

## UNESCO/UNITWIN NETWORK WORKSHOP<sup>1</sup>

“Culture, Tourism and Development”

Rimini, Italy

21-23 September 2007

NETWORKING SITES AND SUPPORTING THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF THE  
TERRITORIES THROUGH CULTURAL TOURISM:

TOOLS, EDUCATION AND STRUCTURING COOPERATION

### FINAL REPORT

by Laure Veirier<sup>2</sup>

October 2007

UNESCO Contact:  
Hervé Barré  
Sustainable Tourism Programme  
World Heritage Centre  
UNESCO  
[h.barre@unesco.org](mailto:h.barre@unesco.org)

---

<sup>1</sup> **Theme of the “Culture, Tourism and Development” Network**

*Cultural tourism* encompasses all relations between tourism and the various forms of cultural expression. It may concern a visit to a museum, site or monument, attending a historical, musical or theatrical performance, or savouring a landscape, but it may also involve taking part in traditional festivities or living with one of the local people. The scope of cultural tourism also extends to the study of the cultural effects of meetings between tourists and the host populations (acculturation, social change).

Without neglecting the anthropological aspects of cultural contacts, “developing sustainable heritage tourism” – or, more succinctly, *heritage tourism* – is more especially interested in ways of protecting, optimizing and managing the various forms of tangible and intangible heritage with a view to the development of sustainable tourism.

Ref. Apd ICOMOS

<sup>2</sup> Report drafted in cooperation with of Alain Laurent and based on preparatory documents, Power Point presentations and notes provided by the participants, in particular Antonio Barone, Amareswar Galla, Kevin Griffin, Tomke Lask, Valéry Patin and Zaki Aslan.



## **Contents**

Foreword

Opening of the Workshop

1. Meeting on Tourism development and networking cultural sites and routes. Key issues and methods.
2. Meeting on The challenges of distance training and e-learning
3. Functioning of the Network

Plan of Action of the Network

Annexes



## FOREWORD

This workshop follows on from the first two meetings (held in Paris, March 2005 and Gréoux les Bains, May 2006), at which members of the Network exchanged views on the contribution of tourism to the promotion of cultural diversity, poverty eradication and sustainable development in the territories. The spirit of these meetings has always been to use lessons learnt on the ground to enrich university education, and vice-versa. Since its establishment, the Network has also striven to translate the principles of the 1972, 2003 and 2005 UNESCO Conventions into strategies and activities and to follow the lines of emphasis of UNESCO's "Culture, Tourism and Development" and World Heritage programmes.

Furthermore, the selection of topics and the reorganization of the Network recommended for the 2007-2011 period at the end of the second meeting held in May 2006 have been endorsed in the new UNESCO guidelines, namely:

- (1) to confirm the Chairs' and Networks' research, cooperation and skills transfer functions while concomitantly strengthening interaction with UNESCO programmes, with which the Chairs and Networks should be more "in step";
- (2) to build genuine partnership between UNESCO, its programmes, Secretariat and National Commissions on the one hand, and the Chairs and university networks on the other, the aim being to enable UNESCO, and the World Heritage Centre in particular, to draw on the wealth of university research and to involve the Chairs and Networks as genuine partners in achieving programme objectives;
- (3) to create, on the basis of the UNITWIN Networks, "centres of excellence", defined as groups of higher education and training institutions and research units dedicated to innovative projects in UNESCO's major priority areas;

The formula adopted this year of having preparatory work and a workshop addresses the concern that the Network should be efficient and operational, and thus the need for some of the themes to be examined in greater depth and for internal network operations to be fine-tuned.

The workshop was hosted by the University of Bologna at Rimini, Italy, and organized under the direction of the Network Coordinator, Professor Bernard Morucci, with support from the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (Hervé Barré, Arthur Pedersen and Marielle Richon).

Its twofold objective was:

- to work on themes relating to the networking of sites (including World Heritage sites) in order to provide the World Heritage Centre, the decision-makers and actors in the field with methods and tools for sustainable territorial management by giving prominence to culture and the cultural and natural heritage;
- to take stock of the new challenges in distance learning (e-learning) and the Network's potential means of establishing a resource centre and an operational skills platform to improve knowledge, offer training for capacity building and be established as a service provider and a centre of excellence to take up external calls for tender (for example, from the World Heritage Centre and the European Union).

In addition to these two topics, the functioning of the Network was discussed.

The workshop was structured in three sub-groups. The first workshop (“Routes”) was moderated by Alain Laurent, the second (“e-learning”) by Kevin Griffin and the third, on the functioning of the Network and the skills platform, by Tomke Lask. Each sub-group was co-moderated by Bernard Morucci, while the overall synopsis was conducted by Laure Veirier.

In the interests of clarity, this report draws a distinction between three complementary levels of discussion:<sup>3</sup>

- (1) Routes and networking of sites;
- (2) e-learning and information sharing;
- (3) the functioning of the Network and the plan of action.

### **OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP**

The workshop was opened by Professor Salvatore Torrisi, Vice-President of the University of Economics of Rimini, Professor Marcella Gola, Director of the Academy of Tourism, Professor Fiorella Dallari of the University of Rimini, organizer of the workshop and member of the UNESCO/UNITWIN Network, Ms Elisa Marchioni, representing the City of Rimini, Professor Bernard Morucci, Professor Emeritus of the University of Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne and Network Coordinator, and Mr Antonio Barone, Director of the Association for the Route of the Phoenicians.

- After welcoming all present, **Fiorella Dallari** stated that the spirit of the workshop was characterized by a determination to find a workable response to the challenges facing the Network, especially with regard to cooperation with the countries of the South and poverty eradication. She apologised on behalf of Mr Thomas Pennette of the European Institute of Cultural Routes who was unable to attend, but with whom it was desirable to form a partnership, in particular through the Network’s representing at the Puy-en-Velay Conference to be held on 27-29 September 2007.
- **Professor Bernard Morucci** again explained the Network’s main lines of emphasis and the recent realignment of UNESCO’s guidelines on the UNITWIN Chairs and Networks. He stressed the mutual complementarity of the competences of the members of the Network, in which some twenty universities covering every continent were actively involved. He spoke on behalf of UNESCO representatives who could not take part in the workshop, in particular Hervé Barré, whose speech was read out.<sup>4</sup> He stressed UNESCO’s determination “to move to another level in strengthening its partnership with the academic world”, as it had done with the private sector, while noting that UNESCO’s “Culture, Tourism and Development” programme would be assigned to the World Heritage Centre, which could offer the Network “a new field of action, more directly in tune with the specific requirements of Member States in implementing the 1972 Convention”. He touched on the need to examine the practical aspects of the sustainable management and networking of both listed and non-listed sites and on the inherent risks of the lack of a sustainable tourism management plan, particularly in regard to the sites’ authenticity and integrity.

