



Sustainable tourism and natural World Heritage

Priorities for action

Maria Ana Borges, Giulia Carbone, Robyn Bushell and Tilman Jaeger

January 2011



Sustainable tourism and natural World Heritage

Priorities for action

Maria Ana Borges, Giulia Carbone, Robyn Bushell and Tilman Jaeger

January 2011

The designation of geographical entities in this book, and the presentation of the material, do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IUCN concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN.

Published by: IUCN, Gland, Switzerland

Copyright: © 2011 International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources

Reproduction of this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes is authorized without prior written permission from the copyright holder provided the source is fully acknowledged.

Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission of the copyright holder.

Citation: Borges, M.A., Carbone, G., Bushell, R. and Jaeger, T. (2011) *Sustainable Tourism and natural World Heritage – Priorities for action*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. 29pp.

ISBN: 978-2-8317-1339-7

Cover photo: Ngorongoro Conservation Area, Tanzania © IUCN/David Sheppard.

Layout by: Maria Ana Borges

Available from: http://www.iucn.org/knowledge/publications_doc/publications/

Sustainable tourism and natural World Heritage

Priorities for action

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
1. Introduction: World Heritage and tourism	3
2. Methodology	5
3. Tourism driven impacts on natural World Heritage.....	7
3.1 Negative impacts (Threats).....	8
3.2 Positive impacts (Opportunities)	10
4. Attaining sustainable tourism	11
4.1 Understanding the context.....	11
4.2 Planning for tourism.....	11
4.3 Governance of tourism	12
4.4 Stakeholder involvement in site governance and management	14
4.5 The role of the private sector.....	14
4.6 Making use of effective communication tools to add value to a site	15
5. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	17
6. Implications for further studies	18
7. References	20
Appendix I: Criteria for the assessment of Outstanding Universal Value	21
Appendix I: Criteria for the assessment of Outstanding Universal Value	21
Appendix II: Detailed information on the case study sites.....	22
Appendix III: Proposed Principles for Sustainable Tourism at World Heritage Properties....	28
Appendix IV: Survey questions for follow up study	29

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the contribution of the experts interviewed for the study, without which this paper would not have been possible: Paul Dingwall, Andrew Drumm, Bui Thi Thu Hien, John MacKinnon, Bernard O'Callaghan, Tim O'Loughlin, Allen Putney, Robbie Robinson, Pedro Rosabal, Rami Salman, Chris Sampson, Andrew Scanlon, Andrew Seidl and Elizabeth Williams. A special thank you goes to Annelie Fincke for her preliminary research into the subject and her important role in collecting and compiling the data. Many thanks also to the IUCN colleagues that provided comments and feedback at different stages of the project including, Mariam Kenza Ali, Tim Badman, Josephine Langley, Leticia Leitão, and Peter Shadie.

1. Introduction: World Heritage and tourism

The inscription of a property in the World Heritage List is not only the recognition of its outstanding universal value and integrity but also the recognition of the need to protect and manage it (Edroma, 2004). Together, these sites constitute the common heritage of humanity, contributing to the conservation of globally important cultural and natural areas as well as to the processes associated to these sites. In order for a site to be inscribed in the World Heritage List, it must meet at least one of the ten criteria of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) described by the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (UNESCO, 2008) (see the list of criteria in Appendix I). At present, the World Heritage List includes 911 properties of which 704 are cultural, 180 natural and 27 mixed sites.

The 180 natural sites inscribed in the list are extremely diverse, occurring in all regions of the globe and showcasing universally outstanding biomes, ecosystems as well as geological and evolutionary processes. Natural properties are nominated according to four of a total of ten criteria for OUV. These four criteria recognise sites that are of exceptional natural beauty, outstanding examples of major stages of the earth's history represent significant ongoing biological and ecological processes and/or contain the most important natural habitats for the conservation of biodiversity (Appendix I). Well known sites in the list include the Great Barrier Reef in Australia, the Galapagos Islands in Ecuador, Ha Long Bay in Vietnam and the Victoria Falls in Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Diversity in these sites is not limited to their physical features, but also encompasses an inseparable human component. Firstly, there are many stakeholders in World Heritage Sites: Local communities, traditional owners and custodians of these places have very strong cultural connections (Borrini-Feyerabend et al, 2004) and a multitude of other stakeholders may also have an interest in the site including local, national and regional authorities, tourists, the tourism industry and the international community. Secondly, stakeholder involvement and the dynamics between stakeholders can vary between sites. Thirdly, the way the site is governed and managed also changes from site to site and is both dependent and affected by the physical and human characteristics of the site. Furthermore, the management of the site for tourism requires its integration into the wider landscape surrounding the site, and consideration in relation to the tourism destination as a whole.

