a national database;

c. provide technical assistance to support the creation and development of tourism businesses in compliance with the provisions of the law;

d. monitor that the tourism private sector respects all laws and regulations and suggest the necessary steps to be taken by the responsible state institutions.

A priority in the tourism planning will be the establishment of a tourism business focused on Cultural Heritage with all the required services and infrastructure.

In 2010, 50,000 international guests visited Berat and the 13 hotels and guesthouses, featuring 154 rooms with 318 beds, reached an occupancy rate of more than 60%. Several new guesthouses have recently been opened in the traditional Ottoman houses of the Mangalem and Gorica quarters. Berat has about 25 restaurants with both traditional and international cuisine, serving mainly local and organic food. A Tourist Information Centre and four tour operators started to promote and arrange visits and travels to Berat. Hospitality and ‘table’ taxes have been introduced in hotels and restaurants.

Fig. 22 – Overview of Mangalem quarter in Berat
To implement the vision and goals outlined in the TSAP, the Tourism Action Committee identified four key areas of action containing 21 objectives. The areas are interdependent and equally important:

- Product development and quality improvement
- Infrastructure and access
- Marketing and promotion
- Human resources and destination management

**Environmental Aspects**

The environmental statistics and services are still poorly developed, hence the Environmental Planning and Management process will give better insight into the present situation. The lack of proper infrastructure (water, electricity, fire systems) is the main problem hindering the development of the historic city centre. The water management is considered inadequate and the energy supply covers only the current needs. Tourism growth requires special efforts to assure sufficient water and energy supply also in the future. Berat has high potential to develop renewable energy which could be a solution for the future. The waste management is very traditional and the annual (?) waste generation increased from 19,000 tons in 2004 to 22,000 tons in 2012. The traffic produces noise and air pollution in the city centre and is still insufficiently organised. Main obstacles to reduce heavy and intense traffic in the inner city are lack of a ring road as well as public parking space and parking for caravans.

Seven public Wi-Fi access points and internet cafés as well as an optic fibre network allow access to ICT facilities.

The Tourism Plan 2011 – 2021 (TSAP) stipulates that the public and private sectors will provide the necessary infrastructure, such as roads, water and waste management, lighting and public transport as well as facilities, including museums, art galleries, gardens, sports venues and events, which all significantly contribute to both the life
quality of the local community and the experiences of the visitors. Attracting investment in key infrastructure is needed to achieve a ‘quality tourism’.

Socio-Cultural Environment

Berat hosts a number of festivals and events based on tradition and religion that represent the region’s intangible Cultural Heritage. Most events target the local population, but there is the opportunity to promote the existing activities and to develop new events for attracting visitors throughout the year.

The main problems regarding cultural attractions is the lack of maintenance or the damage to cultural/historical assets, the museums and churches being generally closed and the lack of designated tourist villages. Berat is well known for its hospitality and for its religious and cultural coexistence: on the city’s main square, an orthodox church, a mosque and a catholic church are placed in front of each other. Berat has a good education infrastructure, especially professional schools (e.g. art school). On the other hand, there is a lack of management skills and well-trained staff in local tourism businesses. People do not yet consider tourism employment as a career option (e.g. low salaries) and service standards are therefore not at the required level.

The TSAP defines three lines of action relating to society and culture:

“Product development and quality improvement: There is a need to improve the quality of existing tourism products and services diversifying, in the mid-long term, the product offer with the aim to develop Berat as a high quality tourism destination that contributes to the wellbeing of citizens. Improving existing products and services focuses on upgrades in the Historic Centre and its surroundings (buffer zone) and building on and improving products based on the culture and traditions. The development of new products and services aims to increase the variety of products available to tourists, attracting a broader market and encouraging visitors to stay longer in the region. New offers have to be based on an understanding of the tourism demand from target markets and the need to create conditions for a thriving and sustainable destination”.

“Targeted marketing and promotion: While tourism in Berat is growing, there is a need to develop a unique image that meets the needs of potential tourists. Berat needs to position itself well, based on the products that it has and the stage of development that it is in. In the short term, Berat will focus on raising its profile as a destination through participation in and hosting of special events and through targeting public relations. As the quality of products and services is improved, action will be taken to market Berat to target markets.”

“Developing human resources and coordinating tourism development: People are the tourism sector’s major asset. Quality interactions between visitors and their hosts are what visitors value and remember. Berat must ensure that it has a qualified workforce to meet the future growth of the industry. Managing that growth and the sustainable development of the sector is also important. Improving cooperation between the public and private sectors and developing skills to manage and coordinate the sector over the coming years will be key to driving sustainable development and delivering a world class experience to visitors.”
Key Success Factors

Significance: Berat together with Gjirokaster bear outstanding testimony to the diversity of urban societies and to various types of monuments (Mangalem and Leaden Mosques, Gorica Monastery) and vernacular urban housing during the Classical Ottoman period, in continuity with the various medieval cultures in the Balkans. The castle of Berat is a significant fortress built on the top of a rocky hill and contains several important churches and frescoes. Other significant Cultural and Natural Heritage are the outstanding collections of the National Onufri Iconographic Museum and the Ethnographic Museum and also the Canyons, Waterfalls and National Park in the surroundings.

Distinctiveness: The settlements constitute a unique mosaic of different cultures and religions and various historic periods in the Balkans, especially the Ottoman settlement bears exceptional witness to this spiritual and cultural diversity. Artisanal work and stone manufacturing are characteristic for the Berat region, as well as cultivation of figs and grapes and wine production.

Clustering: Other significant heritage sites in the surroundings include the Dimal Castel, the churches of St. Nicholas in Prondi and Santa Maria in Sinje, the Illyric ruins (Krotina, Margelic and Clos) and the archaeological sites of Gjirokaster and Appollonia. Vlora and the Adriatic coast are other nearby tourist destinations.

Brands/networks: The World Heritage site of Berat known as the “City of a Thousand Windows” is included in tourist itineraries of national and international tour operators.

Access: The sites can be reached from the international airport or Tirana within 2 - 3 hours by car or public transport. The road network is not yet adequately developed. Organised tours and itineraries are the best opportunity to visit the sites today.

Seasonality: The period from July to September is the main tourist season; the sites have high potential for year-round tourism.

Partnerships: UNESCO, the Network of Balkan Towns with Historic Centres, the European Association of Art Towns.

Strategic Planning: The Tourism Strategy Plan and the World Heritage site Management Plan will guide the further development of Berat. The Municipality is very committed to the development of the heritage site.

Accessibility of sites: Printed materials are available at the Tourist Information Centre (www.bashkia-berat.net).

Sustainability: The Tourism Strategy and Management Plans will define the future policy of Berat. The institutional foundations, the commitment of the municipality and the stakeholder involvement will guarantee the long-term development.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The key success factors show high potential for development of a Cultural Heritage destination in the Balkans based on strategies targeting quality and sustainability. Obviously there is a need for further efforts, especially for enhancing the access and
accessibility of the site and also for the creation of national and international partnerships for joint promotion of heritage sites.

Image and Promotion are important factors in the launching of Berat as an international tourism destination. The regional Tourism Assistance Office has been set up and the signage system has recently been standardized. The website of the Municipality and good quality restaurants contribute to the image of the site. On the other hand, night life is still missing but the frequent organisation of festivals and events is already providing positive inputs. Increased diversity in cultural life, ‘quality’ tourism packages and events could enhance the attractiveness of Berat as cultural tourism destination and foster also the media interest. The environmental aspects and the strategic planning need special consideration to assure adequate services for tourists and local people.

Tourism development planning (as stipulated in the TSAP) has laid the basis for progress towards sustainable tourism development and shall:

a. be based on the national inventory of tourism resources;
b. be in accordance with national and municipal tourism development plans;
c. focus on areas with a tourism development, capable of promoting socio-economic restructuring;
d. shall be periodically reviewed and revised to ensure compatibility with the national and municipal socio-economic development situation.

The direct involvement of the private, public and relevant NGO sectors in all local and regional areas in developing Albania’s tourism potential is a key factor for the success of the country’s tourism industry, as highlighted in the law on Cultural Heritage. There is an opportunity to promote existing activities and to develop new events for attracting visitors throughout the year.

Efforts to attract and promote investment in key infrastructure will be required to enhance the Natural and Cultural Heritage Tourism. The UN Organisations as well as national and international funds have given support to build up infrastructure and services for the sustainable development of Berat. In future, the international support will decrease and a long-term funding and fundraising strategy will have to be established. Public and private contributions will be needed to guarantee the restoration and maintenance of the heritage and tourism infrastructure. Berat is at the early stage of development and has the chance to adequately balance the needs of the Natural and Cultural Heritage, the local population and the tourism business.

Berat has a high potential to become a top eco- and cultural tourism destination in South East Europe. The jointly agreed strategy will help avoid the risk of hit-and-run or mass tourism.
The national Law on Protection of Cultural Heritage adopted in March 2004 identifies the types and categories of heritage assets to be protected and determines the legal measures/instruments required to protect the Cultural Heritage. In 2007 this Law was extended to include European Directives in the Cultural Heritage fields as well as several amendments. The Law is focused on tangible heritage and is coherent with the international conventions, but it does not take account of the 'dual heritage', i.e. heritage that has cultural as well as natural characteristics such as cultural landscapes, and the instruments for the protection of intangible heritage are not sufficiently included. The law designates the Ministry of Culture as legal body and the National Conservation Centre as institution responsible for the protection and conservation of the Cultural Heritage. Seven conservation centres share the responsibility at regional level.