---

<sup>3</sup> This report incorporates preparatory documents by Alain Laurent and Laure Veirier, and documents provided before or during the workshop, in particular the technical brief by Valéry PATIN (ICOMOS) and the document by Amareswar GALLA (Tourism Development and Networking Cultural Sites and Routes – Challenges and methods; E-learning and Collaborative Capacity Building. Desultory Notes from the Asia Pacific).

<sup>4</sup> See Annex I.

- **Professor Salvatore Torrasi** mentioned the University of Rimini's wealth of expertise in the field of cultural tourism. The contribution of tourism to the Italian economy could be further increased, in his view, as there was a need for innovation in the sector and for better interaction between the cultural sector and the new technologies. Techniques and skills must be developed further in order to optimize the role of tourism and enhance both Italy's expertise and its uniqueness.
- **Ms Elisa Marchioni** gave a short account of tourism in Rimini since the 1960s, showing how the sector had changed from a guest house business to a genuine industry requiring constant review and structuring to take account of changing expectations. Tourism was regarded as a lever for democracy, a means of showcasing the rich and diverse regional and local character, and not merely as a seaside activity. The University played a central role in ensuring that tourism was discussed in depth and in helping the city to innovate.
- **Professor Marcella Gola** focused on the links between tourism and culture: tourism needed both territory and culture. In that connection, she stated that Parliament had recently passed a law transferring responsibility for tourism from the Ministry for the Economy to the Ministry for Cultural Property, which had given rise to much debate on culture, tourism and the regions, in which the people had participated actively. The concept of cultural tourism had thus gained from being linked to the concept of cultural property, which encompassed traditions and intangible heritage, thus leading to a diversification in the range of tourism opportunities. Such a conception of tourism integral to its region meant that, cultural heritage was no longer an obstacle to the growth of tourism but a resource for tourism and an opportunity for its development so that "tourism itself becomes culture". There was still work to be done on much of the current tourism opportunities available, which magnified the problems of conservation. Putting multidisciplinary teams in place and training both tourism stakeholders and the tourists was one of the key issues in helping to overcome the lack of culture, and meet the challenges inherent in the interdependence of tourism and culture.
- **Mr Antonio Barone** emphasized the challenges raised by the Euro-Mediterranean dialogue in his presentation of the Route of the Phoenicians (Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe).<sup>5</sup>
- **Dr Andrea Babbi's** statement highlighted the importance of partnerships at the regional level, with particular regard to the marketing of tourism products, innovation, sustainability and the participation of the local stakeholders who had to take a bottom-up approach in organizing their tourism provision.

## **FIRST MEETING:**

### **Tourism development and networking cultural sites and routes. Key issues and methods.**

This summary does not cover material submitted to the workshop in the preparatory study, but rather deals with the questions raised by the participants on issues concerning the establishment, management and promotion of cultural routes.

---

<sup>5</sup> His statement is included in the section of the report dealing with routes.

## Summary of the key issues

- Stakeholders today want and need to **work in a network, which raises practical problems** that must be weighed up both from the technical standpoint (feasibility) and in terms of their consistency (validity of the content).
- **The clash of underlying rationales of cultural tourism and culture** (developing sustainable heritage tourism)<sup>6</sup> means that a clear stand must be taken to ensure that culture is not swallowed up by tourism (the risk here is that cultural heritage may be taken over for purely commercial ends – rationale increasingly used for merchandizing).
- **Impact assessment is unsatisfactory: situations must be evaluated as a whole:** a site that is well managed after several years of training can create imbalances at the regional level that can threaten the site's very conservation and local development (conflicts, imbalances and power struggles). It is imperative that the local people acquire the necessary knowledge and play an active role in the development process.
- **A gap exists between the wide range of techniques and the knowledge currently available, on the one hand, and on the other, the means and willingness to manage sites and the level of training of the local actors.**
- **The World Heritage Centre wishes the 1972 Convention to be better implemented.** In a broader sense, it wishes to bring new partners on board to influence the countries' and in particular the cultural actors' decisions.

The workshop was devoted to expressing and sharing views on the key problems and solutions relating to the central issue of developing sustainable tourism for routes (itineraries and networks) of cultural value.

The workshop focused in the end on a number of areas:

- (re)defining the ultimate aim of action on “cultural routes/itineraries”;
- clarifying the main problems to be solved;
- identifying the main lines of solutions, in other words the guiding principles for action, using a presentation of the Route of the Phoenicians as a template for good practices.

### → **Discussion of the routes' aims and purposes**

Before the discussion on the ways and means of developing the routes, their ultimate aim was discussed. In addition to “conservation of natural and cultural sites for future generations”, which seems to be one of the aims and purposes of the World Heritage Centre, a number of related challenges were mentioned:

- contribution to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (sustainability and poverty eradication);
- promotion of local economic development and the empowerment of local communities through cultural tourism and regional development;

---

<sup>6</sup> See in that connection the point made repeatedly by Bernard Morucci, at the beginning of the document and in the table on page 21.



- acknowledgement of differences in scale, context and socio-economic situations both within and among the countries;
- consideration of the way in which listed sites relate to other sites in the region.

These initial exchanges produced results in terms of:

- content:

working towards the MDGs and making an effective contribution to heritage conservation AND to development, positions cultural routes/itineraries/networks as means, vectors, or approaches to be used in fulfilling an ultimate aim that overrides their individual cultural significance;

- methodology:

characterizing the nature of the sites and the way in which they are managed or not managed is a preliminary step to be taken in tailoring action to the specific features of each territory included and of each route/itinerary/network linking these territories together.

#### → **Discussion on a route's specific objective**

Given the ambitious and long-term nature of the ultimate aim, the group considered whether to set out a more limited, operational goal. The following wording was proposed: “to help local communities, site managers and/or States to improve the management of sites in order to:

- minimize the negative impacts of tourism;
- maximize the benefits of tourism”

This gave rise to the comments below:

- Many sites are not managed (often, there is no site manager) and it is difficult to identify those responsible for the sites or routes/itineraries/networks. It is therefore unclear on whom the aid is targeted. Aid centred exclusively on site managers would lead to failure in a number of territories.
- The external effects of tourism, in terms of both “benefits” and “negative impacts”, should be clarified for each territory (what are the risks in a given context and what are the benefits sought?)
- The term “manager” needs to be defined more clearly. The role of manager is sometimes assigned by public bodies of a more or less informal nature.
- State responsibility for tourism diminishes as the power of the regions increases.
- The term “local communities” is inappropriate in the European context and in the West in general.
- The size (scale) of sites is an important parameter to be taken into account.
- With regard to sites on the World Heritage List, it is taken for granted that the Convention is being applied, which is not the case in many “developing” countries.