The World Heritage name is well recognised worldwide and often attracts attention from tourism players, particularly tour operators, tourism developers and tourists themselves. The fact that the label represents "Outstanding Universal Value" gives tourists the expectation that visiting the site will be a unique experience and at the same time provides the tourism industry with an easily promoted and almost fail-proof destination. World Heritage Sites are therefore amongst the most popular and heavily promoted attractions in a variety of countries (Buckley, 2004). Moreover, tourism development in such sites can have important implications for their protection. On the one hand, tourism has the potential to bring about economic benefits that support site conservation and the local/national economy, but on the other, uncontrolled and poorly managed tourism can have severe consequences for the site's integrity, compromise its OUV, as well as having social and cultural impacts (Tourtellot, 2007).

Gaps exist in our understanding of how tourism development affects natural World Heritage Sites, including the nature and extent of different types of impacts from tourism in and around sites, and the underlying reasons for these. A clearer understanding is also required with regards to how the different players (tourism industry, tourists, local authorities...) contribute to such impacts and which of these groups can be considered the drivers of change. Furthermore, better knowledge of the level of integration (e.g in terms of governance, management, funding, land-use planning, tourism development and destination management) of World Heritage Sites in the wider landscape would be beneficial. In light of these gaps, it is important to determine how the World Heritage status and mechanisms can be used more effectively to address the current challenges.

The aim of this study is to examine the aforementioned gaps in order to support the development of sustainable tourism in natural World Heritage Sites. Through an increased understanding of the risks and opportunities associated to tourism development and growth in World Heritage, this study hopes to encourage tourism development that while protecting the integrity of the site, also brings income generation opportunities for local communities associated with World Heritage Sites, offers financial

and other support for the conservation of the sites, and contributes to visitors' awareness about the values of nature. To help achieve the aim, the study has four key objectives:

- Provide an up-to-date analysis of tourism driven impacts (positive and negative) on natural World Heritage Sites and adjacent areas.
- Identify the key factors contributing to the current situation.
- Illustrate the complexity of developing tourism in World Heritage Sites through the analysis of World Heritage Committee documents and the collection of case studies.
- Prepare the grounds for a follow up study on management response and best practices to address tourism risks and opportunities.

The "Sustainable Tourism and natural World Heritage – Priorities for action" paper is structured as follows:

- **Section 1** provides an introduction to the study.
- **Section 2** describes the methodology used to research tourism development in World Heritage Sites as well as the underlying assumptions and limitations of the study.
- **Section 3** summarises the key impacts from tourism development and examines the root causes for the issues associated with developing tourism in World Heritage Sites.
- **Section 4** outlines some key processes that need to be in place for sustainable tourism development in natural World Heritage Sites and presents the potential role of IUCN in supporting such development.
- **Section 5** makes some recommendations for the more effective management of tourism in World Heritage Sites.
- **Section 6** proposes follow up research that would fill the current gaps.

2. Methodology

This study commenced in July 2009 and comprised three main components to address the aim and objectives. The first component was a desktop analysis of key documents prepared by the States Parties to the Convention, IUCN, UNESCO World Heritage Centre and/or considered by the World Heritage Committee in the last four years (2006 to 2010). The World Heritage Committee is responsible for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, whereby it defines the use of the World Heritage Fund, decides the inscription and deletion of properties in the World Heritage List as well as examining reports on the state of conservation of inscribed properties.