At local level, the Programme for the Revitalization of the Old Bazaar in Skopje and the Management Plan for the Cultural and Natural Heritage of the Ohrid region were issued in 2010. A Management Plan for the Old Bazaar in Bitola, comprising also environmental aspects, will be developed in 2013 in the framework of the CHERPLAN project. The Municipality has already elaborated several strategic plans regarding vision and development of Bitola, among them Strategies for Rural Development 2008-2013 and for Tourism Development 2009-2014, as well as the 2005 Management Plan for the Pelister National Park.
According to a research promoted by the Municipality of Bitola in 2008, most of the tourists do not stay more than one day in town, but the last period registers an increase in overnight stays of about 8% a year. The survey conducted in the context of the 2009-2014 Tourism Strategy Plan shows that the tourist’s average daily spending amounts to €75 including the overnight. Individual tourists visit both the cultural site and the National Park, while groups visit only the cultural area. The Tourism Information Centre has been operating since 2006.

Table 6 - Tourism business in Bitola - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism Bitola 2012</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total accommodations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hotels/Rooms</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Para hotel</td>
<td>2 guest houses</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other BB, Private Rooms</td>
<td>Not existing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Camping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Arrivals*</td>
<td>21,318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overnights*</td>
<td>48,204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stay (days)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Day tourists</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Expenditures/day</td>
<td>€ 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Exp inclusive overnight</td>
<td>€ 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. National tourists*</td>
<td>11,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. International tourists*</td>
<td>9,961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipality of Bitola (Ex-Tourist Information Centre) and Survey conducted in the framework of the 2009-2014 Tourism Strategy Plan; * National statistics (2011)

Environmental Aspects

The Old Bazaar, built by the Ottomans around 1383, is a pedestrian area situated in the heart of Bitola and is the first place visited in town. The area features plenty of shops located in beautiful historic buildings in need of restoration. Here the CHERPLAN project has identified a building to be restored, using innovative techniques and adopting modern energy sources without damaging the beauty of the building.

The electrical network is efficient; the three thermoelectric power stations of REK Bitola produce nearly 80% of all electricity in the state. The public company ENV is responsible for the energy management in Bitola. Renewable energy sources are almost not used. A cable wire system guarantees ICT connections in the area.

Water and waste management are delegated to the public companies Vodovod and Komunalec. Water is drinkable and sufficiently available and a modern sewage system was built. Waste is collected every day ensuring a clean environment.

The road system is satisfactory. Internal connections by bus are quite good. A railway line connects Skopje to Bitola with local trains, halting at all stations. The M1 highway crosses the country from north to south spanning 165 kilometres and a regular international train connects the Republic of Macedonia to Greece in the South and Serbia in the North.
The town centre is a pedestrian area with several public parks. The neighbouring Pelister National Park offers opportunities to enjoy recreational activities such as picnicking, walking, biking, skiing etc.

**Socio-Cultural Environment**

Bitola has planned to set up a strategy for tourism promotion which should contribute to the establishment of new management methods for urban development and revitalization. Revitalization is considered a driver for local development and innovation, and should result in new economic, cultural, education and tourism activities. The strategy aims at enriching the cultural dimension as an essential element for creating a common cultural identity. The street in the town centre with representative buildings of the old city architecture is called Shirok Sokak, a pedestrian area with many shops, restaurants, theatres and galleries.

Bitola offers many cultural events on local, national and international scale. The most famous event is the Summer Festival Bitfest, other significant events include: the Day of Culture, the Bitola Opera, the International Youth Art Festival - Bitola Open City, the International Amateur Documentary Film Festival - Camera 300, the European Days of Cultural Heritage, the Festival of Monodrama, the International Film Festival Milton Manaki.

The municipality is doing its best to promote the site and has recently participated thanks to IPA funding in several EU projects, with the aim to improve its attractiveness and to enhance the management skills in the public sector. The lack of English speaking personnel is limiting the possibilities to promote more effectively the destination, the natural and cultural resources and the tourism products at international level.

**Key Success Factors**

*Significance:* The town has a very rich Cultural Heritage. The combination of different styles (Roman, Greek and Ottoman) makes this town very interesting and attractive. The St. Dimitri Church, the Sinagogue, the Aidar Kadi, Hadji Mahmud Beg and Ieni Mosques, the Turkish Bath, the Clock Tower, the Covered Bazaar and of course the Old Bazaar are the most remarkable monuments.

*Distinctiveness:* Bitola is also home to 13 consulates, which gives the city the nickname “the city of consuls”. The town has significant capacity in the textile and food industries. The Pelister National Park and Prespa lake constitute attractive destinations of Natural Heritage. The Ohrid and Prespa lakes belong to the oldest lakes in Europe and are well known for their geology and for the presence of more than 200 endemic species.

*Clustering:* Nearby attractions are the site of Heraclea Lyncestis at a distance of 4 km, the Pelister National Park at 15 km and the Calicica National Park with the Ohrid and Prespa lakes. The Ohrid lake is the deepest lake of the Balkans, on its shores stands the notable Orthodox Monastery of St. Naum.

*Brands/networks:* The municipality, the museums and other institutions are promoting the site across Europe through fairs, events and publications, establishing contacts with
local tourist operators and local authorities, exchanging information and publicizing Bitola as tourism destination.

Access: There are 2 airports: the main one in Skopje and one in Ohrid, the most popular tourist destination in the country. Bitola is located 180 km from Skopje, 170 km from the Skopje airport, 75 km from Ohrid and 15 km from the Greek border. Skopje can be reached with international bus transport or by local train.

Seasonality: The main tourist season is from May to October, with high potential for year-round tourism.

Partnerships: The town is twinned with 14 European cities and one town in Australia (Rockdail).

Strategic Planning: The Municipality of Bitola has elaborated a Tourism Development Strategy for the period 2009-2014, based on the following principles: sustainable tourism, profitability, selective investments, target marketing, public-private partnership.

Accessibility of sites: Tourists usually arrive by car or bus, while taxi is a common and cheap means of transportation in the city centre. There is no public transport such as metro or tram.

Sustainability: The Municipality of Bitola has already worked out a series of strategic plans for the development of Bitola. Currently it is preparing the Management Plan for the Old Bazaar based on the sustainable principles described in the CHERPLAN project and is also developing a marketing strategy in the framework of the CULTEMA project to increase Cultural Heritage investments in a sustainable way.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Bitola has already initiated a tourism development process focused on Natural and Cultural Heritage. The key success factors clearly show the high potential for development a top eco- and cultural tourism destination in the triangle with Greece and Albania, in an area of bio-geographic importance with the two oldest lakes in Europe, in addition to two national parks and with an extraordinary biodiversity. Bitola is the second town in the country and could profit from the proximity to this Natural Heritage.

Bitola is also rich in Cultural Heritage, historic monuments and cultural events. The restoration of the historic monuments could enhance the attractiveness of the city centre and highlight the significance of the place. An Environmental Planning, that introduces modern supply and management systems, that develops ICT infrastructure and implements energy-efficiency measures, including renewable energy, would contribute to the positive image of the site and create a first-hand opportunity to combine sustainable development with Natural and Cultural Heritage protection and conservation. A park and greenbelt plan that encompasses the historic and modern city architecture could be a supplementary asset in South East Europe and attract investments internationally.

Environmental services and funding schemes contributing to the long-term financing of the heritage protection and conservation should be established.
The public transportation system needs improvement, especially in the accessibility to the landscapes of unique beauty surrounding the Ohrid and Prespa lakes. A network of excellence that includes different types of accommodation and diverse shops selling local products could enrich the attractiveness of the surrounding area.

Bitola is very active in promoting a sustainable tourism based on Natural and Cultural Heritage, local products, intangible heritage and particular events. The summer tourist season could easily be extended to year-round tourism. Specific brands which underline the quality of local products and tourism infrastructure would further enhance the value added contributing to sustainable development. Bitola could also attract alternative travel modes such as trekking and cycling.

Bitola could be developed into the most important eco-cultural tourism centre in South East Europe with access to a rich Natural and Cultural Heritage.
CETINJE – MONTENEGRO

Governance and Tourism Business


With support from the British Council, Cetinje has elaborated a cultural tourism strategy focused on coast, culture and nature as the resources for sustainable tourism development. Furthermore, in view of the future nomination of Cetinje as World Heritage site, the Ministry of Culture has developed a Management Plan (2009) that includes a detailed Action Plan with objectives and responsibilities. This document will be integrated into the Environmental Planning approach elaborated by the CHERPLAN team. The Ministry of Culture has recently (2010) moved from Podgorica to Cetinje, thus giving a clear sign of its commitment to a future Cultural Capital City in Montenegro. The General Urban Plan and the Strategy Development Plan of the Capital (2012) provide the basis for the future development of Cetinje and will further foster the investment in culture and tourism in the old Montenegrin capital. Moreover, the initiative Beautiful Cetinje, a project dealing with the economic revitalization of the old capital in cooperation with UNDP and engaging public and private institutions, aims at establishing a Culture City guaranteeing a participatory process involving stakeholders and the public. The project is to be implemented between 2011- 2013 and its overall objectives can be outlined in the
following: “to regenerate urban environment and revalorize buildings of historical and cultural importance implementing energy efficiency measures”.

Today about 260 people (100 of which seasonal workers) are employed in the Tourism Business, another 300 are staff of the Ministry of Culture, while 100 persons belong to the Art Faculty. The Tourism Agency (TOPC) and the Tourism Information Center (TIC) coordinate the tourism activities and distribute promotional material and city maps. A picnickers’ tax co-finances the management and the maintenance of the two National Parks Lovcen and Skadar Lake, close to Cetinje.