The participants therefore made the following recommendations with regard to the initial statement:

- the scale and all the specific features of sites and territories should be taken into account;
- the benefits of developing cultural heritage tourism should not be limited to economic benefits;
- earnings should be considered (tax, indirect tax and commercial earnings);
- “communities”, “population groups” or “inhabitants” should be considered, depending on the context;
- managers or officials should be targeted, where appointed, for matters other than training in an individual capacity;
- the territorial/regional level of the government authority responsible for tourism in the States should be taken into account.

A more detailed text was proposed:

“Depending on scale and specific features, to assist the local communities or populations, site managers (where appointed) and/or States and local authorities in improving the management of sites in order to minimize the negative impacts of tourism and maximize its benefits in the cultural, environmental, social and economic fields.”

#### *Consequences in terms of methodology and tools*

The need to develop tools to implement the 1972 Convention and ensure that it is “more than just a logo” is part of a process of reasoning involving:

- mobilizing and informing local population groups about the “do’s and don’ts”;
- taking account of the regions and those aspects of their heritage to which the local people attach value as “cultural sites”;
- examining and addressing the relationship between listed sites and specific unlisted cultural and natural sites.

#### **Key issues and guidelines for action**

In relation to the objective of the work, the central question is:

What major issues, of whatever nature, arise from the development of sustainable tourism of routes, itineraries and networks of cultural sites?

This question may be illustrated, in terms of good practices, by the example of the Route of the Phoenicians, presented by Antonio Barone. It serves as a “testbed” for developing a methodology for an itinerary described as a local development system requiring, not only networking, but also innovation and management based on the value of the territory.

“The Route of the Phoenicians is the network of great sea lanes used by the Phoenicians since the twelfth century B.C. as the main trade, communication and cultural routes in the Mediterranean. By

plying those routes the Phoenicians became a great civilization contributing to the creation of a Mediterranean cultural “*koine*” or community.

Today, these maritime routes symbolize the model of interculturality that forms the basis of a Cultural Itinerary under the Council of Europe programme, which passes through 15 countries on 3 continents and 80 towns of Phoenician origin.” ([www.rottadeifenici.it](http://www.rottadeifenici.it))

### **1. The significance and nature of cultural routes/itineraries/networks determine their potential for building recognition, attractiveness and loyalty.**

“Itineraries”, “cultural landscapes”, “cultural landscape network”, “tourist routes” and “World Heritage routes” are terms that come close in meaning to the notion of “networks of sites”. In practice, these routes are not lines, but geographic areas where mobility, economic factors, sustainability, social aspects and history blend into a “process by which identity is revealed” before they can become a motor of the economy.

#### **Cultural and historic consistency**

A network must be composed of sites that have some historic links to each other, either because they belong to the same period or have similar architectural features or form a cultural unit. This is often the case with thematic routes, such as the Route of Santiago de Compostela, but it can also be true of a monument that is tens of kilometres long, as is Hadrian’s Wall in the United Kingdom, or a series of monuments relevant to a period of history or particular historical events, such as the *Pays Cathare* or the *Llegado Andalusi*. It is therefore not always possible to establish networks of sites that have a coherent cultural significance. On the other hand, it may be possible to establish networks of sites based on practical concessions such as reduced prices or no queueing. One example in France is the “Museum and Monuments” pass in the Paris area. It is valid for 1, 2 or 3 days and allows the holder to enter the site straight away without queueing or buying a ticket.

Valéry Patin (International Expert, ICOMOS)

The purpose of a cultural route or itinerary is to conserve culture (in the broad sense) and pass it on, and to contribute to peace-building by strengthening intercultural dialogue. Tourism comes into play only at the second stage, once the local people have conferred legitimacy on the proposed route. In reality, each route is different. Each one has its “lowest common denominator”. For the Routes of the Phoenicians, that denominator is a shared Mediterranean identity.

A route is “a way of getting from A to B”. It is not an end in itself, as each route has its own *raison d’être* and its own special features: economic development (through better product marketing), marketing, the need for cooperation and partnerships to build shared infrastructure, dialogue and poverty reduction. There is no automatic way of establishing networks of sites that have a coherent cultural significance.

While no route can be imagined without the local actors who provide its *raison d’être* and bring it to life, it must also be evaluated from the point of view of the consumers, who consider the route in other terms (such as its feasibility, interest to tourists, and so on).

→ To sum up, the route, itinerary or network of cultural sites is concurrently:

- a geographical journey, through a territory with many local identities;
- a mental journey, through values, perceptions, senses and expectations;

- a new tourism product based on the idea of networks of countries and territories: something original, with its own products, organization and logistics;
- a meta-system made up of a number of territorial systems, with “sub-systems” of actors, on a scale that has “top-down visibility and bottom-up manageability”;
- a process of “revelation” in a context in which identity presents problems;
- a process of communication about the idea of heritage;
- a learning process.

It also entails a variety of practical realities:

- differences of scale;
- differences in the size of sites and places;
- different contexts (North/South);
- different political, economic, social and cultural realities and structures.

A route, itinerary or network of sites rests on a major development in the concept of heritage in which identity-related values are linked to dialogue with the territories so that each site is managed and, at the same time, networks of networks are established at every level.

## **2. The requirement of a regional “bottom-up” approach has major methodological implications**

In practice, a cultural route or itinerary lends itself to a particular managerial method that focuses on facilitation, participation, coordination, complementarity and consistency of methods.

The three main features of this management concern land-use planning, the profile of the territory and communication with the media.

The complexity of the routes or itineraries has implications for the expertise required:

- complexity of information – the transfer, exchange and sharing of information;
- organizational complexity – identifying and managing activities;
- relational complexity – creating and maintaining relationships over time;
- existential complexity – discovering and passing on identity.

Routes are one of the possible responses to problematic local issues (added value, initiation of dialogue and diversity). In fact, the question whether to launch a route or an itinerary that is mainly cultural is an issue in the long-term regional development that requires participatory management.

“Since the quality of tourism depends on the quality of the relations between the actors in the system”, the methodological framework defined must be conducive to innovation and be rooted in the realities on the ground.

However, it has been found that a top-down approach is taken to most itineraries. It is necessary to reverse this trend, eliminate preconceived ideas and focus discussion on the territory. Each cultural route has its own goals that entail specific criteria for the development of the territory.

