

The Implications of World Heritage Status for Planning and Managing Tourism in the Wadden Sea

Research report by EUROPARC Consulting,
December 2011



EUROPARC
CONSULTING

The Interreg IVB
North Sea Region
Programme



*Investing in the future by working together
for a sustainable and competitive region*

European Union



The European Regional Development Fund

PROWAD

PROTECT & PROSPER
SUSTAINABLE TOURISM
IN THE WADDEN SEA



WADDEN SEA
WORLD HERITAGE

www.prowad.org

The Implications of World Heritage Status for Planning and Managing Tourism in the Wadden Sea

Research report by EUROPARC Consulting, December 2011

Objective

The purpose of this report is for members of the Task Group –Sustainable Tourism Strategy Project to consider the implications of the World Heritage status of the Wadden Sea, and how this should influence the sustainable tourism strategy.

Contents:

Section 1: Introduction to the advisory work undertaken by the World Heritage Committee and its Advisory Bodies on tourism in World Heritage sites.

Section 2: Examination of the significance of World Heritage status for the planning and management of tourism, based on a review of best practice and current experience from other World Heritage sites.

Annexed: Four sets of guiding principles for tourism in World Heritage sites

Annexe 1: Policy orientations: defining the relationship between World Heritage and tourism

Annexe 2: Proposed Principles for Sustainable Tourism at World Heritage Properties (from Borges et al, 2011)

Annexe 3: Principles of the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas, EUROPARC Federation

Annexe 4: Principles of the Cultural Tourism Charter (ICOMOS 1999)

Section 1: Advice from the World Heritage Committee, IUCN and ICOMOS

The development of the sustainable tourism strategy for the Wadden Sea needs to take account of guidance from the World Heritage Committee, which is responsible for the ongoing implementation of the World Heritage Convention. The Committee has undertaken a programme of work in the field of tourism whose main activities and outputs are summarised below. In addition, IUCN (the advisor to the World Heritage Committee on natural properties) has developed guidance on tourism in natural World Heritage sites. Some guidance from ICOMOS (which advises the World Heritage Committee on cultural properties) is also relevant. Together, this guidance may be considered as the formal World Heritage advice that the managers of the Wadden Sea World Heritage site should have regard to.

The World Heritage Committee

The Committee has addressed the issue of tourism in World Heritage sites over many years. In the past century, it was mostly in response to problems of inappropriate tourism development in individual World Heritage sites. However, in more recent years the Committee has recognised tourism as a generic issue affecting many World Heritage sites and has developed a proactive programme of work in this field.

Thus in 2001 it formally adopted a World Heritage Tourism Programme with activities at the regional level designed to identify lessons that could be used in World Heritage site management. This programme addressed issues such as the planning process, training community members in tourism management, helping communities to market goods and services to tourists, raising public awareness, using tourism-generated funds for site finance and sharing lessons learnt between sites (WHC-01/CONF.208.24)¹. An early output was manual for site managers (Pedersen, 2002).

The initial activities of the programme were reviewed leading in 2006 to a more focussed Tourism Programme for World Heritage, with four main themes:

- Strengthening the capacity of World Heritage regional desks
- Increasing the capacity of World Heritage site managers to manage tourism
- Promoting alternative livelihoods for local communities
- Engaging the tourism industry to increase conservation benefits (WHC-06/30.COM.12).

In the following year, a World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Initiative was launched by the Programme to accelerate implementation in the above four areas. This

¹ This and similar references in this section are to World Heritage Committee documents, available on-line from UNESCO.

initiative had the support of other international bodies, including the World Tourism Organisation and funding agencies like the World Bank. A number of regional meetings that have taken place under the auspices of this initiative, including one on tourism in World Heritage sites in the Nordic-Baltic region in October 2010, held at Visby, Gotland, which was attended by Denmark.

In 2010, the World Heritage Committee took note of the outcome of an international workshop held in China on Advancing Sustainable Tourism at Natural and Cultural World Heritage sites, and adopted the “policy orientation which defines the relationship between World Heritage and sustainable tourism” (WHC-09/33.COM/5A - see **Annexe 1**). It also decided to replace the existing programme with a more inclusive one to be developed in its place, which would be open to engagement by the tourist industry. At its most recent meeting in Paris in June 2011, the World Heritage Committee asked the World Heritage Centre to transmit to State Parties a draft of this new World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme (Decision WHC-35COM 5F). This will be addressed through an expert meeting held in October 2011 in Switzerland.

IUCN – the International Union for Conservation of Nature

IUCN has engaged with issues of tourism in protected areas as a whole for a number of years. For example, through its World Commission on Protected Areas, it produced best practice guidelines on this subject (Eagles et al, 2002). As the adviser to the World Heritage Committee on the natural side of the Convention, it has also developed specific advice on tourism in Natural World Heritage sites, most recently in *Sustainable Tourism and natural World Heritage – Priorities for action* (Borges et al, 2011). This report is a key one in understanding issues of tourism in natural World Heritage sites: its findings are drawn on at various places in the second section of this report, and it includes a set of ten principles on tourism in World Heritage sites (see **Annex 2**) that should be compared with those in the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas (see **Annex 3**).

ICOMOS – The International Council for Monuments and Sites

Although the Wadden Sea is inscribed as a natural site under criteria (viii), (ix) and (x), the advice of ICOMOS on the management of cultural sites could also be relevant, as many of the issues of tourism management in sensitive environments are the same in both natural and cultural properties. In 1999 it adopted an International Cultural Tourism Charter, including a set of principles (see **Annex 4**). ICOMOS published a further set of “Guiding Principles and Policies for World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism” (Brooks, 2008). This identifies four current developments in thinking about tourism in World Heritage sites that seem relevant to places like the Wadden Sea:

- Both the tourism and conservation sectors increasingly see regard heritage sites as assets to be protected and conserved to meet both their respective objectives.
- Tourism that simply exploits heritage sites is being replaced by tourism that is an active contributor to the conservation - from “carrying capacity” to “caring capacity”.
- The private tourism sector now sees the value of joint engagement with public policy to provide infrastructure for both local communities and tourism demand.
- Since heritage sites cannot be managed only within their boundaries, management must consider buffer zones, broader social, cultural, political and economic considerations and the tourism supply chain.

Conclusions

- The World Heritage Committee sees its programme of work on tourism in World Heritage sites as an important, on-going area of work. Managers of World Heritage sites, such as the Wadden Sea, should be aware of this programme, alive to the advice and training opportunities that it offers, and indeed ready to participate in relevant activities and contribute their own experience.
- The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have each produced a set of principles on tourism in sensitive sites (see Annexes 1, 2 and 3) which have a lot in common with the principles in the Sustainable Tourism Charter. Managers of World Heritage sites, such as the Wadden Sea, should be guided by these principles.
- The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have also produced guidelines and case studies on tourism in World Heritage sites, which should be used in the management of the Wadden Sea.