Table 7 - Tourism business in Cetinje - 2012 (*2005, ** average 2005-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism CETINJE 2012</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels/Rooms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para hotel</td>
<td>1/5 Bungalow</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other BB,PR</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals*</td>
<td>7,588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnights**</td>
<td>41,975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay (days)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day tourists**</td>
<td>74,413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures/day</td>
<td>€ 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National tourists*</td>
<td>6,131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International tourists*</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Aspects

Despite the attractive green belt and the historic park system, as well as the architectural enhancement of the city centre through intensive restoration works of the historical buildings, the infrastructure and environmental services need some major improvements. The water supply system needs to be renewed and the EU will contribute 6 million Euro within 2014 for the construction of a wastewater treatment plant and a sewer network. The energy supply is considered satisfactory and the Law on Energy Efficiency has set saving targets of 9 % by 2018.

Cetinje can be reached by car and public bus. In the near future the Municipality is planning to build a new bus station to improve its accessibility and the interconnection with other towns.

A modern ICT network should be constructed to ensure all facilities the Ministry of Culture, the Academies and Tourism Business require. To date, only Internet Cafés and Wi-Fi bars guarantee public internet access.

The first component of the project “Beautiful Cetinje” addresses low carbon development through regeneration of the urban environment and revalorization of buildings of historical and cultural importance by implementing energy efficiency measures and making buildings and infrastructure environmentally friendly. “Good levels of energy efficiency will protect the sustainability of historic buildings, and ensure that present functions achieve affordable comfort. Reduction of energy inefficiency in these buildings
will be done without compromising their historic and architectural character. This will be done through balancing historic buildings’ character, retention of original fabric, energy conservation and the needs of modern living and functioning.” The main goal is to create benefit also for building owners, occupants and local community, e.g. lower operating costs, higher return of investment, higher capital value, lower environmental footprint, improved corporate image and higher attractiveness for further investments. The actions will foster green business and capacity building on green economy to enhance labour quality and job opportunities. Energy audits will assess the progress made in the field of energy efficiency as well as energy consumption.

Furthermore the green belt planning will increase attractiveness of the entire Capital City since the parks are part of the historic city centre. “Public space in Cetinje need to be more than safe and accessible, they also need to have meaning and significance for people...” Therefore the project’s main focus is the improvement of existing public spaces through reconstruction and revitalization projects.

Socio-Cultural Environment

The city’s architectural character, based on the preconditions and characteristics of the material culture of the society and the geographical area, embodies some particular features related to the autochthonous tradition in building the habitat. The city reflects the influences to which this region, in centuries of long battle for survival and recognition of its national and cultural identity, was continuously exposed between the East, the West and the Mediterranean. Unfortunately, in situations of serious economic and spiritual stagnation, especially between the two World Wars when the region was overwhelmed by the bureaucratic mentality of artificial taste, architectural works of false monumentality were created, which brought discord to the continuity of artistic and environmental values in the picturesque valley of Cetinje.

Cetinje’s rich architectural, historical, cultural, artistic, spiritual and environmental heritage represents a remarkable potential for the development of the town and its vast surroundings. The present potential of the town includes also science, educational and tourism resources; integrated promotion is necessary to make sound use of them. The synergy of the architectural heritage and the preserved natural and cultural landscape contains great potential for economic valorisation and integration in the modern way of life. Careful protection and enhancement of these assets must be a priority task. The wealth of books and documents, the numerous museum and gallery exhibitions, the large number of cultural institutions, including the Faculty of Art and Drama and the Music Academy, constitute the very significant potential of Cetinje in science and education. A very important project in this context is the construction of the University of Art Complex, which will provide the opportunity to set up new faculties and study programmes such as history of art, archaeology, ethnology, museology, librarianship, restoration, and set, stage and costume design. This initiative could bring expertise and job opportunities in professional fields that are essential for Cultural Heritage preservation and that are presently lacking.

The second and third component of the Beautiful Cetinje project are aimed at enhancing employment generation and encouraging green design ideas and innovation in an overall urban development. The professional skills will be enhanced through capacity building
and vocational training related to the revitalization of Cetinje. Furthermore the urban development should be characterized by new and innovative ideas.

The new socio-economic strategy of Cetinje gives special attention to young people and women and to new technologies which will certainly improve the hospitality and the quality of the tourism business. The initiatives from the Government, UNDP and private investors will boost employment and professional skills. The tourism infrastructure in Cetinje’s economy needs diversification and the quality of the services must be improved to offer modern facilities and adequate services to the tourists. The lack of hotels is a deterrent for overnight tourism. In addition, the event, business and congress tourism should open up new opportunities for the inhabitants, taking advantage of the Cultural Heritage assets and the related activities, and will certainly contribute to extend the tourism season. The tourism sector will presumably be the main pillar of Cetinje’s economy and therefore the mentioned requirements are certainly the most convincing incentives for the future development of the Royal Capital.

**Key Success Factors**

*Significance:* The history of Cetinje, the old Royal Capital of Montenegro, clearly illustrates the high cultural value and significance of the site which constitutes a heritage ensemble with a series of important protected monuments and a rich cultural life. Today Cetinje is the Cultural Capital of Montenegro.

*Distinctiveness:* Montenegro was the most important Kingdom in the Balkans and is therefore distinct from all other places in South East Europe. It is a country with a rich and diverse cultural heritage that combines a wide range of tangible and intangible creative work.

The architectural character of the city embodies some distinct features related to the autochthonous tradition in building the most primitive habitat of this hidden place and reflects the incessant influences to which this region was exposed.

*Clustering:* The nearby National Parks Lovcen and Skadar lake, the Crnojevic’ river and Lispka cave, as well as the neighbouring coastal area with Cultural Heritage sites such as Kotor (WH site), Budva, Sveti Stefan and Dubrovnik (WH site in Croatia) compose a very attractive natural and cultural landscape, that links a rich Cultural Heritage to mountains, lakes, rivers and seaside.

*Brands/networks:* Cetinje is included on the WH tentative list. The town is renowned for local products such as cheese, ham and honey. A special brand for local products could promote the area and increase the visibility of the local economy and resources.

*Access:* Cetinje is easy accessible by bus and car thanks to good connections with airports and main roads, nevertheless the public transport systems are still insufficient. Improving and diversifying public transportation could be an asset for cultural tourism.

*Seasonality:* The period from April to November is presently the main tourist season since the milder periods of the year facilitate visits to the cultural monuments and sites. Thanks to the favourable climate in summer, the quiet surroundings without much traffic
and noise, and the negligible distance from the coast and the Lovćen Mountain, there is a high potential for extension of the tourism period.

**Partnerships:** Public administration, academies, event organization and tourism business create a multi-actor network. The cooperation at national level and within the Balkans bears a high potential for synergies.

**Strategic Planning:** High level strategic planning and very progressive new laws provide a good framework for a target tourism development.

**Accessibility of sites:** All Cultural Heritage sites are easily accessible and itinerary guides are available. Hiking trails in the national parks are well signalized.

**Sustainability:** Nature protection (National Parks Lovcen and Skadar Lake) as well as conservation and restoration of Cultural Heritage go hand in hand and the architectural ensemble is restored contemporaneously with the single monuments. The sustainable development is assured by interlinking Cultural Governance with Education, Manufacturing and Tourism based on highly targeted legal instruments. Environmental assessment as well as monitoring of the achievements of the "Beautiful Cetinje" initiative will assure the concise strategic planning for the future.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

The key success factors illustrate the great potential of Cetinje to become a top sustainable tourism destination linked to Cultural Heritage and related activities. Montenegro has established the required legal and strategic framework for Cultural and Natural Heritage conservation and for sustainable tourism. Special efforts from public and private institutions are now needed to implement the established frameworks.

The consequent implementation of the planned measures and a clear focus on high quality tourism, as well as the creation of high standard tourism infrastructures and the development of professional tourism business will revitalize the royal capital. In order to avoid Hit-and-Run Tourism, the tourism business needs to achieve high standards and diversification that can satisfy the needs of different tourist groups.

The use of traditional crafts, techniques and materials in the restoration process of the architectural heritage could contribute to the preservation of values and authenticity in heritage, landscape and environment, that also benefits tourism. Training of skilled craftsmen, improved access to traditional materials and techniques, and production of local goods would contribute to a local economy focused on cultural tourism. A special brand for typical products and handicrafts could furthermore promote the area and increase the visibility of the local economy and resources.

Tourist packages that include not only Cetinje, but also the attractive surrounding area from the coast to the mountains would be an opportunity to foster overnight tourism in
Cetinje. Special attention has to be given to the public transportation so that individual and group tourists can access the places of cultural and natural interest.

In the last few years the efforts of Montenegro have been sustained by international institutions and UN Organizations. New fundraising strategies and modalities for the creation of revenue have to be established in order to be able to support the future development of the town. Besides investments from public and private institutions, contributions from the EU/IPA have to be envisaged. People with a specific preparation in EU project development and management have to be trained. An active involvement of local authorities and private companies in EU programmes has to be fostered in order to achieve the targets defined in the strategies.

Without doubt, the conditions in Cetinje are optimal to achieve the targets, and the implementation could even be enhanced through the active participation of the local population.
Governance and Tourism Business

At the national level, the Monument Protection Act (Denkmalschutzgesetz) defines regulations for the protection of movable and immovable Heritage within the country. The law was first adopted in 1923 and successively revised until the last modification in 2008. The law introduces the Austrian National Heritage Agency, which acts in the public interest for the protection of cultural goods in Austria. The Monument Protection Act stipulates general rules, sanctions and provisions. At the federal level, the Monument Protection Act is implemented by regional agencies of the Austrian National Heritage Agency, the so-called Landeskonservatorat. Hallstatt, depends on the Upper Austrian Landeskonservatorat, with around 50 immovable goods, ranging from Alpine huts to old cemeteries. Any alteration of these goods (e.g. building work) requires an authorization from the Austrian National Heritage Agency. This can be a source of conflict between public and private interests, especially in the case of private properties.