For a route/itinerary/network of cultural sites to be viable, it is important for the local inhabitants to share common goals, values and interests. Sharing gives meaning to indispensable partnerships that duly take each community's role, status and aims into account.

The authenticity, physical visibility and values of the area will entail specific approaches that must be integrated into the methodologies, methods and tools:

- multi-actor approach;
- multi-temporal approach;
- multi-scale approach.

#### The multi-actor approach

This approach proceeds from a twofold observation:

- in the great majority of cases, routes have not only multiple actors but also multiple managers;
- routes/itineraries/networks of cultural sites are more the product of partnerships based on a shared determination, technical advantages or regional systems that are already in place, than of physical realities.

Thus, it is vital clearly to identify the role of each partner and reconcile different, or even antagonistic, points of view held by the operators, the cultural actors and those with responsibility for the territory. This background throws into sharp focus the lack of connection between central government and territorial authorities and the actors on the ground as a whole.

Managing the multi-actor approach implies putting in place specific management methods:

- based on the value of the area;
- adapted to the cultural models;
- designed to clarify, build and evaluate the partnerships and ensure that they are mutually compatible.

The example of the Route of the Phoenicians shows how very varied the direct actors are, since they include schools (offers of visits), young people (learning how to organize an itinerary in a few days), agencies and major TOs (close cooperation in all phases), tourists, and others.

#### The multi-temporal approach

This approach is unavoidable owing to the conflict between the short-term interests of the tour operators and the long-term interests of the area and its culture. It takes at least eight years for an itinerary to become established. Tourism projects are implemented more quickly. The Route of Santiago de Compostela, a tourism product, is an example in point.

### The multi-scale approach

There are four levels of actors in routes/itineraries/networks of cultural sites: local, regional, national and international. The latter level depends on the countries' trust and their willingness to cooperate with each other, with UNESCO and with the main international tourism groups.

The inclusion of the small regional systems ultimately results in one integrated system involving different countries. The Route of the Phoenicians brings 18 countries together in intercultural dialogue.

### **3. Necessary operational conditions for a route, itinerary, or network of cultural sites**

It has been seen that a network of sites in a tourist region is much more likely to function well (number of visitors, spread of visitor flow, and expenditure near attraction sites), than a circuit proposed in the form of a route.

What does it take to make a route or itinerary operational? This question has to be answered by the experts from the perspective of working methods.

The preconditions for routes/itineraries/networks of cultural sites to become operational are as follows:

- they must be designed in the field, **on the initiative of the local population**;
- they must engender multi-faceted **cooperation**;
- the **common goals** must be shared: in other words they must be formulated jointly;
- **common working standards** must be developed gradually. For example, if each of the countries develops a different intersectoral strategic plan, the process of reconciling those plans will be very slow.

### The central issue of partnerships

The issue of partnerships stems from the constraints inherent in multi-scale, multi-actor routes, itineraries or networks of cultural sites. It is a key factor of methodological support and tools. Interreg is mentioned as an example of a good partnership. The partnerships link up a chain of actors in one way or another: the European Union, States, local authorities, local inhabitants, tour operators and so on.

In a partnership, the different roles must be clarified and even changed.

→ The World Heritage Centre, often seen as an organization that grants seals of approval, could act more as an incubator for new initiatives, on routes or itineraries in particular.

### Developing tourism along a specific route

The example of the Route of the Phoenicians shows how tourism develops naturally when the local people take ownership of their heritage. One of the goals of European citizenship can thus become a goal as a “cultural product”.

The key factors in developing tourism along a route/itinerary/network of cultural sites are:

- demand analysis: the local population, the population of the region, and the conventional tourists;
- analysis of supply requirements to meet the demand: between cultural routes and tourist products, many permutations are possible;
- creation of new products to distinguish the route from “cultural” tourism products and services;
- quality-based marketing;
- consistent images.

In terms of implementation, this means:

- designing **integrated products** (for example, use of a passport system to allow each tourist to visit four or five stretches of the itinerary);
- defining and developing **new professions**;
- defining and developing **new methodologies**: communicative interpretation, ICTs, direct booking systems, heritage education;
- defining and developing “different itineraries within an itinerary”.

#### Developing sustainable tourism for routes

This expression encompasses features of sustainable development in the broad sense.

Some of these features are detailed below:

#### **Integrated management**

- Developing quality initiatives, especially in the field of culture (site conservation, education, enhancement, etc.)
- Considering the place of the environment in a cultural tourism product.
- Building relations between the actors, including the associations that manage the World Heritage sites.

#### **The challenges of management**

This is the major source of problems. A network of sites means, in the vast majority of cases, a large number of managers. Thus, it is often difficult for managers with opposing interests to work together, a case in point being managers of sites that attract only passing visitors and sites of sites where people make a stopover. Opening hours must be compatible between one site and the next, guided tours must not be too repetitive and the overall promotion effort must not favour some partners unduly over the others. These difficulties are rarely surmounted in practice. They manifest themselves in an inability to work together effectively (the Route of Santiago de Compostela on the French side), the reduction of networks to include only jointly managed sites (*Pays Cathare*), and in the limited services provided (*Terre Catalane*).

Valéry Patin (International Expert, ICOMOS)

### **Balance between the territories**

- Imbalances in revenue should be corrected in favour of the least visited sites on a route or itinerary so as to give them the resources they need for receiving visitors and providing tours, safety, upkeep and site enhancement.
- Advertising techniques that showcase the main attractions and “flagship” sites could be used to attract people to the less well known secondary sites.

### **Regulating the flow of visitors**

Among the numerous advantages of networks, the ability to show less well known sites and thus regulate the flow of visitors holds pride of place. However, it must be borne in mind that tourists are usually interested mainly in the “flagship” sites. A mere glance at trends in visitor numbers will reveal that only the major sites show a continued increase, while the smaller sites are falling behind, except where they are managed in a very dynamic way. This means that it is often the enthusiasts, or those who have been several times to the area, who go to the less well-known sites. It follows that a network of sites set up in an area where tourists stay has a much better chance of success in terms of visitor numbers, regulation of visitor flow and expenditure near the places visited, than a circuit proposed in the form of a route. The route is a product used by advertisers to attract people, because it conjures up an image of several fine sites, but in actual fact, with some exceptions, most of the time it has no real meaning for the tourists.

Valéry Patin (International Expert, ICOMOS)

### **Economic viability**

- Drawing on the new CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) policies of the major groups/TOs (such as Nouvelle Frontières/TUI) to introduce products that have cultural meaning and added cultural value and thus move out of the narrow (elitist) niche of “cultural tourists”,
- involving the same TOs in site conservation.

### **Awareness raising and education**

- Developing new activities and products of informative and educational value, which involve each visitor but still remain attractive.