Section 2: The Significance of World Heritage Status for Tourism Planning and Management

Introduction

Before examining the issue of tourism specifically, and so as to put tourism into its context, it is important to understand why countries nominate places as World Heritage sites. Research commissioned by the Lake District World Heritage Project (Rebanks 2009 and 2009a) into the economic impacts of World Heritage Status around the world (including six detailed case studies) found four broad reasons for doing so:

- As a 'celebration' or reward for an area's outstanding qualities
- As an 'SOS' to encourage emergency action for a heritage site at risk
- As a marketing or quality logo or brand, particularly in respect of tourism
- As a catalyst for 'place making', to encourage socio-economic progress (Rebanks Consulting, 2009)

This distinction is helpful but many countries nominate sites for several of these reasons; others may begin with one purpose in mind and then begin to pursue others. Also the reasons are not self contained: for example the celebration of a place through World Heritage status often requires action to protect its Outstanding Universal Value; and building a sense of place among the community will often create a more attractive World Heritage site for tourists to visit. While, the Lake District study showed that heritage protection was the primary motive in most World Heritage sites, the socio-economic reasons for nominating sites were becoming of growing interest in many countries. In the most successful sites, action taken in pursuit of each of these four reasons helps to achieve other ends too. In summary: "World Heritage status is a catalyst for more effective conservation, partnerships, civic pride, social capital, learning and education and for securing additional funding and investment" (UK National Committee for UNESCO, 2010).

So the development of sustainable tourism in the Wadden Sea is not only an important objective in its own right, it should also help to celebrate and protect the heritage assets, and build stronger support among local people and visitors for World Heritage purposes. Also, tourism is only one aspect of economic activity that is affected by World Heritage status, and it can only be sustainable if it takes account of other economic, social and, above all, environmental considerations. The development of a sustainable tourism strategy for the Wadden Sea therefore cannot be a stand-alone exercise: it has to be complemented by other plans for sustainability in the area and derived from the aims of the Management Plan.

This rest of this section poses questions about the implications for tourism planning and management of World Heritage status, refers to the available evidence and then seeks to answer these questions in turn.

Question 1: How does World Heritage status affect an area's global profile, and thus create new opportunities for tourism marketing?

World Heritage designation means belonging to a “globally recognised top tier of heritage sites” (Brand and Wollesen, 2009). There is therefore a reasonable expectation that World Heritage designation will help to raise the profile of World Heritage sites, encourage investment and in particular help promote tourism, e.g. “The designation of the Wadden Sea area as a World Heritage would surely present new chances for marketing, since this decision would bring with it a number of new platforms in the global competition. This would have positive consequences for the economics of the region and should therefore be considered in future marketing strategies” (ibid).

However, a study of six UK World Heritage sites undertaken for the UK Government in 2007 found as follows: “World Heritage status is suggested to provide a promotional advantage and a ‘branding effect’ which can encourage additional visitors. However, the evidence indicates that this is likely to have a very marginal effect (c.0-3%) and this will be stronger for less ‘famous’ sites” (PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, 2007). Also: “our research shows that the impact WHS status makes on visitor motivations is usually very marginal and there is little evidence that becoming a WHS automatically generates additional visitors” (ibid, pp.84).

This conclusion may seem surprising. However, in reviewing the above report a few years later, the authors of a study prepared for the Lake District Project looked critically at the information and drew a rather different conclusion: “World Heritage status achieves little automatically, and therefore many (sites) have few benefits to show for it, but some ... that have tried to achieve benefits appear to have used World Heritage designation with value” (Rebanks Consulting, 2009). In other words, World Heritage status as such does not automatically attract tourists, but it can be used as a brand marketing tool which, by implication at any rate, promises a well-managed tourist destination where nature and culture will be protected. Where this has been done, World Heritage designation has often been followed by marked increases in visitor numbers.

It is though probably true that World Heritage status does less to encourage visitors to go to well known and well established destinations. But many World Heritage sites are not well known (at least internationally), and there are numerous examples of how World Heritage status has been used to help raise awareness among potential tourists of the existence of an area, and of the important heritage assets that visitors can see.

The report prepared for Lake District Project cited above gives the following (and other) examples of how World Heritage status is being successfully used to promote sustainable tourism:

Bordeaux, France: “Right from the first internet click (<http://www.bordeaux-tourisme.com>) the potential visitor to Bordeaux is left in no doubt that this destination is a World Heritage Site, and that this is a badge that shows it to be a place that offers a rich cultural, social, economic and historic experience for visitors, investors and residents”.

Cinque Terre, Italy: “Travel journalists from around the world visited Cinque Terre in the 1980s and penned articles urging everyone to visit quickly before its impending disappearance. But this hasn’t happened, and UNESCO/WH status has played a prominent role in the process that prevented it from happening”.

Bamberg, Germany: “Impressively, the city has grown its visitor numbers from 255,000 in 1993 to c.400,000 in 2008 —a growth rate of 64% since UNESCO/WH inscription” (ibid.)

Even among the UK examples looked at in the PricewaterhouseCoopers study there are two where significant tourism growth is reported following World Heritage designation: the Dorset and East Devon (Jurassic) Coast, and Blaenavon Industrial Landscape.

Within and beyond Europe there is growing evidence that wealthy international tourists are using the World Heritage brand as a promise that a quality experience can be found. For thousands of would-be eco-tourists, World Heritage status is becoming a sign that they will find what they are looking for. National tourism agencies respond to this by promoting the World Heritage sites within their tourist literature in order to attract visitors. Many private companies do this too, for example:

- The Landmark Trust, which has properties in the UK, Italy France and the USA, and provides up-market self-catering holidays in high value heritage buildings, identifies the proximity of a World Heritage site as a selling point in its advertising,
- Viking River Cruises, which runs luxury holiday cruises on European rivers, makes a point of highlighting World Heritage sites that their boats pass by.

Looking well to the future, World Heritage status also could open up long term options for a different kind of tourism. Tourism at present means travelling to the place to enjoy it, but in future maybe there will be more “virtual tourism”, in which it is possible to have a relationship, even an economic one, with a distant place without actually visiting it. The environmental benefits of that are obvious in reduced long haul travel. “Imagine a high quality app. for smart phones with which you could download information on World Heritage sites that helped potential traveller with logistics such as travel and accommodation and which also linked up to micro-finance web sites that would let you support grass roots businesses at the site” (Rebanks, 2011): in effect, creating a global community of people who care about

World Heritage sites but may not always feel it necessary to visit them in order to express that support.

Answer to Question 1: World Heritage status - as such - does not significantly affect tourist numbers, especially if the site is already well known, but:

- *it can be used as a 'brand' to market destinations to discriminating tourists who seek places of high natural and cultural value*
- *its significance is increasingly recognised in tourism promotion by both public agencies and private providers*
- *there is evidence that visitor numbers can be affected by World Heritage status where a well considered marketing strategy is in place that complements the effective management of the site itself*
- *looking to the future, World Heritage status could offer the potential to create a market in virtual tourism.*

Question 2: what does World Heritage status do for the sense of identity associated with the site, and what are the implications of this for tourism?