The Monument Protection Act deals exclusively with human-made Heritage. For Natural Heritage, other national law acts apply. Considering not only the specific environmental, but also infrastructural characteristics of Hallstatt, a number of other legal acts play a significant role, e.g. the Water Act, the Forestry Act and its by-law for torrent & avalanche control, the shipping act, the railway act and the Mining Act. Other legal framework e.g. on Occupational Health and Safety Standards and regulations on handicapped people represent a specific challenge for implementation in buildings at heritage sites such as Hallstatt.

The Upper Austrian Spatial Planning Act (1993), which compels the municipalities to elaborate a Land Use Plan, enables the participation (consultation) of citizens during the elaboration process. According to article 33 of the Upper Austrian Planning Act, the municipality has to inform the citizens about any planned update or control of the Land Use Plan from the beginning. Each citizen has the right to communicate, in written form, its interest to the Municipality. Later, and before its validation, the Land Use Plan must be exposed for public consultation at the Municipal Office for four weeks.
At the regional level, the REGIS association has brought together the main stakeholders of the Salzkammergut to debate on the status of the region and establish visions for its development. At the municipality level, citizens’ participation has been requested during the elaboration of the Land Uses Plan (consultation), which is considered as a key tool for the conservation of Cultural Heritage in Hallstatt. Founded in 1994, the association REGIS aims at defining objectives for the development of the Salzkammergut region as well as coordinating activities of regional stakeholders. REGIS also provides access and guidance to public funding for local projects contributing to the regional development objectives (http://www.regis.or.at/). Participation Process was a key aspect during the definition of regional development objectives for the period 2007-2013.

The Upper Austrian Tourism Act (1989), a very effective Upper Austrian Nature and Landscape Conservation Act (2001) and related regulations are defining the development and protection of the Dachstein/Salzkammergut area.

With the increasing tourism in the second half of the 19th century, guest houses, tourist accommodations, new shops and new professions were created. Tourist infrastructure, such as hiking trails and lakeside resorts were constructed and the arrangement of excursions, fireworks and parties at the lake should guarantee the tourists’ amusement. Tourism now plays a crucial role in the market development.

The tourist season lasts almost all year round: from December to April (Ski season) and from May to November (summer season). Four Tourism Information Centres and four tour operators offer services in Hallstatt. From the 41 hotels present in the larger area, 14 are situated in Hallstatt.
Fig. 26 - Arrivals Dachstein - Salzkammergut (average 2007 – 2011)

Fig. 27 - Overnights Dachstein – Salzkammergut (average 2007 – 2011)
Table 8 – Tourism Business in Hallstatt - 2012 (* calculation based on car and bus numbers and public transport, ** average 2005 – 2011, *** approximate numbers from Upper Austria 2011 in summer and winter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>units</th>
<th>beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total accommodations</td>
<td>5,814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels/Rooms</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallstatt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para hotel</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other BB, Private Rooms</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals**</td>
<td>163,678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnights***</td>
<td>556,631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay (days)**</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day tourists*</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures*** (s/w)</td>
<td>€ 57 / € 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp inclusive overnight*** (s/w)</td>
<td>€ 110 / € 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National tourists</td>
<td>46.6 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International tourists</td>
<td>53.4 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial contributions to the tourism promotion are linked to the overnights stays. The figures show clearly that Hallstatt has a similar number of arrivals as the neighbouring towns Bad Goisern and Obertraun. On the other hand, Hallstatt counts less overnight stays. The visitors of the three adjacent municipalities make also a stopover in Hallstatt, but without contributing to infrastructure maintenance, nature protection and restoration of the historic heritage. Hallstatt has more day-trip tourists and contributions are therefore very low. The lower number of overnight stays may be due to the difficult access to the hotels in the centre and the absence of 4-5 stars hotels with a high number of beds and recreational facilities, which limits the stopover of large tourist groups. The predominantly international visitors pay just a short visit to Hallstatt, which is reflected in the length of stay, an average of 1.9 nights only (Obertraun 3.3; Gosau 3.9; Bad Goisern 4.4). The expenditure figures (Tab. 8) for Upper Austria are based on interviews carried out in summer (on 1,400 tourists, from May through October 2011) and winter (on 955 tourists, from November 2011 through April 2012). The effective expenditure of day tourists may even be lower than the figures given in Tab. 8 since the respondents were mainly overnight tourists.
Environmental Aspects

Hallstatt is a complex cultural landscape in the Eastern Alps consisting of numerous lakes, mountain ranges and historic art treasures. Located on an alluvial cone formed by accumulation of mountain debris over time, the Hallstatt core area and its houses are squeezed between steep mountain slopes and the Hallstätter See (Lake of Hallstatt). This challenging location resulted in a dense vertical development of the structures. The rough climate, mountainous soil, settlement density, mining activities and related forestry caused the development of very small-scaled agriculture. Today still 121 Almen (alpine pastures) are exploited in the region and they represent therefore an important trace of the social, agricultural and settlement-specific development of the region. Together with very distinct local customs, the so-called Grüne Dächer (green roofs) of the Salzkammergut are an integral part of the Cultural Heritage.

The area offers a wide variety of geological phenomena, the karst massif contains impressive caves and still preserves its glaciation to date and constitutes as such a research site for alpine tectonics and micro-paleontology. The steep slopes of the ‘Salzkammergut’ and corresponding torrents, avalanches, rockfalls and diverse mountainous dynamics represent a risk for settlements and infrastructural facilities. Healthy forests providing a stable forest cover are vital for a sustainable protection of the exposed settlement areas (including its Cultural Heritage) and habitats.

For a long period Hallstatt was not connected to the modern traffic network of the region. The dominating means of transport were different kinds of boats and ships for both goods (mainly specified on the concerns for the salt industry) and passenger transport. With the completion of the ‘West Railway’ in 1858 and the ‘Salzkammergut Railway’ in 1877, the region of Salzkammergut was connected to the European Railway network. Today the town centre is free of traffic and can be reached only by shuttle bus from the parking spaces for cars and buses (paid parking) outside the village. Since tourists arrive mainly by bus and car, large parking space is needed. Hallstatt’s park management
registered in 2012 a total of 82,653 cars and 4817 buses between May and October. Calculations by the local authority estimated around 660,000 passengers arriving by car or buses and 140,000 by public transport in this period.

Environmental services (water systems, waste management and energy) are quite satisfactory for the need of the population. Water supply is managed by a Municipality Consortium which guarantees a good quality and quantity of water. The old water sewage system is expensive and not very efficient. Energy is supplied by geothermic and hydropower, solar panels are not foreseen in the near future, heating is predominantly with oil.

The management of tourist waste creates some problems, especially near the buses there is a lot of garbage. The small bins have to be emptied 2-3 times per day, and the differentiation is very difficult to manage. A modern ICT network is not yet established, therefore each apartment has its parabolic antenna, but they are coloured and thus not much visible. The Upper Austrian Spatial Planning Act clearly indicates the protection of the environment as priority and in specific cases the Municipalities have to carry out environmental assessment.

**Socio-Cultural Environment**

The region of Hallstatt is characterized by a long tradition of intensive interaction of humankind with nature. Human activities have had an impact on Hallstatt’s outstanding natural environment since pre-historical times. A long tradition of systematic management of the natural environment (mainly linked to salt mining activities) as well as the well-established support and appreciation of Cultural Heritage, as baseline for tourism, are of special relevance.

However, in the 1820s, tourism found its way to the region and stimulated new dynamics. A new potential pillar for Hallstatt’s economy and natural resource management started to be established. So far, the local forestry and agriculture, traffic infrastructure (passenger and goods transfer) and even the settlement structure had been almost exclusively oriented on salt mining. Now, regional assets other than ‘salt’ were identified - primarily by scientists, followed by other curious visitors. By the end of the 18th century more and more geologists visited and examined the Dachstein mountain area. In the beginning of the 19th century the area’s outstanding value for reconstructing pre-historic culture and cultivation was discovered. The first archaeological excavations were undertaken at the Salzberg Hochtal, the area of pre-historic salt mining activities and settlements (burial ground) located high above today’s settlement. More and more visitors were attracted and interested in learning about the early civilization of the Hallstatt Culture.

The scenic beauty of the landscape was also increasingly appreciated. The harmony and beauty of the Salzkammergut, first revealed in realistic landscape paintings, was discovered by painters and poets in the second half of the 19th century. Along the decades, the link between tourism and Cultural Heritage management was more and more formalized. In 1947-1950, Austria’s first regional planning concept dealt with the Salzkammergut defining the ‘beauty of the scenery’ a resource that had to be protected. The ‘cultural landscape’ should be developed as basic resource for the region, linking
landscape conservation, historical monument protection and spatial planning. Ever since, tourism has been considered vital for Hallstatt’s development and represents the second important source of ‘traditional knowledge’ for Cultural Heritage management. However, critics point out that the transformation of the region, from being an industrial hotspot to being a society based on the provision of tourist services, caused a suppression of the original heritage. Hence, the long tradition of technical and industrial know-how was increasingly replaced by a ‘constructed’ heritage – built up from fragments of traditional customs embedded in an exceptional natural landscape – and causing recently a new regional identity. In this context, the founding of Hallstatt’s technical college for wood sciences in 1873 should be mentioned. Education specialized in local aesthetical and technical know-how should be institutionalized thus not only strengthening local craftsmanship but also establishing a stable source for workers in craft-oriented industry. The school is still functioning today offering specialized programs in carpentry, sculpting, turnery and manufacturing of musical instruments.

The REGIS members further recognized that Cultural Heritage is and must remain a key characteristic of the region and therefore should be protected and fostered. Innovative uses of Cultural Heritage were highlighted as a chance to secure and enhance local economy, to improve the quality of life in the region and raise its attractiveness (in particular for young families).