One example is the Route of the Phoenicians which enables visitors:

- to learn about Mediterranean culture, use their holiday time to learn, build cultural awareness and “recharge their batteries” (cruises used as learning experiences);
- work on tourist communications based on cultural mediation and interpretation programmes: theatre-based studies of the history of the area; participate in site conservation (archeological tourism), assist young people in becoming part of society, etc.

## **4. Skills building through training to meet the particular needs of route stakeholders**

The idea of networks between partners is a recurring theme, with the route/itinerary/network of cultural sites as the area covered by the networks.



It has led to number of approaches to capacity-building through training, which the Network intends to address, in particular through e-learning (see the next topic):

- training in networking for the actors and thus the partnerships (a territorial approach to development requires disciplines and experience that complement each other);
- training in sustainable development. To play a real part in a route/itinerary/network of cultural sites, multi-actor approaches require a common methodological framework. This is the case, for example, with the 21 local agendas for culture. Common methodological frameworks greatly facilitate not only technical communication, but also business communications and marketing.

### Summary table

Principles of the approach or initiative	Consequences for methodology	Possible means (mentioned at the workshop)	Possible tools (mentioned at the workshop)
<b>Territorial approach</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• multi-actor, multi-sectoral and multi-scale</li> <li>• “overall quality” initiative</li> <li>• long-term planning for tourism enhancement</li> </ul>			
<i>Overall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of actors and their thinking (culture and tourism)</li> <li>• Knowledge of different concepts of time</li> <li>• Analysis</li> <li>• Indicators of the “actors” and “wealth” of the territories</li> <li>• Evaluation system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multidisciplinary teams with different skills to cater for complexities on the ground</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Territorial diagnostics</li> <li>• Cultural mapping</li> <li>• Unity of reference for impact assessments</li> <li>• “UNESCO – World Heritage” label</li> </ul>
<i>Organization</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local cooperation (local network), also interregional and international</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organizing associates and coordinating the United Nations agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common descriptions</li> </ul>
<i>Economics</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Giving serious attention to the economic issues of heritage</li> <li>• Local approach to development</li> <li>• Job creation and income generation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulating the flow of visitors and the economic consequences</li> <li>• Regional development and management plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combined Products</li> <li>• Project Methodology</li> </ul>
<b>Participatory approach</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encouraging the local population to take ownership of its heritage (precondition for developing tourism and increasing provision).</li> <li>• Mobilizing actors for quality initiatives</li> <li>• Partnerships: drawing up mutual commitment agreements for all those involved (public/private partnerships)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participatory multi-actor FORUM</li> <li>• Strategic Impact Study</li> <li>• Facilitating body (UNESCO)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intermediation</li> <li>• Working Groups with TOs</li> </ul>
<b>Bottom-up approach</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organizing the tourism provision by theme and tourism market</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting local facilitation and coordination and the use of local expertise to support site management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing all the themes of interest to tourists based on the resources of the area</li> </ul>
<b>Organizational approach</b>			
	Defining a network management system to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• create a facilitation structure specific to each route</li> <li>• organize the transfer of resources between sites on the same route</li> <li>• improve the sharing of benefits and advantages between the sites</li> <li>• organize a system of joint financial cooperation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contractually binding commitments by all parties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specialized communication tools</li> <li>• Website</li> <li>• Organizing twinning by themes</li> <li>• Equalization fund under multipartite management</li> </ul>
<b>Training-based approach</b>			
	Defining: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the type of evaluation and capitalization for the projects</li> <li>• Methods for training managers of sites and routes</li> <li>• Training in management, networking, communications, and in devising and distributing products</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observatories</li> <li>• Skills platform and Resource Centre of the Network</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation matrix</li> <li>• e-learning training modules</li> <li>• Criteria and indicators of progress</li> </ul>

<b>Education-based approach</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On meaning, values and sustainability</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting local facilitation and coordination and the use of local expertise to support site management</li> <li>• Training in management, networking, communications, and in devising and distributing products</li> <li>• Repositioning the role of the institutions (UNESCO) in relation to the territories</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing partnerships to carry out meaningful marketing projects</li> <li>• Voluntary work by young people (together with schools).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specialized communications tools</li> <li>• Charters</li> <li>• Heritage learning centre</li> <li>• Resource sites to respond to various questions about the heritage and the routes.</li> </ul>

## SECOND MEETING

### THE CHALLENGES OF DISTANCE TRAINING AND E-LEARNING

#### Outline of the key issues by Valéry Patin

In this area (heritage management and enhancement), educational needs are very great. To date, the institutions, in particular UNESCO, have taken action giving priority to conservation management and the protection and cultural enhancement of sites. The management of tourism, promotion and communications, the economy and the involvement of the local population groups were addressed incompletely, in view of their importance on the ground and the studies and research conducted in those fields in recent years. Here, too, efforts are being made, but very late in the day, and are hampered by a degree of inability to tackle the economic issues associated with heritage seriously. The management of heritage tourism depends primarily, however, on controlling both the flow of visitors and the tourism economy. These two subjects must feature prominently in such education, with due attention being paid nonetheless to the primary issues of protection and conservation. Likewise, the presentation of sites to tourists who spend an average of about two hours on the site, wherever it may be, also calls for a break with traditional approaches, which were devised in the main by scientists with little knowledge of realities on the ground, in pursuit of themes that are closer to the concept of interpretation predominant in English-speaking countries.

In addition, such education primarily targets people in a wide variety of countries and regions who initiate or formulate policies to enhance the tourism potential of their heritage. They must therefore take the individual characteristics of this diversified audience into account. Development conditions vary according to the nature and intensity of the tourism in any given region. They also differ according to the legal framework established to protect the heritage and the facilities that can be provided for tourists. Owing to these unique local features, education must be designed to take a situational typology into account. The same is true where conservation, protection and inventory issues are concerned, as they vary according to whether or not the countries have the technical means or the human and financial resources for implementation and management purposes.

#### THE NEEDS IDENTIFIED

- Ask the key questions in respect of training (financing, planning, management, etc.): what training strategies (for developing sustainable heritage tourism), what teaching and what networking methods are required, and on what scale, to provide those national officials with site management methods?
- Harmonize the vocabulary and help all stakeholders to speak the same language (build a common culture).
- List available expertise (techniques, experts, training institutions, training courses, etc.) in order to facilitate harmonization and coordination (learning networks).

- Collect data on both the positive and negative impacts of tourism at the on-site level, on local populations, the environment, etc.
- Analyse the data in order to establish a link between the impact assessed and the management method (using management criteria).