It is already clear that the mere designation of an area as a World Heritage site has rather little impact: what matters is how World Heritage status is used. However, there is much evidence that it *can* be used to create a stronger sense of identity and of place among local people and visitors, even where there was effectively no such sense of identity and of place beforehand. This has obvious implications for the development of tourism, and is especially relevant to large areas covering many hundreds of individual places of interest or attractions, such as the Wadden Sea. Whereas previously tourism may have been seen as a site specific activity, it becomes possible to conceive of it, and market it, as a regional activity, binding each of the sites more strongly together and creating a place that is more than the sum of the parts.

As the identity is strengthened in this way, it becomes possible to develop a range of World Heritage branded products which build on the identity that World Heritage can provide. Examples are:

- tourism packages involving accommodation and transport
- tourism routes (e.g. by public transport, by car, on foot or on bicycle)
- food and drink
- craft products
- publications and web-based materials.

Common messages, common designs (logos, house styles etc.) and quality assurance can be built around this stronger identity – and in turn help to reinforce it further. Used properly, this can be a virtuous circle.

Two examples from the UK illustrate this well, and show how World Heritage status has been used to strengthen the identity of the place so that it becomes a much more attractive and interesting tourist destination, drawing together a range of previously disparate tourist schemes:

- Dorset and East Devon Coast: The ‘Jurassic Coast’ was inscribed by UNESCO in 2001 because of its remarkable geological treasures. The cliffs of the site provide an almost continuous sequence of rock formations spanning 185 million years of the earth’s history. The area’s important fossil sites and geomorphological features have contributed to the study of earth sciences for over 300 years. The designation of the site has been used to draw together public and private tourism investment and to reinforce the message of a uniquely important place – creating an identity for the Jurassic Coast which did not exist before. A number of projects have helped to create this sense of a unified site – even though it extends over 150 kilometres and across two counties: a local authority-run bus service along the entire coast; a company set up to attract visitors to the Jurassic Coast by offering bus tours, guided services, interpretation and translation for a lay audience, along with print and electronic information; and a coastal cruise company that takes between 40,000 and 50,000 visitors a year to see the World Heritage site from the sea. Such businesses, which were brought into being as a result of the area’s World Heritage status and which treat its assets with respect, help to strengthen the identity of the place in the minds of visitors and residents (Rebanks Consulting, 2009). A survey of local residents and businesses 82% found that the new Jurassic Coast identity had a positive impact on confidence in the area and the local economy: a significant majority of respondents valued the WH brand, its influence on visitor profile, its ability to stimulate business, its impact on sustainability and its role in attracting additional investment (Jurassic Coast World Heritage Team, 2009).
- Hadrian’s Wall (part of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire): Hadrian’s Wall was inscribed by UNESCO in 1987, because of its outstanding historical value. In 2005 it became part of a serial trans-frontier World Heritage site, including also the Raetian frontier between the rivers Rhine and Danube; the Antonine Wall in Scotland was added in 2008. At the outset, designation was exclusively about preservation and celebration. For some years, visitor numbers declined whilst numerous small, un-coordinated tourism schemes were implemented. In the past few years however the site has “intellectually reinvented itself from an older perception of WHS, to a more modern focus on socio-economic impact” (Rebanks Consulting, 2009). To do this, a company,

Hadrian's Wall Heritage Ltd., was set up to be the lead organisation in the Hadrian's Wall Corridor working in partnership with many interests, to communicate the importance of the area to the public, to support key tourism schemes, and to help promote Hadrian's Wall as a leading global heritage destination. The main achievements in business terms have been summarised in these words: "several key funders reported higher levels of confidence in making investments as a result of having a sole coordinating body – a lead organisation that helps develop funding applications for new/improved facilities; that makes the case for strategic investment by developing the evidence base; that coordinates capital projects on behalf of the funders to ensure that investment is timed and targeted appropriately; and that encourages quality improvements in the capital projects." (ibid). In brief, World Heritage status has been used to create an identity that in turn can be used to co-ordinate tourist planning and investment. It will be much more challenging, though, to give a successful identify to the wider concept of Frontiers of the Roman Empire which extends across several countries.

Answer to Question 2: World Heritage designation as such will not do much to create an identity for an area, but it provides a great platform upon which to base a programme designed to do this. World Heritage status can be a means to co-ordinate the efforts of the public, private and community sectors, so that they work together to raise the profile of the place and create a stronger, more positive, image of it in the public mind. In this way World Heritage inscription can be the beginning of a virtuous circle in which sustainable forms of tourism are based upon the area's identity and image, and in turn help to reinforce these.

Question 3: Can World Heritage status build pride and self confidence among the local community?

Though never considered at the outset as a prime purpose of the World Heritage Convention, it has been shown that the mere designation of a place as of "outstanding universal value" helps to establish a stronger sense of self worth among the community affected. One might then expect local people to say: "*If this place is that important, we had better take pride in it and in our communal efforts to protect it*". Thus designation can help create another virtuous circle: more self confidence in the community, more investment in the area, better quality tourism, more visitors, positive feedback etc.

Several of the examples cited in the Lake District project study (Rebanks Consulting, 2009) demonstrate this. A particularly striking example from within the UK is:

- Blaenavon Industrial Landscape displays evidence of the pre-eminence of South Wales as the world's major producer of iron and coal in the 19th century. All the necessary elements can still be seen - coal and ore mines, quarries, a primitive

railway system, furnaces, workers' homes, and the social infrastructure of their community. However, the decline of coal mining and iron working in the past century has left the area in an economically depressed condition, with its population halved. From the outset, the designation as a World Heritage site, achieved in 2000, “had a clear socio-economic motive and a new perspective on using natural or cultural heritage as a key economic driver” (Rebanks Consulting, 2009). The community at Blaenavon used the World Heritage “process to take their existing and new cultural assets and fit them within a cultural narrative that residents, investors and visitors can understand....It is clear that in identifying its OUV Blaenavon ... (has) found something that might be described as ‘cultural glue’ that unites (its) disparate community facilities, and visitor attractions into a coherent product that is bigger than the sum of its parts” (ibid). A £30.8 million regeneration scheme has been the engine of change that has dramatically increased tourism numbers, on the back of which employment, economic and community prospects have improved. “According to several of these funding bodies, World Heritage Status was a factor in the decision to provide funding to the site. [...] On balance we believe that it would be reasonable to assume that WHS has had a significant impact on the level of funding gained by the site” (ibid). Above all, community pride and a sense of place have been created, and a strongly positive identity has been secured for Blaenavon.

Answer to Question 3: World Heritage status can be used to build local pride which can help sustain and develop successful tourism. Formal and informal education should be used to promote a sense of local “ownership” of the World Heritage site. However, pride may derive more from a sense that the place is prospering than from the existence of heritage assets accompanied by supportive messages: public respect for heritage will be stronger when it is seen to bring prosperity in its wake.

Question 4: What are the implications for tourism development of the commitments made by a State Party when it achieves World Heritage status for a site?