The review of documents included all the State of Conservation (SoC) reports, mission reports and periodic reports produced in the last 4 years as well as some documents dating further back. News articles related to the theme of “tourism and world heritage” (using Google) were also collected for the last 2 years and incorporated into the research.

The second component of the study was to select a number of World Heritage Sites to study in more depth. The selection was done based on the results of the desktop research and included sites that were mentioned in Committee meetings for having tourism-related issues as well as sites that showed exemplary tourism development. Another criterion for selecting the sites was whether a recent mission had been carried out to the site. A total of twelve sites were chosen with a wide regional distribution and representing a broad range of types of natural World Heritage Sites (see Appendix II for information on the sites selected).

For each of the twelve selected sites, interviews of key experts were carried out and additional documents analysed. Most of the experts interviewed had either recently been on an official IUCN mission to the site, or were familiar with it, and its development since nomination having visited the site at regular intervals. The interview questions varied based on the background information available for each site, but generally reflected the following themes:

- Tourism-related impacts to sites;
- Tourism industry involvement in developing/managing the site;
- Stakeholder collaboration in the site;
- Initiatives promoting sustainable tourism;
- Request for up to date information/documents on the site.

The final component of the study was to propose a way forward for a follow up study based on the findings of the research and the “Principles for Sustainable Tourism at World Heritage Properties”. These principles were formulated as a component of the World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme whose role is to develop best practice policy guidance for the management of tourism in World Heritage properties (see Appendix III for the list of principles). A survey aimed at World Heritage site managers was also developed. For the twelve selected sites, additional contacts were collected.

The study enabled mapping existing mentions of tourism in World Heritage documents. Table 1 describes how the information obtained was organised (this information can be obtained from IUCN).

Preliminary results of this study were presented in Mogao, China at the “Advancing Sustainable Tourism at Cultural and Natural Heritage Sites: A workshop” in September 2009.

Table 1 – Information collected from interviews and desktop research

Desktop Research	Interviews
Four documents listing all mentions of tourism at natural and mixed World Heritage Sites during WH committee meetings in 2006 (30 th), 2007 (31 st), 2008 (32 nd), and 2009 (33 rd)	Notes from the interviews to the experts listed in Appendix II
List of all natural and mixed World Heritage Sites identifying WH documents produced for each site in the last 5 years and with a summary of the mentions of tourism for these sites (incomplete)	For each selected site, a compilation of all mentions of tourism in mission report, state of conservation reports and periodic reports
Hard copies of news articles about tourism in natural and mixed World Heritage Sites	A table summarising the information obtained from interviews and documents studied (Appendix III)
List of all WH in danger and the main reason for this	Additional documents provided by experts

Assumptions and Limitations

The study was based on the assumption that surveying experts with knowledge of the case study sites would be a reasonable way to obtain an up to date overview of each site. However, this approach may have a few limitations, including:

- Bias of the expert's personal opinion;
- Interpretation of other stakeholder's views by a third party;
- Incomplete knowledge of the site (including of impacts, challenges and dynamics between stakeholders);
- Some experts had not been back to the site in the last two years.

This assumption and limitation was in part addressed by the desktop review of documents which often served as a complement to the information provided by the experts.

3. Tourism driven impacts on natural World Heritage

Tourism is often praised for its ability to reconcile conservation and development goals in or near protected areas (Ashworth & van der Aa, 2006; Figgis & Bushell, 2007). From a conservation perspective, tourism can raise funds for protecting natural areas, enhance local and tourist awareness of biodiversity and conservation issues as well as discourage local people from unsustainable livelihoods. From a development perspective, tourism revenue may reduce poverty by stimulating business development and job creation that is in principle compatible with biodiversity conservation as well as enhancing local services, and through improved education empower local people to advocate for the protection of the natural environment. However, if tourism is badly planned and not managed responsibly, it can on the contrary lead to biodiversity loss, ecosystem degradation and negative impacts to local communities. It is therefore essential for tourism that takes place in protected areas to be managed correctly and uphold the principles of sustainable development. Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that the overall goal of a protected area is conservation and in the case of World Heritage Sites there is a particular emphasis on the protection, conservation and presentation of the features that are of OUV.