Recourse to e-learning meets changing needs and logically integrates the new technologies into education. It often gives students access to supplementary courses, with optimum cost and time savings, thus increasing their autonomy and building their skills. These courses, complementing those attended in person in the universities, allow:

- the teachers to support their students in taking the first steps towards a professional career, including outside the university (sometimes at the place of training),
- the students to pursue their studies at their own pace, depending on their goals and needs, and to maintain contact with the university network.

This tool provides professionals with effective in-service training and occasional support on a given subject or selected techniques, depending on their needs. It must always be attractive and easy to access.

To meet needs in respect of information, the sharing of knowledge, training and expertise, the network must be capable of establishing a real platform for work and discussion, while gathering and updating data and information (the strategic and documentary monitoring function).

The proposals made at the Network's last two meetings were reviewed and the most suitable solutions in the light of the Network's time and organizational constraints were examined. The participants were required to reflect on the simplest and most effective means of keeping informed, exchanging ideas and identifying what the Network offered so that it could become an international centre of expertise in the provision of services. The Network must be flexible enough both to meet the needs of students and to provide "customized" services for professionals. It must also prove its capacities in training, management, research and expertise and act as a resource centre if it is to become the partner of choice of the actors in the field and of the institutions, in particular the World Heritage Centre.

The points raised are listed below:

- Presentation of e-learning and discussion of its advantages and disadvantages.
- Limitations arising from current copyright laws.
- Communication system adapted for Network members, the list server, updating the Chair's website: the database, ongoing projects, members' contact details, etc.
- Organization into working sub-groups to respond to calls for tender.
- Optimization of North/South, South/North and South/South transfers.
- Means of establishing educational and technological monitoring.
- Ongoing projects.
- Database of academic dissertations and theses.

Several participants presented their e-learning modules based on various software programmes (WebCT, MOODLE, MOS, BLACKBOARD, etc.) The courses offered by Laval University (Quebec) were presented by Laurent Bourdeau, those of Queensland (Australia) by Amareswar Galla and those of the Dublin Institute of Technology (Ireland) by Kevin Griffin. Bernard Morucci presented a module assembled in a few hours to show how relatively easy it is to combine various media into a single e-learning course in order to meet demands from various quarters in a flexible manner.

E-learning requires effort to become familiar with it in the initial stages, but this is largely rewarded in the medium and long term. At the outset, teachers must be ready to take the time to develop new tools and new approaches to work and communication. Universities must also budget to cover software costs, which can be very high.

That said, the advantages of e-learning are numerous:

- ease of updating and publishing;
- adaptable to meet specific expectations;
- scope for high-quality content (graphics, multimedia, etc.);
- feedback is easy and learning programmes can be developed jointly;
- creation and re-use of data (modules);
- distance learning capability (mix of distance and “in person” learning);
- training is simplified;
- time and money saved;
- ease of communication between student and trainer.

The benefits for students in terms of interactivity, working autonomy, cooperation and encouragement to work together are numerous. Its usefulness to professionals is equally obvious, provided that:

- the conditions of use and the goals are clearly defined;
- the content is adapted to meet expectations;
- the degree of interaction is defined;
- there is a sufficient amount of input;
- costs are forecast;
- translation issues are resolved;
- provision is made for converting materials for those who do not have Internet access;
- module designers maintain high standards constantly.

As an example of a programme structure designed to protect and promote the heritage, the ATHĀR Programme (Conservation of the Archaeological Heritage in the Arab Region, 2004-2012) was presented by Zaki Aslan of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM). This example led to a discussion about training methods on the ground and brought out the problems involved in using a bottom-up approach. Applied courses on management of heritage sites (Bosra and Damascus, Syria, 24 January-3 February 2005, in collaboration with the UNESCO Office in Beirut), and the regional seminar on the Practical Manual: Introducing Young People to Heritage Site Management and Protection, Tunis, 11-13 February 2005, were mentioned as illustrations and examples of the cooperation that could be achieved through the Network.

Participants also spoke about the projects on which they are working and bodies that could become partners, such as the Pacific Asia Observatory for Cultural Diversity in Human Development, presented by Amareswar Galla, which supports a number of projects on the themes of the workshop: cultural mapping and heritage tourism in Phnom Penh, a training programme concerning World Heritage sites in Viet Nam, etc.

### 3. Functioning of the Network

In parallel with the discussions on the networking of sites and on training methods, the participants clarified a number of points on the functioning of the Network, its added value, the complementarity of its competences, the independence of the network and academics, and so on. The outcome of those exchanges was a plan of action for 2008 endorsed by all present (see below).

Bernard Morucci, as Network Coordinator, emphasized the need not to try to cover too broad a field of study, but to concentrate on “sustainable” management of heritage tourism. He clarified the distinction between “cultural tourism” and “developing sustainable heritage tourism”, the latter being the concept preferred by the Chair since its inauguration.

“Cultural tourism refers to all the relations between tourism and the various forms of cultural expression. It might be a visit to a museum, site or monument, attending a historical, musical or theatrical performance, or savouring a landscape, but it might equally involve taking part in traditional festivities or living with one of the local people. The scope of cultural tourism also extends to the study of the cultural effects of meetings between tourists and the host populations (acculturation, social change).

Without neglecting the anthropological aspects of cultural contacts, “developing sustainable heritage tourism” – or, more succinctly, *heritage tourism* – is more especially interested in ways of protecting, optimizing and managing the various forms of tangible and intangible heritage with a view to the development of sustainable tourism.”

Ref. Apd ICOMOS

During the discussion on partnerships, participants stressed their determination not to be cut off from the field, from private sector actors and from other institutions, and at the same time to maintain independence and high ethical and scientific standards.

Several partnerships were proposed, in particular by Katalin Czippan of the World Conservation Union (IUCN), based on the strong potential for cooperation in the common field of heritage preservation; a partnership agreement was suggested, as was the exchange of information via the websites and the newsletter.

Marielle Richon proposed that those members wishing to do so could become members of the “Forum UNESCO – University and Heritage” by sharing their experiences on how networks functioned, the importance of clarifying what was their added value and regularly communicating to show the advantages of membership.

A questionnaire was drawn up and sent to the participants to gather specific information that will enable the Network to be presented in all its diverse aspects, showing its openness to internal debate and the services it provides. The Network must be able to offer different products that are adapted to needs on the ground and the needs of the institutions.

The work priorities remain to be clarified, depending on what the members of the Network decide in the coming weeks. However, new training needs are already generating great interest among the participants. It only remains to structure the work of exchanging information and examining the issues.

Three priority areas of work were proposed, with referents still to be identified.