Article 4 of the World Heritage Convention commits each State Party to ensure the “identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage, and to “do all to this end to the utmost of its resources”. Article 6(3) commits “each State Party ... not to take any deliberate measures which might damage directly or indirectly the cultural and natural heritage”. Thus World Heritage status brings added responsibilities for the protection of the site. This can enhance conservation efforts. As reported by the UK Committee for UNESCO: “World Heritage Site designation has ... had a strong influence on conservation practice of the historic environment both in the UK and abroad. [It is] felt to result in greater focus, planning care and investment of resources resulting in good conservation of sites. The research ‘tends to strongly

support with evidence this area of WHS benefit' as the 'quality of development around such sites may be superior'" (UNESCO UK, 2010).

The influence of designation is particularly felt because, under the Convention, each State Party becomes accountable to the World Heritage Committee to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Values that were recognised at the time of inscription are protected. So World Heritage status increases the 'political' profile of the area – and as a consequence potentially controversial tourism and related projects receive greater publicity. In some cases, the controversy may be so great that it becomes an issue that engages the World Heritage Committee.

Two examples have arisen in recent years in relation to tourist development in World Heritage sites in the UK:

- Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast was inscribed as a World Heritage site in 1986 under natural criteria (vii) and (viii). The Causeway Coast has an unparalleled display of geological formations representing volcanic activity during the early Tertiary period some 50-60 million years ago. The most important feature of the site is the exposure of a large number of regular polygonal columns of basalt in perfect horizontal sections forming a pavement, or causeway. These dramatic coastal features are among Northern Ireland's most important tourist destinations. In 2002, the World Heritage Committee expressed concern about piecemeal tourist development at the site and requested that Management Plan be prepared and greater protection be given to the site (WHC-02/CONF.201/15). There followed a protracted debate over plans for tourist development and the ownership of tourist assets, involving the Northern Ireland government, the local authority, private developers (who sought to advance their own proposals for visitors) and the National Trust. Eventually the Trust secured a central role in the development of a new tourist centre, now well on its way to completion, and a satisfactory scheme for the management of the site and the protection of its natural beauty is taking shape. At various stages IUCN, the World Heritage Centre and the World Heritage Committee engaged in the debate, reminding local interests of their international obligations under the World Heritage Convention; indeed the status of the Giant's Causeway as a World Heritage site was a key factor in influencing events and ensuring a good outcome.
- Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites were inscribed in 1986 under cultural criteria (i), (ii) and (iii). They are among the most famous groups of megaliths in the world. Stonehenge in particular is a massively popular site for visits by national and international tourists. The site at Stonehenge is managed by English Heritage and much of the land around, which is also of great archaeological importance, is owned by the National Trust. By common consent, the provision made for visitors is completely inadequate, and their buses and cars intrude into the ancient landscape. Stonehenge is also affected by traffic on nearby busy

roads. Various schemes have been advanced to solve the complex management issues, including the construction of a road tunnel (abandoned on cost grounds), the closing of another road (now agreed) and moving the current visitor provision well away from Stonehenge. An agreed site for this new centre has now been identified and there is every prospect that it will be completed within the next two years. Even more than in the case of the Giant's Causeway, lengthy and difficult discussions over the past 25 years about the future of Stonehenge have been fought out under the scrutiny of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee. The UK Government has had to satisfy the Committee and its advisors that it is capable of protecting and managing the site to the high standards expected of it.

There are many other examples of tourism in World Heritage sites that have attracted the attention of the World Heritage Committee, for example:

- Pirin National Park, Bulgaria where the Committee asked for an expert mission to be undertaken to examine the threats posed by unregulated winter sports development (e.g. WHC-05/29.COM/7B.Rev).
- Machu Picchu, Peru, which has to cope with massive tourism development affecting not only the site itself but also the setting nearby, where a whole town has sprung up to service the tourists drawn to it (ICOMOS etc., 2007),
- The Rice Terraces of the Philippines Cordilleras was inscribed in 1995. It was added to the list of World Heritage Sites in Danger in 2001 by the Committee as uncontrolled tourism and the introduction of an open-market economy threatened both the natural heritage of the province and the traditional practices of its inhabitants (UNESCO, 2008), and
- Lake Fertő/Neusiedlersee, Hungary and Austria, where a dispute arose over the height of a hotel in the World Heritage site. In 2007, following a visit by ICOMOS, the Austrian authorities agreed to reduce the hotel from 73m to 47.2m, and other design features were altered (ICOMOS etc., 2007a).

The most important point here is that tourism threats to World Heritage sites, arising from poorly planned tourist development schemes or poorly managed tourism activity, can become matters of concern to the World Heritage Committee and the advisory bodies (IUCN or ICOMOS). This throws a spotlight on the issue at the international level (often to the embarrassment of the government concerned). The problems of unsustainable tourism may come to light through the Periodic Reporting process, to which all World Heritage sites are subject; or this may happen through Reactive Monitoring, when an issue becomes so controversial that it attracts the attention of one of the advisory bodies and the Committee – often after an intervention by a 'whistle blowing' national or local NGO.

Answer to Question 4: The planning and management of tourism in World Heritage sites is subject to more critical scrutiny at the national and international levels than

elsewhere. Therefore it has to meet the highest standards expected of such areas. If it falls short of these standards, and puts the values of the site at risk, it may become a matter of concern to the World Heritage Committee.

Question 5: Can World Heritage status for a trans-boundary site strengthen international collaboration in tourism management?

Guidelines for the management of *all* transboundary protected areas have been developed by IUCN and should apply to any World Heritage transboundary site (e.g. Sandwith et al, 2001). Cooperative management (or co-management) is at the heart of every transboundary conservation initiative, ranging from information exchange to joint decision-making. It is this that most distinguishes protected area management at transboundary sites. Because the context varies so much between the countries involved in a transboundary park, there are many challenges in managing them. There may be different legal and governance systems, cultural and language differences, unequal levels of professional standards and economic development, etc. But there are more than 200 transboundary conservation complexes in existence worldwide, and the ecological, social and political benefits of this form of co-operation have become very evident in recent years

What distinguishes trans-boundary² World Heritage sites is that they are *also* subject to a wider policy regime, whereas most transboundary protected areas are the subject only to a bilateral (or multilateral) agreement amongst the parties. Such a trilateral agreement already exists in the case of the Wadden Sea, and there are shared policy positions amongst the three countries concerned regarding tourism (the Covenant Vaarrecreatie Waddenzee (2007) etc.). However, the designation of the World Heritage site (albeit without for the time being the Danish component) means that there is stronger international framework for a tourism strategy.

The following is a list of World Heritage transboundary sites (both natural and cultural) where there appear to be a significant amount of tourism:

- Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Białowieża Forest (Belarus and Poland)
- Caves of Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst (Hungary and Slovakia)
- Curonian Spit (Lithuania and Russia)

² The Operational Guidelines distinguish between “transboundary”, “serial” and “serial transfrontier” properties. *Transboundary properties* (like the Wadden Sea) occur when “all concerned States Parties [have] adjacent borders”; *serial properties* will include related component parts, but where it is the series as a whole – and not necessarily the individual parts of – that is of outstanding universal value; where such serial sites occur within the territories of different, but not necessarily contiguous States Parties, they are called *serial transfrontier properties* (UNESCO, 2008a, para. 132-134).