A recent IUCN study on developing biodiversity businesses explored to some extent the relationship between tourism and protected areas (IUCN, 2009). The study focused on IUCN NGO members that have set up small businesses to solve conservation problems and the majority of the businesses were tourism businesses. One of the key recommendations of the study which relates well to this discussion on impacts was the constant need to keep present the conservation objective behind tourism development. This needs to be clear when establishing the vision for the business and should be integrated in all components of tourism development. This is also vital in developing, managing and monitoring tourism in and around World Heritage Sites.

A study commissioned by the UK Lake District World Heritage Project (Redbanks Consulting & TBR, 2009) compared economic and social benefits of World Heritage inscription on a number of international sites. While it was confirmed as a positive catalyst for change, they found few benefits occur across all sites as a generic outcome of inscription. More effective conservation, partnerships, civic pride, social capital and investment gains seem to follow inscription but tourism advantage is not a given. If a site is already an established destination the effect can be negligible. They also note that averaging findings from studies tends to mask quite large differentials in motivation, actions and performance. And, that these are the more important determinants than inscription, on increases in tourism.

Overall, the research demonstrated that there is a mixed picture of tourism development in Natural World Heritage Sites. It was found that in some cases tourism development is well-planned and occurs in a sustainable manner, whereas in others development occurs rapidly and often without planning or appropriate regulatory control. As expected, an upward trend in visitor numbers which frequently accompanies nomination can be problematic if the correct site protection mechanisms are not in place. In the sites with tourism-related problems, the key negative impacts observed were visitor pressures from unsustainable growth in numbers, invasive/destructive infrastructure development, pollution and social impacts deriving from unrealised expectations. On the other hand, when tourism was well-planned some positive impacts of tourism were achieved including, infrastructure and other developments that enhanced the OUV of the site, as well as conservation and community development goals being supported. Table 2 gives an overview of the tourism-driven impacts of the 12 sites selected and Appendix III provides a more detailed account of these.

Table 2 – Tourism driven impacts to 12 selected natural World Heritage Sites.

Site	Country	Negative Impacts / Threats			Positive/ Negative	Positive Impacts / Opportunities		
		Visitor pressures	Pollution and Waste	Unrealised expectations *	Infrastructure	Improved conservation	Site valued	Community development
Iguazu/Iguaçu	Argentina / Brazil	x			x			
Purnululu NP	Australia			x	x		x	
Tasmanian Wilderness	Australia						x	x
Belize BRS	Belize	x			x			
Jiuzhaigou	China	x			x			
Galapagos	Ecuador	x	x		x			
Wadi Al Hitan	Egypt					x	x	x
Monarch BBR	Mexico	x	x					
East Rennell	Solomon Islands			x				
Canaima NP	Venezuela		x	x	x			
Ha Long Bay	Vietnam	x	x					
Victoria Falls	Zambia/ Zimbabwe	x			x			

*Impacts that derive from expectations being raised include conflicts between communities and with local authorities, lack of support for the management authority, as well as bad publicity for the site through word of mouth from dissatisfied tourists, amongst other things.

3.1 Negative impacts (Threats)

In regards to negative impacts of tourism development, some common trends were reported. Increased visitor pressure is seen as one of the key issues associated with World Heritage Site status and can have severe consequences for the integrity particularly when the increases are either unplanned or very rapid, outstripping the capacity of site infrastructure and management systems to cope. A rapid increase in tourism numbers, particularly when this is not accounted for by the management of the property often threatens the values for which the property was inscribed in the list in the first place. Associated to an increase in visitor numbers are other issues reported in the survey including congestion, heavy traffic, infrastructure development, air, noise and /or water pollution and severe effects to the diversity of the area through physical changes provoked by the presence of large numbers of tourists (e.g. through trampling, disturbance, vandalism etc). A number of indirect effects of high numbers of visitors to an area, such as the introduction of invasive species were also reported.