- (1) Creation of an e-learning module, with the UNESCO Chair label, on the management of sustainable tourism at cultural sites: this module should demonstrate how the Network can work together and should serve as the basis for a course that can be adapted to suit different needs. This working group will be required to establish the conditions for the successful transfer of information depending on the expectations described.
- (2) Research-action project on the methodology of cultural routes and itineraries; the Route of the Phoenicians and the Hannibal Route were mentioned as examples of what their scope might be. Stronger cooperation with the European Institute of Cultural Routes was desired. It was proposed that a glossary of concepts specific to the subject be compiled for shared use by the members of the Network.
- (3) Establishment of a skills platform (resource centre and strategic monitoring): this platform is indispensable in order to gather and organize all of the data and to transmit information. This working group must be able to optimize communication methods within the Network, the exchange of information and the updating of data.

These three lines of enquiry were proposed in order to pursue the discussions that took place in the workshop and answer the questions posed, in the spirit of cooperation and innovation that can be seen in the plan of action drawn up and validated by the participants.

**Plan of action of the UNESCO/UNITWIN Network on “Culture, Tourism and Development”, Rimini, 21-23 September 2007**

**Recalling the specific nature and the added value of the UNESCO/UNITWIN Culture, Tourism and Development Network of the University Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne, coordinated by Professor Bernard Morucci, namely:**

- action to address the “development of sustainable heritage tourism” at the international level (this concept being different from that of “cultural tourism”),
- long term sharing of expertise between universities, institutions and professionals from both North and South to take up the challenge of poverty eradication, institute dialogue on cultural diversity and ensure that local people (communities and indigenous peoples) play a full part in tourism projects,

- capacity to facilitate exchanges of information, mobilize multidisciplinary teams and benefit from the complementarity of “South and North” approaches so as to innovate and devise flexible and tailored responses to the demands not only of students but of institutions and professionals as part of continuing education,
- capacity to meet the requests of the World Heritage Centre in respect of training, the development of sustainable heritage tourism and the management of sites,
- forms of cooperation and the establishment of partnerships as part of public-private projects relating to the network’s main theme (the development of sustainable heritage tourism) in order to influence tourism stakeholders in keeping with the network’s and UNESCO’s philosophy,
- Practical implementation of the forms of cooperation proposed before and during the workshop by the representatives of ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN.

**Remaining vigilant as to the issues involved in international cooperation (by ensuring that Western approaches are not the only ones used, that rights of authorship are respected, ethical issues addressed and the independence of the network upheld, and taking into account the lack of financial means of some universities and their low level of participation),**

**The workshop participants have agreed to:**

- (1) Facilitate exchanges of information both between the members and partners of the Network (by setting up a suitable system of remote communication, updating the website and clarifying and understanding the competences of each member university) and externally (by newsletter, participation in conferences, responding to calls for tender, especially from the World Heritage Centre, etc.);
- (2) Launch three main areas of focus for its work: (a) the creation of an e-learning module, with the UNESCO Chair label on the management of sustainable tourism at cultural sites; (b) a project for research and action on the methodology of cultural routes and itineraries; and (c) the establishment of a skills platform (resource centre, strategic monitoring);
- (3) Establish working sub-groups on these main areas of focus, each having a referent whose role is both to coordinate the work of the group and to keep the entire Network regularly informed.
- (4) Respond to the various proposals to cooperate on:
  - the tools and methods used in the sustainable management of cultural sites and itineraries;
  - the development of a database (with an online tourism glossary, a collection of student dissertations, etc.);
  - partnership projects exclusively on Network issues, such as the one with *National Geographic* on the compilation of electronic tourist guides;
  - preparation of the Network’s contribution to the UNESCO International Conference on Tourism at World Heritage sites, scheduled for 2009;
  - preparation of the workshop of the Network and the meetings to be held in the autumn of 2008 (Laval-Quebec and/or Leeds).





## ANNEXES

### 1. Statement by Hervé Barré (UNESCO, World Heritage Centre)

“Strengthening the partnership with UNESCO”

Mr Mayor of Rimini,  
Distinguished Rector of the University,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Having been called upon – such is the privilege and the duty of the international civil servant – to represent the Director-General of UNESCO at an official event in Switzerland, I regret that I am unable to take part in your work, but I have asked Professor Morucci to be kind enough to read this short statement on my behalf.

The Network of Universities for “Culture, Tourism and Development” under UNESCO’s UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs programme was established on 11 November 2002 on the initiative of the UNESCO Chair at the University of Paris 1 – Panthéon-Sorbonne, and I should like to commend the successive Presidents of that university for their commitment and the remarkable work of facilitation done by the Network Coordinator, Professor Bernard Morucci, without whom, as we know, this network would never have the relevance it has today, as the Secretariat well knows. I should also like to extend warm greetings and thanks to those universities that play a part in the life of the Network and enrich its debates through their contributions.

On behalf of UNESCO, I offer sincere thanks to the Mayor of Rimini, and to Dr Fiorella Dallari and the University of Bologna for hosting and organizing this workshop. Thanks are also due to Professor Morucci, Laure Veirier and the entire team involved in organizing this workshop.

The aims of this programme, we should remind ourselves, are to build capacities – of both teachers and universities – by means of cooperation and exchanges, not only North-South but also South-South and North-North. This Network spreads the concepts, principles and approaches of the relationship between culture, tourism and development contained in its instruments of reference, including the major international Conventions such as the 1972 Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and the 2005 Convention on cultural policy, as well as the conclusions of the International Conferences and Summits on Cultural Policy in Stockholm in 1998 and on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2001. The first two meetings of the universities in the Network, held in March 2005 in Paris and in May 2006 at Gréoux, in France, bore witness to the shared advantages to UNESCO and universities from all regions of the world of cooperating within the framework of UNESCO’s programme of UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN Networks.

UNESCO is now seeking to move to a new level by strengthening its partnership with the academic world.

UNESCO considered, in fact, that the partnership with the universities had not been given the importance it deserved, and has embarked on an examination of ways and means of boosting its cooperation with the universities and of making it more effective, by upgrading its programme of UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN Networks.

The main thrust of the process of upgrading the UNESCO Chairs and Networks programme can be summarized as:

- (1) confirming the functions of the Chairs and Networks in research, cooperation and know-how transfer, while reinforcing interaction with the UNESCO programmes with which the Chairs and networks need to be more “in step”;
- (2) building a true partnership between UNESCO, its programmes, Secretariat, and National Commissions on the one hand and the university Chairs and Networks on the other. The primary aim of this partnership is for the universities to be able to make a full intellectual contribution so that UNESCO’s programmes can draw on the wealth of their debates, their research findings and the benefits of their numerous forms of cooperation. The other aim is for the Chairs and Networks to come together, as partners, in order to achieve the programme’s objectives, by contributing their competence and expertise and serving as an indispensable bridge between UNESCO, the intellectual community and civil society;
- (3) using the UNITWIN Networks as the basis for creating “centres of excellence”, by which is meant a group of higher education and training institutions and research units involved in innovative joint projects. The intention is to include the themes of these projects in UNESCO’s priority areas and to attain a “critical mass” that will assure them of high quality and international visibility.