Participation processes have been implemented in Hallstatt and in the Salzkammergut region for planning purposes including conservation of Cultural Heritage. However, even if Hallstatt’s citizens were given the opportunity to have their say in the update of the Land Use Plan in 2012, it seems that their participation was relatively limited (considering the number of participants in the public consultation). A possible explanation for this might be the limited leeway actually available in terms of development planning for Hallstatt due to the many restrictions imposed by the nature of the site (e.g. World Heritage site, limited space available).

The limitations provided in the national law on Cultural Heritage protection are so strict that the inhabitants prefer to move to the surrounding area.

**Key Success Factors**

*Significance:* Hallstatt is of global uniqueness for its natural features and beauty and for the archaeological heritage of the ‘Hallstatt Culture’ dating back 2,500 years. The cultural landscape of the Hallstatt-Dachstein/Salzkammergut region is a unique documentation of an epoch of history of human-nature interface and reflects the indivisible unity of nature and culture in both the landscape and the man-made monuments and sites.

*Distinctiveness:* Within the World Heritage site ‘Dachstein-Hallstatt/Salzkammergut’ every Municipality has its own field of attraction:

- Hallstatt: Salt
- Bad Goisern am Hallstaettersee: Handicraft products
- Gosau: Geology
- Obertraun: Caves
Clustering: There are many attractive places in the Hallstatt surroundings: Schafbergbahn, Eurotherme, Bad Ischl, Pre-Alpine lakes, Tauplitzalm, Saltmine, Postalm, etc.

Brands/networks: UNESCO World Heritage site, Natura 2000, WH award in the UNESCO region Dachstein-Hallstatt/Salzkammergut

Access: The Salzburg’s airport is located at 80 km distance. The site is reachable by railway, road and boat.

Seasonality: May-September and December-February are the main tourist seasons.

Partnerships: Twin City Hallstadt (Germany)

Strategic Planning: The national laws and regional acts regarding Planning, Tourism, Nature and Landscape Conservation and especially the Land Use Plan define the vision, strategy and targets of the site in a long term. Even though the Plan was decided after public consultations, a communication of the Ministry in June 2010 stated that the Austrian National Heritage Agency and the Hallstatt Municipality were to work in closer cooperation in order to draft a development plan for the World Cultural Heritage, including joint agreements on the protection of cultural properties.

Accessibility of sites: The site is reachable by car, bus and by boat. The mountain trails and heritage site attractions are well signalized.

Sustainability: The Environmental Management Plan elaborated within CHERPLAN is trying to find solutions to mitigate the conflicts involving tourism, conservation and development. The development plan for World Cultural Heritage should lay the basis for long-term approaches regarding the critical points of heritage conservation and development.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Hallstatt and the adjoining UNESCO World Heritage region are clearly top tourism destinations and the Hit-and-Run tourism has reached a critical level. As World Heritage site Hallstatt has clearly more restrictive regulations on the restoration and conservation of the historic buildings and the modernization of the houses which are certainly limiting the life quality of the inhabitants today. Furthermore, the financial burden on the Hallstatt population, due to the higher maintenance costs and the lower revenue from the overnight tax, may be considerably higher than in the neighbouring Municipalities. Another disadvantage is also the pedestrian centre; local people can hardly reach their houses by car since the road and parking space is very limited.

With improvements and centralization of the environmental and ICT services, a modern lifestyle with adequate communication tools could be facilitated. Agreements with tourism business regarding waste management could decrease the costs for the Municipalities.

Financial contributions to the tourism promotion are linked to the overnights stays. The visitors of the three neighbouring municipalities make also a stopover in Hallstatt, but without contributing to infrastructure maintenance, nature protection and restoration of the historic heritage. Tourists in Hallstatt are predominantly day-trippers and contributions are therefore very low.
The Hallstatt population consists of 800 inhabitants, which means that the amount of tourists is far above the Carrying Capacity. In average, around 450 arrivals are registered daily in the accommodations of the region and approximately 2,000 - 4,000 people visit Hallstatt each day during the main season. Possible solutions could be a better balance of the contributions from taxes among the Municipalities in the Dachstein-Salzkammergut area and the reduction of the burden for the resident people resulting from the stringent Culture Heritage conservation regulations.

During the summer period the car park management calculated around 7,000 cars and 800 buses per month. The small village cannot cope with the high number of cars and buses arriving every day with thousands of tourists causing negative impacts on environment and heritage. The Environmental Management Plan elaborated within CHERPLAN is trying to find solutions to mitigate these phenomena. The World Cultural Heritage development plan should lay the basis for long-term approaches regarding the critical points of heritage conservation and tourism development. Hallstatt has the opportunity to establish shared strategies within the Region among private and public partners for heritage conservation and sustainable development.
IDRIJA - SLOVENIA

Governance and Tourism Business

Slovenia has issued many laws, regulations and tools concerning the Cultural and Natural Heritage sector. Among them, most relevant at national level are: the Spatial Development Strategy of Slovenia (2004); the Environmental Protection Act (2004); the Spatial Planning Act (2008); the Cultural Heritage Protection Act (2008) and a Register of Immovable Cultural Heritage (2009). At national level, the following data base systems have been elaborated: the Digital Encyclopaedia of Natural and Cultural Heritage (2010) and the Spatial Portal to a Cadastral Central Database called PROSTOR.

The strategic focus on eco- and cultural tourism has been established by the Idrija Mercury Mine Act (2004) and the decree declaring the technical heritage in Idrija and its surroundings ‘cultural monuments of national importance’ (2001, amended in 2002, 2008 and 2009). Cultural and Natural Heritage are important building blocks of collective memory and contribute to the national identity. A unique Geographic Information System (GIS) Portal of the Municipality of Idrija has been published on line in 2007. For years, Idrija has been included in several national and international projects, national and international networks and various tourism development plans. Due to the gap between the limiting natural conditions and the flourishing economy, Idrija was selected as a test region in both the DIAMONT project (Alpine Space Interreg III B), which dealt with the developmental challenges of Alpine Municipalities, and the CAPACities project (European Territorial Cooperation Project), focusing on the attractiveness and competitiveness of small Alpine centres and their future development.

Fig. 29 - Entrance of the Mercury Mine in Idrija

To reach the requirements for a successful tourist destination, a minimum of recreational facilities should be provided and in town there is no cinema or theatre. Camping facilities
are not yet available, but are foreseen to be built in the near future. Instead, the city offers new fitness and climbing facilities, sport parks, cycling and jogging paths. Three public Wi-Fi access points have been installed at local cafes and an open public Wi-Fi network is planned. There is also a Tourism Information Centre and other 4-5 Info Points will be set up. A tourism website including all tourist services (reservations, booking of local guides, tickets purchase, etc.) is in progress.

Table 9 - Tourism business in Idrija - 2012 (*average 2005 – 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodations total</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotels/Rooms</td>
<td>3 /82</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para hotel</td>
<td>2 youth hostels</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other BB, Private Rooms</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Arrivals*            | 1,942 |
| Overnights*          | 6,571 |
| Stay (days)*         | 2.8   |
| Expenditures/day     | € 25  |
| Expenditures inclusive overnight | € 64  |

Environmental Aspects

The town of Idrija is located in western Slovenia. Its Municipality spans the upper basin of the Idrijca River and the mountains, representing a transition between the subalpine and karst regions. Most of the Municipality consists of leveled karst territory, cut by deep valleys and gorges into several small karst plateaus. The prevailing bedrock is carbonate (limestone and dolomite) with a wide variety of karst phenomena. The entire area is tectonically very active because of the Idrija Fault, which has caused many earthquakes. The presence of mercury ore is associated with this fault. Space for settlement is very limited, and is concentrated in the high-elevation karst plateaus and narrow river valleys, where all major settlements are located. The slopes above the river bottoms are too steep and prone to landslides. Due to its variegated relief, limited natural resources, and remote location, the Municipality is sparsely populated.

The town has become an important 'reference site' - from the scientific point of view - for its centenary experience regarding the diseases derived from mercury. All mitigation measures have been taken to eliminate the mercury pollution. Nowadays, the environment is quite clean and the local administration is doing its best to preserve the beauty of the surrounding natural area.

Two aspects of the natural conditions of the site might be a potential threat to the town’s long-term development and economy: lack of space and transportation difficulties since the town is cut off from major transport axes. The water and energy supply is considered sufficient for the current needs. Detailed plans for the renewal of the water supply and sewage systems, waste management and renewable energy are under preparation. The Operational Programme will improve and upgrade the existing wastewater treatment
plant to serve 9,000 inhabitants. The sewage system will be reconstructed and extended to include also the missing 8.5 kilometres in Idrija. The waste management is functioning well and the amount of waste is decreasing since 2008, to 4203 tons in 2010. Traffic is intense, and the air pollution may periodically be quite high due to the thermal inversion in the valley in winter. An optical fibre network guarantees ICT connections.

The town is surrounded by forest, mountains, rivers, parks that offer a wide choice for natural tourism. The site management plan will soon be finalized including all the relevant instruments for the future development. Idrija is part of the Geopark network with the aim of interconnecting local inhabitants to preserve nature and develop activities in rural areas, particularly tourism (geo-tourism as ‘niche tourism’) and to increase the incomes of the inhabitants.

**Socio-Cultural Environment**

Idrija is a small town in the peri-Alpine foothills of Slovenia with a mining tradition dating back many centuries. Its mercury mine was not only the second largest in the world, but also one of the most prominent Central European corporations. After the Second World War, the mine declined and was finally closed in 1990. After the collapse of communism and the breakup of Yugoslavia, Idrija restructured its economy quickly and smoothly, owing to its long industrial tradition. Idrija’s present-day development largely reflects the values and traditions shaped in previous centuries. Among these, creativity, the population’s openness and commitment to knowledge are to be emphasized, as well as solidarity, a special feature of the mining area. The town continually adapted to meet the needs of the mining industry and constituted an important production centre of the Habsburg monarchy as well as a significant centre of continuous scientific and technological innovation contributing to notable improvements in culture, healthcare, social services, and politics.