The Galapagos Islands are a good example of the knock-on effect provoked by increased visitor pressure. Tourism to the islands has grown considerably in recent years leading to a multitude of issues threatening the OUV of the property. First, a high number of entry points with an availability of several transport modes, especially air transport, has facilitated the rapid increase in visitors to the islands.. Second, the increase in numbers and numbers of operators and tour options and activities available has meant that visitors now access areas of the islands that were previously off limits. Other effects of the increases in tourist numbers have included a growth in hotel construction to service tourism, and other operators servicing the area. Third, tourism growth has triggered significant migration from mainland Ecuador for jobs bringing about a very dramatic and unplanned urbanisation pressure to the islands, together with a range of social issues. Collectively, these changes have resulted in many threats to the local flora and fauna of such fragile ecosystems due to the introduction of invasive species, increased and poor waste management, pollution and changes to many of the intangible attributes of the remote site. The Galapagos Islands, among the first inscribed natural World Heritage sites in 1978, were included in the List of World Heritage in Danger (2007), substantially because of the direct and indirect impacts of tourism. Box 1 below gives a more detailed example of another property with high visitor numbers.

Box 1: Managing visitor pressure: The case of Jiuzhaigou

In 1992, Jiuzhaigou Valley Scenic and Historic Interest Area (JZG) in China was inscribed in the World Heritage list under criterion (vii), which denotes landscape beauty and superlative natural phenomena. It subsequently became a UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserve in 1997. At the time of inscription in the World Heritage List, approximately 170,000 visitors came to Jiuzhaigou every year. This number has increased exponentially since then and today over 2 million tourists visit Jiuzhaigou every year. The turnover for the site is approximately 200 million US dollars and it relies almost exclusively on Chinese tourists (90%).

Jiuzhaigou is an example of a site that has experienced increased visitor pressure since its inscription and yet has managed to maintain its Outstanding Universal Value through effective management. Tourism management is the chief priority for the management authority of the site, who has taken several measures to ensure its protection. Some of these measures include: In 1999, a green bus system was initiated to ferry tourists around the site, with no other means of transport being allowed within site boundaries; A daily limit of 12,000 visitors to the park was placed in 2001, but this has recently been raised to 28,000. To minimise impacts within the park, all restaurants and accommodation were removed from the park in 2002 and tourists are no longer allowed to stay in the park overnight.

Jiuzhaigou is also an interesting example of how external factors can have an effect on tourism. In 2008, an earthquake hit Sichuan province which made the area first completely inaccessible and later inaccessible to foreign visitors for political reasons. Tourism to the site stopped temporarily but then site management worked to bring visitors back.

Today, Jiuzhaigou has an essential role as a model for other protected areas in China. Despite this, there are still concerns for the long-term sustainability of maintaining such elevated tourist numbers. A recent mission to the site has recommended that the number of tourists currently visiting the site is reconciled to its capacity, although this is clearly not a straightforward matter. The mushrooming of hotels and restaurants just outside of the park's boundaries is also identified as a source of wider concern regarding the need for effective planning.

Another common problem of tourism growth reported in the study is unplanned and invasive infrastructure development. For instance, in places like Iguazu/Iguaçu National Park, Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls and the Ngorongoro Crater, tourism concessions have not been well planned leading to a proliferation of developments that devalue the sites. One extreme example of infrastructure development threatening the OUV of a site has been occurring in the Belize Barrier Reef System (BBRS). Despite strong concerns from the World Heritage Committee, the lease and development of land within this property for tourism and real estate has reached unsustainable levels. Mangrove cutting and coral dredging are amongst the most immediate effects of such developments. This uncontrolled tourism-related development led to the inclusion of BBRS on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2009.

Pollution and waste also rank highly on the list of tourism-driven impacts to natural World Heritage Sites. These tend to be related to increased visitor numbers and infrastructure development but also to recreational activities that take place in the site. Sites such as Ha Long Bay in Vietnam have seen pollution and waste become a considerable problem over time. The tourism offer is currently limited to boat trips around the bay and there are more than 400 boats in operation which contribute to pollution and decrease in water quality. In addition, most boats do not have adequate methods for waste disposal and/or management. Another issue exacerbating the pollution problem is infrastructure development outside the site boundaries, namely construction of hotels and ports.