Bringing the UNESCO “cultural tourism” programme under the aegis of the World Heritage Centre (which manages the 1972 Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage) can provide the Network a new field of action, under its Cooperation Agreement with UNESCO, that is more attuned to the practical demands of Member States in implementing the 1972 Convention mentioned earlier.

The issue of how to manage tourism appropriately, on the one hand, in relation to the preservation of the “outstanding universal value” of cultural and natural sites that justified their inclusion in the World Heritage List, and on the other in relation to local people and development, has today become a major topic for consideration by site managers and by States.

The World Heritage Committee’s working document that gives a status report on the conservation of the sites often warns the authorities concerned of the risk that, unless a tourism management plan is in place, excessive pressure will be created and will undermine the authenticity and integrity of the site. It therefore calls on the State in question to take appropriate measures in the form of a tourism management plan or by training tourism managers.

What is true for the 851 cultural and natural sites on the World Heritage List must serve as an example for all those sites that are not listed, as the principles of the 1972 Convention, an international standard-setting instrument adopted by all the Member States of UNESCO, is a reference in the fields of heritage preservation, management and enhancement.

This opens up an opportunity for the Network, if it so wishes, to become more closely associated with UNESCO’s sustainable tourism programme, by helping its Member States to take up the challenges that they face in the area of sustainable tourism. This would be an academic partnership to complement our partnership with the tourist industry under the Tour Operators’ Initiative (TOI).

The agenda items in the programme of work of the Bologna workshop are consistent with the objectives of UNESCO’s sustainable tourism programme and address the need for capacity-building, cooperation and the exchange of experiences and good practices in the management and

encouragement of tourism and development in these areas for the sustainable preservation of the cultural and natural heritage.

The Network may also cooperate with the UNESCO World Heritage Committee's advisory bodies whose representatives I welcome to this workshop – which play a part, among other things, in examining nomination files – namely the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), which should be involved in training activities, including those covering the tourism aspects of management of World Heritage sites.

The Network's universities members are thus required to contribute, as UNESCO's partners, to the achievement of the objectives and ideals of the United Nations in building a more caring world, in which respect for cultural diversity goes hand in hand with sustainable development in aspiring to peace.

I wish you every success in your work, and I again express my regret that I cannot join you.



**2. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**  
(including those absent with apologies)

Zaki ASLAN	ICCROM	<a href="mailto:za@iccrom.org">za@iccrom.org</a>
Antonio BARONE	La Rotta dei Fenici, Italy	<a href="mailto:rottadeifenici@libero.it">rottadeifenici@libero.it</a>
Hervé BARRE	UNESCO, CPM	<a href="mailto:h.barre@unesco.org">h.barre@unesco.org</a>
Laurent BOURDEAU	Laval University – Quebec (Canada)	<a href="mailto:laurent.bourdeau@fsa.ulaval.ca">laurent.bourdeau@fsa.ulaval.ca</a>
Hélène CONWAY	Dublin Institute of Technology (Ireland)	<a href="mailto:helene.conway@dit.ie">helene.conway@dit.ie</a>
Gilles CISTAC	Eduardo Mondlane University (Mozambique)	<a href="mailto:gcistac@gmail.com">gcistac@gmail.com</a>
Katalin CZIPPAN	IUCN	<a href="mailto:czippank@vnet.hu">czippank@vnet.hu</a>
Fiorella DALLARI	University of Bologna, at Rimini (Italie)	<a href="mailto:dallari@spbo.unibo.it">dallari@spbo.unibo.it</a>
Amareswar GALLA	The University of Queensland (Australia)	<a href="mailto:a.galla@uq.edu.au">a.galla@uq.edu.au</a>
Kevin GRIFFIN	Dublin Institute of Technology (Ireland)	<a href="mailto:kevin.griffin@dit.ie">kevin.griffin@dit.ie</a>
Tomke LASK	University of Liège (Belgium)	<a href="mailto:tclask@ulg.ac.be">tclask@ulg.ac.be</a>
Alain LAURENT	Consultant (Beira cfp)	<a href="mailto:beira.cfp@wanadoo.fr">beira.cfp@wanadoo.fr</a>
Marton LENGYEL	Heller Farkas School (Hungary)	<a href="mailto:m.lengyel@axelero.hu">m.lengyel@axelero.hu</a>
Yoel MANSFELD	University of Haifa (Israel)	<a href="mailto:yoel@geo.haifa.ac.il">yoel@geo.haifa.ac.il</a>
Alessia MARIOTTI	University of Bologna, at Rimini (Italy)	<a href="mailto:alessia_mariotti@yahoo.it">alessia_mariotti@yahoo.it</a>
Juan Carlos MATAMALA	University of Barcelona (Spain)	<a href="mailto:jcmatamala@ub.edu">jcmatamala@ub.edu</a>
Xavier MEDINA	IEMED	<a href="mailto:fxmedina@iemed.org">fxmedina@iemed.org</a>
Valérie PATIN	ICCOMOS	<a href="mailto:ypatin@wanadoo.fr">ypatin@wanadoo.fr</a>
Arthur PEDERSEN	UNESCO, CPM	<a href="mailto:a.pedersen@unesco.org">a.pedersen@unesco.org</a>
Mike ROBINSON	Leeds University (UK)	<a href="mailto:M.D.Robinson@leedsmet.ac.uk">M.D.Robinson@leedsmet.ac.uk</a>
Bernard MORUCCI	University Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne, Network Coordinator	<a href="mailto:chunesco@univ-paris1.fr">chunesco@univ-paris1.fr</a>
Marielle RICHON	UNESCO, CPM	<a href="mailto:m.richon@unesco.org">m.richon@unesco.org</a>
Jordi Juan TRESSERAS	University of Barcelona (Spain)	<a href="mailto:jjuan@ub.edu">jjuan@ub.edu</a>
Elena TURCOV	University of Chisinau (Moldova)	<a href="mailto:turcova@ase.md">turcova@ase.md</a>
François VELLAS	University of Toulouse (France)	<a href="mailto:fvellas@gmail.com">fvellas@gmail.com</a>
Laure VEIRIER	Consultant (Interstices)	<a href="mailto:laure.veirier@yahoo.fr">laure.veirier@yahoo.fr</a>