A Protestant primary school was opened in Idrija as early as 1581. In 1716, the people of Idrija demanded for the first time a high school. The first Slovenian intermediate secondary school was established in Idrija by 1901. Healthcare developed as a result of miners’ diseases, especially mercury poisoning and various lung diseases.

Until the 1970s the number of inhabitants increased constantly and then decreased rapidly. Since 1990 the population has been stable. Two-thirds of the entire population lives in the centres of Idrija and Spodnja Idrija. Investment and restructuring activities in the 1970s and 1980s enabled Idrija’s smooth transition into one of Slovenia’s most successful centres for electrical products. Attention must be drawn to the town’s delicate economic and social situation, which is connected with industrial monostructure and related significant economic risk.

Thanks to its production tradition, Idrija boasts elements of heritage and cultural tradition. Making lace by hand, Idrija’s best-known activity, was an additional (and important) source of income for mining families and has played a vital role in shaping identity. It is valued as a intangible cultural and ethnological treasure that must be preserved and at the same time developed and further improved through the creative knowledge of modern design. The Idrija Lace School, established in 1876, is a recognized and highly valued institution in professional circles. Continuing education and development in lace-
making techniques has become a significant factor in transmitting heritage and is therefore important to the fostering of regional identity. The Idrija Lace festival and numerous lace-making competitions promote the local culture, heritage and tradition and have become unique ethnographic, economic, cultural, educational and social events.

Tangible heritage is visible in Idrija at every step: in the technical equipment, the mining and industrial buildings, the characteristic houses, the castle rising above the town, bobbin lace and the ravioli-like culinary specialty known as žlikrofi. The economic success of the companies operating in Idrija is reflected in favourable social development because the inhabitants, despite Idrija’s unfavourable natural conditions, remain in the region. Thanks to its industry, Idrija is an important employment centre, offering job opportunities to both local residents and people from the neighbouring countryside.

The Municipality has made strong efforts to foster the service sector, especially tourism. The local economy is based on two large companies producing electrical appliances and employing the majority of the active population (69%). Probably for this reason the locals are not ready to assume an active role in tourism. There is the hope that thanks to the inclusion on the UNESCO World Heritage List the attitude of the inhabitants will change diversifying their activities.

**Key Success Factors**

**Significance:** The recent inclusion of the Idrija mines on the World Heritage List has concluded a long process promoted by the mayor and supported by the population. The history of the town is strictly connected to the mercury mines and for this reason the inclusion on the UNESCO List has a deep significance for the inhabitants.

**Distinctiveness:** The world’s second largest mercury mine and the production of laces which represent a long tradition are the most important distinctive factors of the area.

**Clustering:** Franja Partisan Hospital located at Dolenji Novaki (28 km from Idrija), Slovenija Partisan Printing shop located at Vojsko plateau and Emerald Trail which is a Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Soca river valley. Near Idrija, at Divje Babe, an approximately 43,100 year-old juvenile cave bear femur was discovered and is considered a prehistoric flute.

**Brands/networks:** The town has been very active in the last 10 years at national and international level. Idrija was included on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 2012 and selected as Alpine City in 2010 and EDEN destination in 2011. The city is member of the Geopark network.

**Access:** Idrija is located 58 km from Ljubljana, 59 km from the Joze Pucnik airport and around 25 km from the motorway Ljubljana-Postojna. The place can be reached only by public or private bus or car; the public transportation system is still rather poor and a railway is missing.

**Seasonality:** The main tourist season is from May to August; tourism in the rest of the year is constantly increasing and bears a high potential for more sustainability.
Partnerships: The town is part of the Association of Historical Cities of Slovenia. It has established several cooperation agreements with research institutions and other bodies at national and international level. Idrija has participated in several EU projects with the aim to develop and promote its territory.

Strategic Planning: The Tourism and Marketing Strategy 2009-2015 is being implemented and an Action Plan for the next few years is being upgraded. The Management Plan of the site will be elaborated within 2013, in association with the CHERPLAN project.

Accessibility of sites: signalization of the mines and the sites is very good.

Sustainability: The town has become an important ‘reference site’ - from the scientific point of view - for its centenary experience regarding the diseases caused by mercury. All mitigation measures have been taken to eliminate the mercury pollution. Nowadays the environment is quite clean and the local administration is doing its best to preserve the beauty of the surrounding natural area. The future action plans will be based on the WH Management Plan and include long-term measures to protect and promote Natural and Cultural Heritage.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Idrija has a high potential to develop niche tourism based on Natural and Cultural Heritage. The number of visitors is far below the Carrying Capacity and to date no negative impact from tourism has been registered. Nevertheless, the population presently does not show particular interest in tourism as today their main source of income lies in the electrical supply sector. On the other hand, they are proud to have their town on the UNESCO World Heritage List which could contribute to changing their minds.

To become a valid tourist destination the town needs investments and diversification in tourism infrastructures (hotels, camping, B&B, restaurants), recreational infrastructures (cinema, theatre, parks etc.) and public transport. The involvement of stakeholders and the public into the decision processes has already been established in the framework of several EU projects. Attracting further investment in tourism and events is needed in order to develop the tourist destination in a long-term perspective.

Enhancing the promotion of intangible and tangible heritage, a market for labelled local products and interesting cultural events could attract further target groups. Professional tourist operators must be trained and efforts should be made to promote the site abroad using modern ICT tools.

Fostering the Clustering key factor could further increase the visibility of the site, e.g. linking the nearby tourist attractions such as the Postojna caves, the Karst Biosphere Reserve with the Kocjaske Jame Regional Park and the World Heritage site of the Skocjan caves as well as the Ramsar wetland area, in a joint destination promotion. A thematic tour linking the ‘karst and underground’ heritage and the Geoparks in the Balkans could be a supplementary attraction for the whole region.
Governance and Tourism Business

The National Law 3028/2002 on the “Protection of Antiquities and Cultural Heritage in General” regulates all aspects of Cultural Heritage protection and management. The law specifically stipulates that the protection of archaeological and historic sites is considered at all levels of planning policies (spatial, regional and urban) and has to be included at all stages of development planning. The Law moreover defines that the archaeological evaluation precedes any other assessment. Greece employs a holistic approach in regulating spatial and town planning and protecting the natural and cultural environment. The conservation of the Cultural and Natural Heritage is not institutionally integrated, therefore strategies regarding sustainability in all governmental policies, as well as horizontal and vertical coordination among governmental agencies and with the local authorities, need to be improved. The participation of citizens and local populations in the decision-making process at all levels sets the framework for future policies of sustainable development.

The “Strategic Planning - Operational 3-year Programme for the Region of Western Greece 2012 – 2014” requested by the law for regulating new architecture development at local level (requested for 5 years as of 2015), consists of a description and evaluation of the present situation and the elaboration of a regional strategy identifying the priorities relevant to the regional development, such as environment, quality of life, economy and employment, social care, education, vocational training, lifelong learning, culture and sports.

SWOT analysis and vision statements regarding the identified priority fields are included for each municipality. The strategic planning for the Nafpaktia Municipality defines four priority areas. The first priority concerns the sustainability of the natural and urban environment...
environment, especially the protection of the natural and residential environment, networks - utilities - infrastructure - waste management, safety and civil protection. Relevant objectives in this context are sustainable use of the aquatic resources, promotion of the local architectural heritage, promotion of the castle city of Nafpaktos and raising environmental awareness among residents, particularly students.

Consortiums of several municipalities and local institutions have set up two agencies to support the development of the area, the Aitoliki Development Agency S.A. and the Aetolokarnania Development Agency.

Today a majority of 60% of the population is working in the tourism sector, primarily dealing with tourist activities and facilities in the coastal area. According to the Hellenic Statistics Agency, the number of tourist arrivals in Nafpaktos and Ano Chora - the rural zone mainly subject to day tourism - amounts to 49,240 with 98,643 overnight stays, 93.3 % are national guests and 6.7 % are foreign visitors. At present there are 681 tourists per kilometre while the carrying capacity has been set at a number of 2,000 people for each kilometre of coast. The urban and coastal area has reached a rate of 0.83 tourists for each local inhabitant, while the rural area counts 0.6 tourists per capita. Hence, the number of guests is much below the Carrying Capacity also during the main tourist season.

Table 10 -Tourism business in Nafpaktos – 2012 (*2011, ** 2009) The figures relate only to the city of Nafpaktos and Ano Chora (rural area) and not to the whole Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism NAFPAKTOS 2012</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total accommodations</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels/Rooms</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para hotel</td>
<td>1 Farm</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other BB,PR</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals **</td>
<td>49,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnights **</td>
<td>98,643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay (days)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day tourists*</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>€ 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp including overnight</td>
<td>€ 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National tourists**</td>
<td>93.3 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International tourists**</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Aspects

Natural resources such as the Evinos and Mornos rivers and mount Varasova are mostly located in the rural area and are protected mainly due to the low accessibility related to the narrow road network. The Messolonghi lagoon and the surrounding zones are particularly attractive to tourists appreciating natural resources.
The traffic situation has been much improved thanks to the construction of a bypass road and the related reduction of heavy traffic in the city. There is a lack of parking space and the narrow streets do not facilitate the simultaneous circulation of people and cars. Traffic reduction would certainly stimulate more intensive commercial activities and increase the attractiveness of the shopping mall in the town centre.