The issue of unrealised expectations is another issue often associated with tourism development (Pedersen, 2002). This research showed that local communities are sometimes convinced by site management and the tourism industry that World Heritage nomination will bring about an increase in visitors to the area and with it, positive change. This can lead to a variety of negative consequences for the site, particularly related to local communities who may become antagonistic toward the management authority and even actively threaten the site's integrity. Of the sites studied, East Rennell in the Pacific is a good example of unrealised expectations. The experts interviewed about

this site reported that the local people envisaged that nomination would bring about a major development boost, not just in terms of tourism, but also regarding the building of new hospitals, improving infrastructure and transport within and to the island. The fact that this has not happened has led to local people becoming despondent and could in the future lead to conflicts and threats to the site.

3.2 Positive impacts (Opportunities)

The findings of the study also suggest that tourism development in natural World Heritage sites can be beneficial when planned and managed in a sustainable way. Social, economic and environmental benefits are all achieved when appropriate site protection mechanisms are in place and tourism planning is integrated with site management planning. For instance, economic benefits from tourism development are often vital for managing the site and used for conservation and monitoring activities. In Jiuzhaigou, tourism generated revenue not only supports site management activities and creates jobs, but also benefits local communities and the local government. Whereas in Australia, a study measuring the economic contribution of World Heritage Areas to the state demonstrated that these contribute 16.1 million AUD in annual direct and indirect national output or business turnover (as well as 83,349 direct and indirect national jobs), 95 percent of which derives from visitor expenditure in these sites (Gillespie Economics & BDA group, 2008). A study of the Dorset & East Devon World Heritage site (ERA, 2009) found that World Heritage inscription had “stimulated the creation of a new identity” and this had revitalised the economy in several ways. This included increased investment, increased national and international media coverage, stimulated new infrastructure, services, businesses and products and hence new employment and educational opportunities.

Through tourism and by using appropriate interpretation tools it is also possible to raise awareness of both locals and visitors to the value of a site and the importance of protecting it. In Wadi-Al-Hitan in Egypt, much work has been done to develop the site for tourism with appropriate infrastructure being built, as well as focus being placed on interpretation and capacity building for all staff and surrounding communities. This work began prior to the inscription of the site and as part of a project for the improved management of several Egyptian protected areas. However, once inscribed, focus was placed on this property in order to make it a benchmark for other protected areas in the country.

Community development can be another positive outcome of tourism being developed in World Heritage Sites and has been reported in many sites. Again in Wadi Al-Hitan, tourism development has occurred mainly at small scale and through local communities who offer most of the services available to the visitors. The site management has worked with the local communities to build their capacity in regards to the site but also with regards to building their skills for offering these services to the tourists. Economic development of local communities has been another outcome of well-planned tourism at Wadi Al Hitan. In many of the Australian sites, community involvement has been a priority and not only as regards tourism development but also in managing the sites. Such involvement has been accompanied by capacity building which in turn empowers communities to participate in decision-making. Other sites such as Canaima National Park in Venezuela and Shiretoko in Japan also demonstrate good mechanisms for community involvement and collaboration and ultimately development.

Although some common impacts of tourism development in natural World Heritage Sites were identified throughout the sites, the reasons for these vary considerably and not surprisingly, cannot be easily categorised to a specific cause. The impacts reflect a multitude of relational factors which range from understanding the socio-political context of the site to analysing its management to other issues related to stakeholder participation and communication. In trying to find common threads among sites, the contrasts between them becomes apparent and their diversity striking. Natural World Heritage Sites represent a wide and diverse range of protected areas and should be analysed as such if a framework for sustainable tourism development in these sites is to be reached.

Section 4 looks closely at the factors responsible for positive and negative impacts from tourism on natural World Heritage Sites and extrapolates on of the types of conditions that need to be in place for tourism to develop sustainably in these sites.