- Fertö / Neusiedlersee Cultural Landscape (Austria and Hungary)
- High Coast / Kvarken Archipelago (Finland and Sweden)
- Iguazu / Iguazu (Argentina and Brazil)
- Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia and Zimbabwe)
- Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany (Ukraine, Slovakia and Germany)
- Pyrénées - Mont Perdu (France and Spain)
- Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Panama and Costa Rica)
- Waterton Glacier International Peace Park (Canada and USA)

Aspects of the planning and management of transboundary tourism have been examined recently in several of these transboundary sites, for example:

- Iguazu/Iguazu National Park (Argentina/Brazil): These two sites are adjacent, though they were nominated and are managed independently. In the past collaboration has been difficult due to political and sovereignty issues and competition for tourism revenues. But this is changing with growing alignment of management and public use strategies and more informal collaboration on the ground. Both parks are focused on the area of the Iguazu/Iguazu falls, with 1 million visitors annually on each side. But the sites differ in their approach to managing tourism and in how they involve stakeholders; governance structures vary too. Governance-related differences between the sites also exist. In general the Argentinean (Iguazu) side has been more effective by:
 - Promoting more sustainable form of tourism
 - Collaborating with private operators to reduce the visual impacts of their facilities through well-planned concessions
 - Creating infrastructure that minimally intrudes on the site's scenic beauty, using appropriate materials, and concentrating any new developments on previously built land at the edge of the park (Borges M., 2011).
- Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe): This is a true transboundary site that is shared and jointly managed by Zambia and Zimbabwe. However, until recently the institutional arrangements for managing and protecting it were weak. "A difficult relationship between the two management authorities made managing the property challenging and fuelled competition for tourism development often making for unsustainable decisions", but a new joint management plan should improve collaboration between the two countries. While tourism in the Zimbabwe side is very developed with considerable infrastructure close to the falls, on the Zambian side there is much less development. However visitation to this side has increased sharply in the last three years, and the Zambian government's plans to

develop the area envisage a sustainable form of tourism in which visitors are dispersed the site to relieve pressure on the immediate falls area (ibid).

- Waterton/Glacier (Canada/USA) – This is often considered to be the world’s first transboundary park, established in 1932 as an international peace park. Waterton Lakes National Park is managed by Parks Canada, and Glacier National Park by the National Park Service. Roughly 0.4 million people visit Waterton and 1.6 million Glacier. There is a tourism/visitor management plan in place for the site, but in fact until recently the two parts of the park were managed quite separately, with some liaison but little joint planning or management. However, in 1999 the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park Heritage Tourism Strategy was developed by the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park Heritage Tourism Council, which is a partnership of both national parks and numerous stakeholders, including regional tourism associations and businesses, aboriginal groups, and provincial/state agencies. Its primary aim is to sustain the International Peace Park as a tourism destination by preserving and celebrating the beauty and ecological integrity of the park and encouraging the same goal in surrounding areas. There are four linked objectives:
 - “To make all visitors and residents aware they are in a national park, International Peace Park and World Heritage Site by actively fostering appreciation and understanding of the nature, history and culture of the peace park and surrounding areas;
 - To protect the Crown of the Continent ecosystem by encouraging environmental stewardship initiatives upon which sustainable heritage tourism depends;
 - To encourage, develop and promote viable opportunities, products and services where they are appropriate and consistent with heritage and environmental values; and
 - To strengthen employee orientation, training and accreditation programming as it relates to sharing heritage understanding with visitors” (Parks Canada, 2004).

Answer to Question 5: World Heritage status for transboundary sites creates a platform upon which greater international collaboration can be built. Also the evidence suggests that there are environmental, ecological, economic and political benefits to be secured from closer co-operation between the different parties involved in transboundary World Heritage sites. Key areas for joint working include tourism planning, management and marketing, along with the development and operation of integrated services (information, interpretation, transport, products, accommodation etc.) for visitors. When this happens, the combined resources of two or more countries can provide a visitor experience that amounts to more than the

sum of the parts. However, the potential benefits will not be realised unless all countries involved pool their efforts in the wider interest.

Question 6: what does being part of the World Heritage network imply for tourism planning and management?

As we have seen, World Heritage status implies much more than just the recognition of an area's outstanding universal value: it carries with it opportunities and responsibilities. But it also makes the site part of a global network, and its managers part of a network of practitioners. Through the networks of World Heritage managers, the work of the advisory bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM) and the information available from the World Heritage Centre, managers will have access to huge fund of experience; they should use it in developing and implementing the strategy. For example through study visits and exchanges with other World Heritage sites, through longer term partnerships with "twinned sites" and even by encouraging local community exchanges.

For the Wadden Sea, priority might be given to World Heritage sites that contain coastal wetlands which share some of its characteristic, such as:

- Península Valdés, Argentina
- Great Barrier Reef, Australia
- The Sundarbans, Bangladesh/India
- Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System, Belize
- High Coast / Kvarken Archipelago, Finland/Sweden
- Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay, France
- Shiretoko, Japan
- Curonian Spit, Lithuania/Russia
- Banc d'Arguin National Park, Mauritania
- Sian Ka'an, Mexico
- The Whale Sanctuary of El Vizcaino, Mexico
- The Danube Delta, Romania
- Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary, Senegal
- iSimangaliso Wetland Park, South Africa
- Doñana National Park, Spain
- Ibiza, Biodiversity and Culture, Spain
- Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast, UK
- Dorset and East Devon Coast, UK
- Ha Long Bay, Vietnam

Many other World Heritage sites contain important marine environments, and some inland wetlands, such as Ichkeul (Tunisia), Saryarka – Steppe and Lakes (Kazakhstan) and Lake Ferto/Neusiedlersee (Hungary/Austria) have some similar

features. The main point is that among the family of World Heritage sites are quite a number which share some ecological characteristics and present similar problems. As well as learning from them, the Wadden Seas could also support conservation efforts in developing countries.

Answer to Question 6: World Heritage status provides access to a world-wide source of advice and experience, to which each manager can contribute and which it may be possible to draw upon for assistance.

Annexes:

Four sets of guiding principles for tourism in World Heritage sites

Annexe 1: Policy orientations: defining the relationship between World Heritage and tourism (adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2010 Decision 34 COM 5F.21)³.

1 The tourism sector

- The global tourism sector is large and rapidly growing, is diverse and dynamic in its business models and structures.
- Tourists/visitors are diverse in terms of cultural background, interests, behaviour, economy, impact, awareness and expectations of World Heritage.
- There is no one single way for the *World Heritage Convention*, or World Heritage properties, to engage with the tourism sector or with tourists/visitors.