The water supplied from springs and artesian wells is still sufficient and is managed by a public company. The energy supply is assured by the national power grid, four hydroelectric units and thirteen wind generators. Also the solar panels on the roofs are an important contribution to the production of renewable energy, though in most cases aesthetically not satisfactory. Nafpaktos has its own biological waste treatment plant. Waste is collected twice a week according to a recycling programme and deposited in the solid waste disposal site.

The area is subject to seismic activity and risk of forest fires (in summer 2007 a large portion of the forest was destroyed), there is pollution of the marine ecosystem due to the stock farming and the industrial plant, illegal fishing and non-rational management of water resources.

**Socio-Cultural Environment**

In 1949 Nafpaktos was declared a tourist city by decree and in 1973 the Ministry of Culture designated Nafpaktos as a site of special historic value and natural beauty with a total of 185 historic monuments and buildings. The castle of Nafpaktos is the only one in Europe with five defensive fortified wall zones, starting from the port and ending on the top of the hill. Despite the devastations and damages, the castle is a historic reference site for the city and the most important and best preserved example of castle architecture in Greece. Better accessibility and signalization of the entire castle defence system could significantly improve the visitor flows.

The area has a great potential to increase the tourism but at present the infrastructures for alternative tourism are inadequate, the site suffers under the pressure from the surrounding area (especially from Patras), and there is scarce promotion of the castle city and other cultural attractions. Only a small number of tourists from the coastal zone visit the museums and the castle city due to insufficient promotion efforts.

**Key Success Factors**

*Significance:* The town is well known under its historical name Lepanto, which is connected to the famous battle. The Venetian castle overlooks the harbour reminding of its significant role in the past. Its well preserved walls are still equipped with cannons and provided with an operating water gate.

*Distinctiveness:* The combination of a coastal area with beaches and a rural area with villages within a short distance from the city offers tourists a variety of activities. In addition, the area includes also Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites.
Clustering: The neighbouring cultural sites such as Delphi-Olympia-Epidavros-Dodoni and natural landscapes as the Messolonghi lagoon and Evinos river contribute in attracting visitors to Nafpaktos.

Brands/networks: Nafpaktos cooperated - through the Aitoliki Development Agency - in the PROAGRITOUR project, by which the first transnational label in the field of alternative tourism was created (agritourism, rural tourism, restaurants and recreation units, production of organic and local products etc.). The PROAGRITOUR label has been registered at European level.

Access: The port of Patras, the main tourist entry point, is located at 24.6 km distance from Nafpaktos and the international airport of Athens at 220 km. There are five tourist harbours (Nafpaktos, Astakos, Vonitsa, Messolonghi, Patras), one ferry transport Rio-Antirrio – nowadays less used, having the famous Rio-Antirrio bridge connecting the town to the Peloponnese - and two public bus services (KTEL Aetolokarnanias and Fokidas). The recently constructed bypass road has significantly contributed to reducing the number of heavy trucks passing through the narrow streets of the town.

Seasonality: the main season is rather short, but the site has potential for year-round tourism.

Partnerships: The town is further supported in its development by the Aitoliki and Aetolokarnania Development Agencies composed of several municipalities and local institutions. The agencies actively participate in several EU projects promoting the area and its products.

Strategic Planning: The “Strategic Planning – Operational 3-year Programme” defines four priority axes of strategic planning, focused on:

- Environment, quality of life
- Social policy, health, education, culture and sport
- Economy and business
- Administration and finance

Accessibility of sites: Accessibility of sites could be improved by installing proper signs both for pedestrian paths and cars.

Sustainability: The “Strategic Planning - Operational 3-year Programme”, defining the development foreseen for 2012 – 2015, has been prepared by the Municipality of Nafpaktia in 2011. The next Programme will cover a 5-years period and define the strategic priorities regarding the local development. In the framework of the CHERPLAN project, the Greek CTI partner, with a major contribution of Region of Western Greece, has issued the Site Strategic Assessment Report, which includes a SWOT analysis.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Nafpaktos has a remarkable historic heritage combined with attractive natural heritage extending from the coast up to the mountains. Based on the key success factors, the town has the opportunity for developing a tourism destination based on Natural and Cultural Heritage, involving the surrounding attractions and the summer tourism along
the coast. The number of visitors is far below the Carrying Capacity and so far no negative impact from tourism has been reported. The low number of international guests is surprising. A targeted promotion of natural and cultural assets should attract tourists from abroad.

Strategic decisions regarding the development of sustainable tourism based on Natural and Cultural Heritage is needed. Such a strategy and action plan should enhance the promotion of natural and cultural assets, and improve accessibility and visibility of the castle and the defence system. The pilot study within CHERPLAN relates to the enhancement and accessibility of the core area of Nafpaktos castle and surroundings.

Environmental planning of the city could improve the attractiveness of the centre. There is a lack of parking space and the narrow streets do not facilitate the simultaneous circulation of people and cars. Traffic reduction would certainly foster more intensive commercial activities and increase the attractiveness of the shopping mall in the town centre.

The involvement of stakeholders and the public could accelerate the development of a sustainable tourism destination. The participation processes have not yet been adequately established. Instead, the cooperation between public authorities and private companies would attract further investments. Awareness of the population regarding the values of the area and the willingness to support the required changes could help achieve such a development.

The cluster of Natural and Cultural Heritage and protected sites should be actively promoted. Especially the proximity to the World Heritage site of Delphi and to the Ramsar wetland of the Messolonghi Lagoon can be included into the promotion of culture and eco-tourism.
9. CONCLUSIONS AND THE WAY FORWARD

9.1 Management Strategies for World Heritage Sites

The importance of tourism when dealing with CH sites has been duly acknowledged by UNESCO, which recently (UNESCO, 2011) embarked on developing (in collaboration with other international bodies – IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM, UNWTO) a new World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme, intended as follow-up and integration of the previous World Heritage Tourism Programme (2001). The aim is to create an international framework for the cooperative and coordinated achievement of shared and sustainable outcomes related to tourism at World Heritage properties. In addition to a number of overarching processes and policies with which it will be aligned, the new Programme has been enriched by an outreach to representatives from the main stakeholder groups including the tourism sector, national and local governments, site practitioners and local communities. The public launch of the Programme is anticipated to take place shortly.

UNESCO believes that, if undertaken responsibly, tourism can be a driver for preservation and conservation of cultural heritage and a vehicle for sustainable development. Sustainable tourism relies on the development and delivery of quality visitor experiences that do not degrade or damage any of the site's natural or cultural values and visitor attraction. Tourism should enhance the visitor's understanding and appreciation of all the heritage values through interpretation, presentation and visitor services. To achieve this sustainable and responsible tourism development and visitor management requires effective, cooperative commitment and coordination between site management and all relevant public agencies and private enterprises.

From what has been illustrated, it should ensue quite clearly that EPM provides a highly suitable framework to effectively tackle the complex issues related to tourism at CH sites, with a special view to enhancing sustainability. As a matter of fact, CH tourism requires careful planning and management, integrating into a holistic perspective the multiple factors – tangible and intangible, environmental and aesthetic, socio-economic and cultural, institutional and regulatory – which are liable to suffer adverse impacts from tourism and/or can have an influence on tourism development. When poorly managed and planned the risk of tourism development becoming unsustainable, up to self-exhaustion and decline, will almost invariably turn into certainty. The introduced CC and LAC methodologies, which represent valuable tools to aid site and tourism managers in planning and monitoring tourism development, will yield unreliable and incomplete results if not supported by accurate data coming from comprehensive assessments of the sites, including the “human systems” they host. Timing and continuity are crucial: if provisions are not made well in advance, it will be difficult to avoid damage or repair things afterwards; moreover, if continuous monitoring of the system is not carried out once tourism development has started, it will be hard to adjust things on the move. Such a comprehensive analysis and such a continuous assessment fit indeed perfectly into EPM's holistic framework.
9.2 Solutions for Impact Reduction

Management strategies affecting the level and nature of exploitation of a site and its physical and socio-economic environment seek to minimise or reduce the impact of visitors (WHC Reports 1, 2002). Factors or variables that can be affected or controlled include:

Reducing the number of visitors:

- restricting entry or closing an area;
- limiting group sizes;
- implementing a quota or permit system;
- increasing fees, or charging different entrance fees on certain days of the week;
- not providing facilities;
- limiting the permissible length of stay in the area.

Visitors’ behaviour can be changed through:

- education programmes teaching low-impact ways to visit a site;
- programmes teaching respect for a site’s resources and protection issues.

Site managers may encourage visitors to practice particular activities by:

- raising or lowering prices for certain types of visitors;
- restricting opening hours;
- offering or not offering infrastructure;
- prohibiting certain activities through regulation and enforcement;
- zoning the site for a particular activity.

A site’s physical environment can be made more resistant to impacts by:

- using infrastructure to “harden” a site, e.g., hardening a trail with a wooden boardwalk or installing permanent moorings at sea;
- relocating infrastructure to more resilient areas, e.g., moving a mountain refuge to an area less prone to erosion.

Actions for reducing conflicts between visitors include:

- zoning an area for compatible activities.

Options for reducing conflict between local people and tourists include:

- channelling economic benefits to local populations;
- incorporating socio-cultural values into the site’s management planning and development by increasing community participation.

Measures helping to avoid negative impact and to re-direct tourism start with a strategy shared among the stakeholders. All the measures may have advantages and disadvantages and their success depends on the cultural context, the participatory process, the targets set and the behaviour of the visitors. Changing visitor behaviour is not a simple process. Visitors must believe that a given issue is real and serious, that a
given action is necessary, and that they can make a difference. Capacity building of visitors, staff and inhabitants as well as clear and transparent communication will contribute to a successful change management. The expectations of occasional tourists should be satisfied, as well as those of local residents and repeat visitors.