2. The relationship between World Heritage and tourism

- The relationship between World Heritage and tourism is two-way:
 - a. World Heritage offers tourists/visitors and the tourism sector destinations
 - b. Tourism offers World Heritage the ability to meet the requirement in the *Convention* to 'present' World Heritage properties, and also a means to realise community and economic benefits through sustainable use.
- Tourism is critical for World Heritage:
 - a. For States Parties and their individual properties,
 - i. to meet the requirement in the *Convention* to 'present' World Heritage
 - ii. to realise community and economic benefits
 - b. For the *World Heritage Convention* as a whole, as the means by which World Heritage properties are experienced by visitors travelling nationally and internationally
 - c. As a major means by which the performance of World Heritage properties, and therefore the standing of the *Convention*, is judged,
 - i. many World Heritage properties do not identify themselves as such, or do not adequately present their Outstanding Universal Value
 - ii. it would be beneficial to develop indicators of the quality of presentation, and the representation of the World Heritage brand
 - d. As a credibility issue in relation to:
 - i. the potential for tourism infrastructure to damage Outstanding Universal Value

³ Some slight editing was done to this text as the syntax was inconsistent in places

- ii. the threat that World Heritage properties may be unsustainably managed in relation to their adjoining communities
- iii. sustaining the conservation objectives of the *Convention* whilst engaging with economic development
- iv. realistic aspirations that World Heritage can attract tourism.
- World Heritage is a major resource for the tourism sector:
 - a. Almost all individual World Heritage properties are significant tourism destinations
 - b. The World Heritage brand can attract tourists/visitors,
 - c. the World Heritage brand has more impact upon tourism to lesser known properties than to iconic properties.
- Tourism, if managed well, offers benefits to World Heritage properties:
 - a. to meet the requirement in Article 4 of the *Convention* to present World Heritage to current and future generations
 - b. to realise economic benefits.
- Tourism, if not managed well, poses threats to World Heritage properties.

3. The responses of World Heritage to tourism

- The impact of tourism, and the management response, is different for each World Heritage property: World Heritage properties have many options to manage the impacts of tourism. The management responses of World Heritage properties need to:
 - a. work closely with the tourism sector
 - b. be informed by the experiences of tourists/visitors to the visitation of the property
 - c. include local communities in the planning and management of all aspects of properties, including tourism.
- While there are many excellent examples of World Heritage properties successfully managing their relationship to tourism, it is also clear that many properties could improve:
 - a. the prevention and management of tourism threats and impacts
 - b. their relationship to the tourism sector inside and outside the property
 - c. their interaction with local communities inside and outside the property
 - d. their presentation of Outstanding Universal Value and focus upon the experience of tourists/visitors.
- The management responses of World Heritage properties need to:
 - a. be based on the protection and conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and its effective and authentic presentation
 - b. work closely with the tourism sector
 - c. be informed by the experiences of tourists/visitors to the visitation of the property
 - d. their presentation of Outstanding Universal Value and focus upon the experience of tourists/visitors.

- The management responses of World Heritage properties need to:
 - a. be based on the protection and conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and its effective and authentic presentation
 - b. work closely with the tourism sector
 - c. be informed by the experiences of tourists/visitors to the visitation of the property
 - d. to include local communities in the planning and management of all aspects of properties, including tourism.

4. Responsibilities of different actors in relation to World Heritage and tourism

- The *World Heritage Convention* (World Heritage Committee, World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies):
 - a. set frameworks and policy approaches
 - b. confirm that properties have adequate mechanisms to address tourism before they are inscribed on the World Heritage List
 - c. develop guidance on the expectations to be include in management plans
 - d. monitor the impact upon OUV of tourism activities at inscribed sites, including through indicators for state of conservation reporting
 - e. cooperate with other international organisations to enable:
 - i. other international organisations to integrate World Heritage considerations in their programs
 - ii. all parties involved in World Heritage to learn from the activities of other international organisations
 - e. assist State Parties and sites to access support and advice on good practices
 - f. reward best practice examples of World Heritage properties and businesses within the tourist/visitor sector
 - g. develop guidance on the use of the World Heritage emblem as part of site branding.
- Individual States Parties:
 - a. develop national policies for protection
 - b. develop national policies for promotion
 - c. engage with their sites to provide and enable support, and to ensure that the promotion and the tourism objectives respect Outstanding Universal Value and are appropriate and sustainable
 - d. ensure that individual World Heritage properties within their territory do not have their OUV negatively affected by tourism.
- Individual property managers:
 - a. manage the impact of tourism upon the OUV of properties, using common tools at properties such as fees, charges, schedules of opening and restrictions on access
 - b. lead onsite presentation and provide meaningful visitor experiences

- c. work with the tourist/visitor sector, and be aware of the needs and experiences of tourists/visitors, to best protect the property; the best point of engagement between the *World Heritage Convention* and the tourism sector as a whole is at the direct site level, or within countries
 - d. engage with communities and business on conservation and development.
- Tourism sector:
 - a. work with World Heritage property managers to help protect Outstanding Universal Value
 - b. recognize and engage in shared responsibility to sustain World Heritage properties as tourism resources
 - c. work on authentic presentation and quality experiences.
- Individual tourists/visitors with the assistance of World Heritage property managers and the tourism sector, can be helped to appreciate and protect the OUV of World Heritage properties.

Annexe 2: Proposed Principles for Sustainable Tourism at World Heritage Properties (from Borges et al, 2011)

Principle 1

Tourism development and visitor activities associated with World Heritage Properties should always contribute to the protection, conservation, presentation and transmission of their heritage values. Tourism should also generate sustainable socio-economic development and equitably contribute tangible as well as intangible benefits to local and regional communities in ways that are consistent with the conservation of the properties.

Principle 2

World Heritage Properties should be places where all stakeholders cooperate through clear and effective partnerships to maximise conservation and presentation outcomes, whilst minimising threats and adverse impacts from tourism.

Principle 3

The Promotion, Presentation and Interpretation of World Heritage Properties should be effective, honest, comprehensive and engaging. It should mobilise local and international awareness, understanding and support for their protection, conservation and sustainable use.

Principle 4

Continuous, proactive planning and management should ensure that tourism development and visitor activities associated with World Heritage Properties contribute to their protection, conservation and presentation, while respecting the capacity of properties to accept visitors without degrading or threatening heritage values . It should have regard to relevant tourism supply chain and broader tourism destination issues, including congestion management and the quality of life for local people. Tourism planning and management, including cooperative partnerships, should be an integral aspect of the site management system.

Principle 5

Planning for tourism development and visitor activity associated with World Heritage Properties should be undertaken in an inclusive and participatory manner, respecting and empowering the local community including property owners, traditional or indigenous custodians, while taking account of their capacity and willingness to participate in visitor activity.

Principle 6

Tourism infrastructure and visitor facilities associated with World Heritage Properties should be carefully planned, sited, designed, constructed and periodically upgraded as required to maximise the quality of visitor appreciation and experiences while

minimising adverse impacts on heritage values and the surrounding environmental and cultural context.

Principle 7

Management systems for World Heritage Properties should have sufficient skills, capacities and resources available when planning tourism infrastructure and managing visitor activity to ensure the protection and presentation of heritage their values and respect for local communities.

Principle 8

A significant proportion of the revenue derived from tourism and visitor activity associated with World Heritage Properties should be applied to the protection and conservation of their heritage values.

Principle 9

Tourism infrastructure development and visitor activity associated with World Heritage Properties should also contribute to local community development in an effective and equitable manner.