Tourism’s potential for benefiting locals is a function of the existing resources and skills that can be used to generate income. The costs and benefits of infrastructure and high-tech solutions should be weighed against the goal of producing local benefits, since such services not infrequently use outside labour, are controlled by outside capital, and are intentionally located outside local communities. Identifying local skills will help determine which activities are feasible.

Concession fees charged to individuals or groups licensed to provide services to visitors can also generate revenues both for sites and local communities. Longer stays may raise revenue and still keep visitor numbers manageable. The availability of an array of visitor services can increase the average length of stay at a site. A base of operations such as a resort can have add-on attractions that tourists can visit within a day. Secondary attractions should offer visitors new experiences.

Suggested Course of Action

A summary of actions and recommendations to be undertaken when standards are not being met shall include:

• Analyse all indicators and related cause-and-effect factors, and determine why standards are not being met.

• If the impact is caused by tourists, identify the group(s) involved. Amass relevant information on the group and possibly open a dialogue with them with a view to determining management actions.

• Evaluate the effects of various indirect and direct methods on an impact, including local social, cultural and economic factors. If problems are not immediate, start with indirect actions and, upon evaluation of the effect of these and if staff and financial resources are adequate, move progressively to direct strategies.

• Estimate the costs of different actions, taking into consideration staffing needs, and determine whether some actions can be combined.

• Discuss with staff and advisory board the scenarios that would result from the different actions, taking into account the site’s goals and objectives.

• Attempt to create partnership agreements and involve stakeholders in both planning and carrying out management actions.

• Extend dialogue to those who may be affected to demonstrate the needs of the site and explain why certain actions are necessary and how they will be implemented.

• Make provisions to ensure continuous monitoring of the site conditions and, particularly, of the effects of the actions taken.
10. RECOMMENDATIONS

The tools and knowledge regarding targeting, planning and implementing sustainable tourism are well known and established. Venice and Dubrovnik, two top destinations in the Mediterranean, show - in spite of their success - the need for clarifying the targets and limits and for defining the funding and resources required for sustainable solutions in the fields of heritage conservation and development. A clear idea about the future of their tourism and intelligent and shared decisions will help to reduce negative impacts and to create a successful tourism development in the long term. The examples analysed show that there are basic factors in the planning strategy that facilitate the successful implementation of sustainable tourism:

**Clear orientation:** Clarifying the strategic orientation and a sound communication with all people involved is basic. Governments at local, regional and national levels have to take decisions regarding targets, limits, and funding. Strategies must be based on real data collected at national, regional and local level.

**Attractiveness:** Focusing the marketing on significance, distinctiveness and attractive clustering can enhance interest of international tourism. All CHERPLAN sites have attractive alternative recreation opportunities. Improvement of accessibility of recreation facilities will increase attractiveness of the sites for overnight tourists. Attractiveness of a site needs to include Cultural and Natural Heritage, recreation facilities and tourism business in order to convince visitors to stay a few days and not to “hit and run”.

**Realistic planning:** Today, tourism is at a critical point, with increased hazard risks and unforeseen political and economic changes. It is important to face the challenge of changes; therefore risks and threats (e.g. climate change, sea level rise) have to be key factors in tourism strategies. Environmental planning at a very early phase will help avoid new obstacles to the development of a tourism destination.

**Measurable development:** Quantitative goals and indicators have to be collected at an early stage in order to accurately observe dimensions and development of tourism. The data collection should be in line with international statistical standards. The relevant statistics and indicators have to be transparent and permanently available and need to be collected at different territorial scales. The data should be used in decision making and in establishing regulations. Therefore it is important to define the monitoring tools in order to plan, manage and assess tourism and its impact continuously, especially in connection with Cultural and Natural Heritage sites.

**Accepted strategy:** A strategy that includes regulations for Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and/or Carrying Capacity (CC) should be developed together with all stakeholders. Participatory processes and stakeholder involvement in decision taking will result in long-term and continuous development. The exchange of good practises and the permanent transfer of knowledge based on quantified data within and among sites will increase the credibility of the strategy. The corporate identity of authorities, people and stakeholders will facilitate the implementation of a sustainable tourism strategy.
**Fair benefit distribution:** It is important to acknowledge the burden of local people living in Cultural Heritage sites; if needed, the loss of lifestyle for being ‘Cultural Heritage’ should be compensated. Revenues among concerned Municipalities should be balanced. Day tourists should also contribute to the maintenance of Cultural and Natural Heritage, preferably in the same amount as overnight tourists (tourism tax). The introduction of tourism taxes has to be transparent and funds should be spent adequately for the maintenance of heritage at local level, contributing to the creation of added value within the site area.

**Efficient promotion:** Establishing targeted partnerships within the site area and also at national and international level can contribute to obtain the desired visibility and to build up the image of the destination. Furthermore, the social networks and IT tools are modern instruments supporting the development of a destination effectively and efficiently.

The destinations involved in the EU CHERPLAN project have all the requisites to rank among sustainable tourism destinations. The driving factors are the attractive Cultural and Natural Heritage; nevertheless, most of them suffer from insufficient development due to lack of infrastructure, missing recognition, remote situation in marginal and less developed and accessible areas and instable political situation. But they have interesting potential for sustainable growth and offer good economic opportunities for stakeholders.

The sites discussed in this report can be divided into two groups as regards their tourism development:

### 10.1 Hit and Run Sites

The sites already facing Hit and Run Tourism need to elaborate strategies to manage tourism and define limits or to find solutions in order to avoid further negative impacts. Venice, the Old City of Dubrovnik and Hallstatt are World Heritage sites which clearly face the problems of Hit and Run Tourism and exceed extremely the Carrying Capacity. Aquileia instead can be seen as an archaeological park with a typical Hit and Run tourism. The site has not reached its limits and the number of visitors is much lower than the Carrying Capacity.

**Venice:** The entire historical centre is suffering from Hit-and-Run Tourism. There are no limitations and very few regulations have been introduced. A concise and shared strategy is urgently needed, balancing conservation and development of the city and its lagoon as well as the needs of residents and visitors. The future challenges, such as the climate change and sea level rise and the socio-economic transformation of the city, the lagoon and the surrounding area have to be taken seriously into account. The WH management plan will hopefully come up with clear analyses and targets in order to improve the focus for the future development. In a clear governance structure the competences and responsibilities have to be clarified. Furthermore, a strong and committed leadership, broadly supported by the stakeholders should immediately start implementing the strategy.

The Venice Management Authority is committed to improving the residential values in order to keep the autochthonous population in Venice (and to) preserve the quality of life for residents and facilitate enterprises (Venice Municipality, 2012). Measures to facilitate the inhabitants and to limit tourism will be needed. Sustainable tourism is one of the
aims of the Management Plan, but it is certainly questionable whether such an aim is realistic with regard to the interests of tourism business today. Furthermore the major challenges of climate change impact (due to sea level rise and changes in the Lagoon ecosystem – UNESCO Venice Office 2011 a, b) and socio-economic development, which will be crucial for the future of Venice, have not yet been adequately addressed in the draft Management Plan.

Dubrovnik: Only the city centre is hit by mass tourism, clearly exceeding the Carrying Capacity, whereas the limits have not yet been achieved when considering the entire city territory. The introduction of long-term funding for Cultural Heritage management assures the restoration and conservation of the Cultural Heritage. A new strategy targeted towards sustainable tourism could be a benchmark for the Region and lay the basis for a long-term development of the entire County. Such a strategy should clarify whether the historic centre should remain a living city with autochthonous population or become a city museum.

Hallstatt: The local authorities consider to be a WH site a burden. Hit and Run tourism and mass tourism on a small spot with only 800 resident people is in fact a very challenging situation. Furthermore the restrictions as a consequence of a very consequent culture policy are a burden for the local people without having adequate revenues. Clarifying the costs and benefits for local people could solve some conflicts. The creation of new opportunities to improve life style and economic situation could result in more acceptance in the local population. Funding schemes with a more coherent and balanced tax system could lead to a more sustainable tourism.

Aquileia: The site can be seen as an archaeological park with Hit and Run Tourism but without achieving Carrying Capacity. Most tourists remain maximum 2 hours. There are very little revenues for the local people and economy. Fortunately the place is not endangered by mass tourism. The realization of an archaeological park system could help to protect the cultural heritage and to manage the site and the tourist flow. With a transparent entrance fee system the funding of restoration and maintenance could be assured and new job opportunities and income for local people could be generated.

10.2 Tourism Development Sites

Several CHERPLAN pilot sites - Nafpaktos, Berat, Bitola and Idrija - are not affected by Hit-and-Run Tourism, but present instead excellent opportunities for development of sustainable tourism destinations based on Natural and Cultural Heritage. These sites intend to foster Heritage-based Tourism, improve their tourism business and promote the attractiveness of their heritage sites. Governance and legal frameworks are well established and tourism and development planning is already well advanced. They still have the possibility to prevent negative impact through well-targeted regulations. A detailed environmental planning and the realization of a modern infrastructure will help in developing a sustainable tourism destination at these sites.

Nowadays in a lot of heritage sites in South East Europe tourism business and infrastructure are not adequately developed, while the environment and socio-cultural contexts do not receive the needed consideration. Under such circumstances, sustainable tourism could be successfully developed, contributing to the protection and
conservation of the heritage sites, but also generating income and benefit for local people as well as for tourism professionals. Careful planning and effective participation focusing on business, product and process innovation can be considered as valuable tools for sustainable development of the CH sites selected for the application of CHERPLAN-promoted integrated planning approaches.

Achieving a win-win-win situation through conservation of heritage and creating benefit for local people can be considered as the uppermost impact of sustainable tourism strategies.
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