Annexe 3: European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas

The underlying aims of the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas are to:

- Increase awareness of, and support for, Europe's protected areas as a fundamental part of our heritage, that should be preserved for, and enjoyed by, current and future generations.
- Improve the sustainable development and management of tourism in protected areas, which takes account of the needs of the environment, local residents, local businesses and visitors.

The charter principles involve working in partnership, preparing and implementing a strategy, and addressing key issues.

Principle 1

To involve all those implicated by tourism in and around the protected area in its development and management.

A permanent forum, or equivalent arrangement, should be established between the protected area authority, local municipalities, conservation and community organisations and representatives of the tourism industry. Links with regional and national bodies should be developed and maintained.

Principle 2

To prepare and implement a sustainable tourism strategy and action plan for the protected area.

The strategy should be based on careful consultation and be approved and understood by local stakeholders. It should contain:

- A definition of the area to be influenced by the strategy, which may extend outside the protected area
- An assessment of the area's natural, historic and cultural heritage, tourism infrastructure, and economic and social circumstances; considering issues of capacity, need and potential opportunity
- An assessment of current visitors and potential future markets
- A set of strategic objectives for the development and management of tourism, covering

- conservation and enhancement of the environment and heritage
- economic and social development
- preservation and improvement of the quality of life of local residents
- visitor management and enhancement of the quality of tourism offered
- An action plan to meet these objectives
- An indication of resources and partners to implement the strategy
- Proposals for monitoring results

Principle 3

To protect and enhance the area's natural and cultural heritage, for and through tourism, and to protect it from excessive tourism development by:

- monitoring impact on flora and fauna and controlling tourism in sensitive locations
- encouraging activities, including tourism uses, which support the maintenance of historic heritage, culture and traditions
- controlling and reducing activities, including tourism impacts, which: adversely affect the quality of landscapes, air and water; use non-renewable energy; and create unnecessary waste and noise
- encouraging visitors and the tourism industry to contribute to conservation

Principle 4

To provide all visitors with a high-quality experience in all aspects of their visit, by:

- researching the expectations and satisfaction of existing and potential visitors
- meeting the special needs of disadvantaged visitors
- supporting initiatives to check and improve the quality of facilities and services

Principle 5

To communicate effectively to visitors about the special qualities of the area, by:

- ensuring that the promotion of the area is based on authentic images, and is sensitive to needs and capacity at different times and in different locations
- providing readily available and good quality visitor information in and around the area, and assisting tourism enterprises to do so
- providing educational facilities and services that interpret the area's environment and heritage to visitors and local people, including groups and schools

Principle 6

To encourage specific tourism products which enable discovery and understanding of the area by:

- providing and supporting activities, events and packages involving the interpretation of nature and heritage

Principle 7

To increase knowledge of the protected area and sustainability issues amongst all those involved in tourism, by:

- providing or supporting training programmes for staff of the protected area, other organisations and tourism enterprises, based on assessing training needs

Principle 8

To ensure that tourism supports and does not reduce the quality of life of local residents, by:

- involving local communities in the planning of tourism in the area
- ensuring good communication between the protected area, local people and visitors
- identifying and seeking to reduce any conflicts that may arise

Principle 9

To increase benefits from tourism to the local economy, by:

- promoting the purchase of local products (food, crafts, local services) by visitors and local tourism businesses
- encouraging the employment of local people in tourism

Principle 10

To monitor and influence visitor flows to reduce negative impacts, by:

- keeping a record of visitor numbers over time and space, including feedback from local
- tourism enterprises
- creating and implementing a visitor management plan
- promoting use of public transport, cycling and walking as an alternative to private cars
- controlling the siting and style of any new tourism development

Annexe 4: Principles of the Cultural Tourism Charter (ICOMOS 1999)

Principle 1

Since domestic and international tourism is among the foremost vehicles for cultural exchange, conservation should provide responsible and well managed opportunities for members of the host community and visitors to experience and understand that community's heritage and culture at first hand.

1.1

The natural and cultural heritage is a material and spiritual resource, providing a narrative of historical development. It has an important role in modern life and should be made physically, intellectually and/or emotively accessible to the general public. Programmes for the protection and conservation of the physical attributes, intangible aspects, contemporary cultural expressions and broad context, should facilitate an understanding and appreciation of the heritage significance by the host community and the visitor, in an equitable and affordable manner.

1.2

Individual aspects of natural and cultural heritage have differing levels of significance, some with universal values, others of national, regional or local importance. Interpretation programmes should present that significance in a relevant and accessible manner to the host community and the visitor, with appropriate, stimulating and contemporary forms of education, media, technology and personal explanation of historical, environmental and cultural information.

1.3

Interpretation and presentation programmes should facilitate and encourage the high level of public awareness and support necessary for the long term survival of the natural and cultural heritage.

1.4

Interpretation programmes should present the significance of heritage places, traditions and cultural practices within the past experience and present diversities of the area and the host community, including that of minority cultural or linguistic groups. The visitor should always be informed of the differing cultural values that may be ascribed to a particular heritage resource.

Principle 2

The relationship between Heritage Places and Tourism is dynamic and may involve conflicting values. It should be managed in a sustainable way for present and future generations.

2.1

Places of heritage significance have an intrinsic value for all people as an important basis for cultural diversity and social development. The long term protection and conservation of living cultures, heritage places, collections, their physical and ecological integrity and their environmental context, should be an essential component of social, economic, political, legislative, cultural and tourism development policies.

2.2

The interaction between heritage resources or values and tourism is dynamic and ever changing, generating both opportunities and challenges, as well as potential conflicts. Tourism projects, activities and developments should achieve positive outcomes and minimise adverse impacts on the heritage and lifestyles of the host community, while responding to the needs and aspirations of the visitor.

2.3

Conservation, interpretation and tourism development programmes should be based on a comprehensive understanding of the specific, but often complex or conflicting aspects of heritage significance of the particular place. Continuing research and consultation are important to furthering the evolving understanding and appreciation of that significance.

2.4

The retention of the authenticity of heritage places and collections is important. It is an essential element of their cultural significance, as expressed in the physical material, collected memory and intangible traditions that remain from the past. Programmes should present and interpret the authenticity of places and cultural experiences to enhance the appreciation and understanding of that cultural heritage.

2.5

Tourism development and infrastructure projects should take account of the aesthetic, social and cultural dimensions, natural and cultural landscapes, bio-diversity characteristics and the broader visual context of heritage places. Preference

should be given to using local materials and take account of local architectural styles or vernacular traditions.

2.6

Before heritage places are promoted or developed for increased tourism, management plans should assess the natural and cultural values of the resource. They should then establish appropriate limits of acceptable change, particularly in relation to the impact of visitor numbers on the physical characteristics, integrity, ecology and biodiversity of the place, local access and transportation systems and the social, economic and cultural well being of the host community. If the likely level of change is unacceptable the development proposal should be modified.

2.7

There should be on-going programmes of evaluation to assess the progressive impacts of tourism activities and development on the particular place or community.

Principle 3

Conservation and Tourism Planning for Heritage Places should ensure that the Visitor Experience will be worthwhile, satisfying and enjoyable.

3.1

Conservation and tourism programmes should present high quality information to optimise the visitor's understanding of the significant heritage characteristics and of the need for their protection, enabling the visitor to enjoy the place in an appropriate manner.

3.2

Visitors should be able to experience the heritage place at their own pace, if they so choose. Specific circulation routes may be necessary to minimise impacts on the integrity and physical fabric of a place, its natural and cultural characteristics.

3.3

Respect for the sanctity of spiritual places, practices and traditions is an important consideration for site managers, visitors, policy makers, planners and tourism operators. Visitors should be encouraged to behave as welcomed guests, respecting the values and lifestyles of the host community, rejecting possible theft or illicit trade in cultural property and conducting themselves in a responsible manner which would

generate a renewed welcome, should they return.

3.4

Planning for tourism activities should provide appropriate facilities for the comfort, safety and well-being of the visitor, that enhance the enjoyment of the visit but do not adversely impact on the significant features or ecological characteristics.

Principle 4

Host communities and indigenous peoples should be involved in planning for conservation and tourism.

4.1

The rights and interests of the host community, at regional and local levels, property owners and relevant indigenous peoples who may exercise traditional rights or responsibilities over their own land and its significant sites, should be respected. They should be involved in establishing goals, strategies, policies and protocols for the identification, conservation, management, presentation and interpretation of their heritage resources, cultural practices and contemporary cultural expressions, in the tourism context.

4.2

While the heritage of any specific place or region may have a universal dimension, the needs and wishes of some communities or indigenous peoples to restrict or manage physical, spiritual or intellectual access to certain cultural practices, knowledge, beliefs, activities, artefacts or sites should be respected.

Principle 5

Tourism and conservation activities should benefit the host community.

5.1

Policy makers should promote measures for the equitable distribution of the benefits of tourism to be shared across countries or regions, improving the levels of socio-economic development and contributing where necessary to poverty alleviation.

5.2

Conservation management and tourism activities should provide equitable economic,

social and cultural benefits to the men and women of the host or local community, at all levels, through education, training and the creation of full-time employment opportunities.

5.3

A significant proportion of the revenue specifically derived from tourism programmes to heritage places should be allotted to the protection, conservation and presentation of those places, including their natural and cultural contexts. Where possible, visitors should be advised of this revenue allocation.

5.4

Tourism programmes should encourage the training and employment of guides and site interpreters from the host community to enhance the skills of local people in the presentation and interpretation of their cultural values.

5.5

Heritage interpretation and education programmes among the people of the host community should encourage the involvement of local site interpreters. The programmes should promote a knowledge and respect for their heritage, encouraging the local people to take a direct interest in its care and conservation.

5.6

Conservation management and tourism programmes should include education and training opportunities for policy makers, planners, researchers, designers, architects, interpreters, conservators and tourism operators. Participants should be encouraged to understand and help resolve the at times conflicting issues, opportunities and problems encountered by their colleagues.

Principle 6

Tourism promotion programmes should protect and enhance Natural and Cultural Heritage characteristics.

6.1

Tourism promotion programmes should create realistic expectations and responsibly inform potential visitors of the specific heritage characteristics of a place or host community, thereby encouraging them to behave appropriately.

6.2

Places and collections of heritage significance should be promoted and managed in ways which protect their authenticity and enhance the visitor experience by minimising fluctuations in arrivals and avoiding excessive numbers of visitors at any one time.

6.3

Tourism promotion programmes should provide a wider distribution of benefits and relieve the pressures on more popular places by encouraging visitors to experience the wider cultural and natural heritage characteristics of the region or locality.

6.4

The promotion, distribution and sale of local crafts and other products should provide a reasonable social and economic return to the host community, while ensuring that their cultural integrity is not degraded.

References

Borges M., Carbone G., Bushell R. and Jaeger T. (2011) *Sustainable tourism and natural World Heritage - Priorities for Action*, IUCN Gland Switzerland

Brandt C. and Wollesen A. (2009) *Tourism and Recreation - Quality Status Report 2009*
Thematic Report No. 3.4, Common Wadden Sea Secretariat, Wilhelmshaven, Germany

Brooks G. (2008) *Developing Guiding Principles and Policies for World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism – A Major UNESCO World Heritage Centre Initiative*, UNESCO, Paris

Brandt A. and Wollesen A. (2009) *Quality Status Report Thematic Report No. 3.4 - Tourism and Recreation*, publishers??

ICOMOS, UNESCO and IUCN (2007) *Report on the Reactive Monitoring Mission to the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru), 22 April to 30 April 2007*, UNESCO, Paris

ICOMOS, UNESCO and IUCN (2007a) *Report on the ICOMOS – UNESCO– IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission to Fertö / Neusiedlersee Cultural Landscape, Austria and Hungary, 25-26 February 2007*, UNESCO, Paris

Jurassic Coast World Heritage Team, *An Economic, Social and Cultural Impact Study of the Jurassic Coast: Summary of Findings* (2009)
http://www.jurassiccoast.com/downloads/news/economic_impact_study_09.pdf

Eagles P., McCool S, and Haynes S. (2002) *Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas - Guidelines for Planning and Management*, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK

Parks Canada (2004) *Periodic Report on the Application of the World Heritage Convention: Section II, Report on the state of conservation of Waterton Glacier International Peace Park*, Parks Canada, Ottawa (see also <http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/rspm-whsr/rapports-reports/r10.aspx>)

Pedersen A. (2002) *Managing Tourism at World Heritage Sites: a Practical Manual for World Heritage Site Managers (World Heritage Manual 1)* UNESCO, Paris

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (2007a) *The Costs and Benefits of UK World Heritage Site Status: A literature review for the Department for Culture, Media and Sport*, DCMS London (see also http://www.culture.gov.uk/images/publications/PwC__literaturereview.pdf)

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (2007b) *The Costs and Benefits of World Heritage Site Status in the UK: Case Studies* (see also http://www.culture.gov.uk/images/publications/PwC_casestudies.pdf) DCMS London

Rebanks Consulting Ltd & Trends Business Research Ltd. (2009) *World Heritage Status: Is there Opportunity for Economic Gain?* (see also <http://www.lakeswhs.co.uk/documents/WHSTheEconomicGainFinalReport.pdf>)

Rebanks Consulting Ltd & Trends Business Research Ltd (2009a) *World Heritage Status: Is there Opportunity for Economic Gain: Preview study* (see also <http://www.lakeswhs.co.uk/documents/WHSEconomicGainSupplement.pdf>)

Rebanks J. (2011) *The price of lemons – World Heritage and economic development*. In **World Heritage Review n°58** - Part threat, part hope: The challenge of tourism – February 2011

Sandwith T., Shine C., Hamilton L. and Sheppard D. (2001) *Transboundary Protected Areas for Peace and Cooperation*, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge UK.

UNESCO (2008) IMPACT publication: *Sustainable Tourism and the Preservation of the World Heritage Site of the Ifugao Rice Terraces Philippines*, UNESCO, Paris

UNESCO (2008a): *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, UNESCO, Paris

United Kingdom National Committee for UNESCO (2010) *Wider Value of UNESCO to the UK*, UK Committee, London