4. Attaining sustainable tourism

Although there are many parallels between natural World Heritage Sites there are also many differences. These begin with the nomination criteria that in themselves allow for very different natural characteristics to be inscribed and continue on to differences in area, management regime, traits, species, habitats, and ecosystems as well as the diverse social, political, cultural and economic characteristics. It may therefore be relatively straightforward to identify common impacts amongst them, but it is much more complex to attempt identifying the causes or indicators for these impacts. In fact, comparing these sites in an effort to identify commonalities and extrapolate a set of rules for sustainable tourism development would be over simplistic and lead to quite contrary results. Instead, it may be worth digging deeper and examining the underlying conditions that are required for tourism to be managed sustainably.

It is also important to examine the relationship between the site, buffer zone, surrounding area and destination. In the World Heritage Sites examined, this relationship was often deemed inexistent or at the very least undeveloped. In fact, the authority of site management stops at the boundaries of the sites and there is little that can be done by the site management to control what happens immediately outside it.

Based on the research carried out, some common denominators were identified for sustainable tourism development. These are explained in detail below but generally illustrate that approaches to tourism development and management need to be tailored to the specific conditions of each site. The need for effective and responsible tourism development and management is also apparent.

4.1 Understanding the context

In order to predict how a site will evolve in terms of tourism development, it is important to analyse the context of the site including the social, environmental, economic (market context), political, geographical, and ecological characteristics of the wider area. The Lake District World Heritage Project (2009) confirmed that worldwide there are very significant differentials in motivation, actions and performance following inscription. These of course are themselves a reflection of a range of existing socio-economic and political factors which are inherently site specific. It is also very important to remember that natural areas are dynamic and conditions change, so it is necessary to build a factor of change into this contextual analysis. A good analysis of the site's characteristics as well as of its relationship with the wider destination (including the market, other heritage attractions and national tourism authorities, etc) will allow for context-dependent solutions to be reached and make for much more sustainable planning of tourism. The lack of influence beyond site boundaries requires that site managers need to establish strong relationships with local authorities and tourism operators in order to influence development in buffer zones and surrounding areas. Understanding the full complexity of a site and the existing relationships needs to precede any tourism planning exercise and should also be built into monitoring plans and occur at regular intervals.

4.2 Planning for tourism

Tourism planning is extremely important if the negative impacts of tourism development are to be avoided. Without a concrete plan of what will be done to encourage tourism on the one hand, and on the other, to limit it, there is also the danger that the expectations of local communities, operators and tourists will be unrealistic. Both the tourism and public use plan need to be consistent with the site's plan of management to ensure conflicting activities do not occur. These plans should also be accompanied by a sound business plan.

The World Heritage Committee in its decisions often alludes to the need for newly inscribed properties to develop and submit management and public use plans. This request is often reiterated at regular intervals in committee decisions but little in terms of support and incentives are offered to the properties to ensure that this occurs. The nomination process would be good occasion to advise the States Parties on the complexity and possible consequences of inscription in a more proactive way encouraging solutions at an early stage. Also, the minimum standards for consideration of tourism in nomination processes deserve to be discussed as there may be room for clarification and improvement, including in the nomination form. Meanwhile, rapid growth of tourism could take place leading to a number of the aforementioned negative impacts and ultimately threats to the OUV of the

site. On the other hand, sites with a proactive attitude to tourism planning reap the benefits of tourism development without suffering the costs. Overall, Australian sites are a good model of tourism planning, with detailed management and tourism plans being developed even prior to nomination. In the Australian context value-based planning models encourage wide community debate and participation in the development of plans of management for sites. These plans account for all forms of development and landuse that might be permitted in and around a site, under what conditions and what will be excluded. The process involves multiple levels of government in order to identify anomalies and loop holes but also to allow community debate to influence government regulations and site management priorities. These processes have seen a considerable increase in productive partnerships between protected area management agencies, government tourism departments and the tourism industry, including the adoption of codes of conduct and accreditation schemes that allow for greater compliance and quality assurance mechanisms.

Another important consideration related to tourism planning is whether site plans for tourism support the destination's approach to tourism and on the flipside, if the overall destination promotes a type of tourism that is in line with the OUV of the World Heritage Sites. This does not seem to be the case on several of the World Heritage properties with unsustainable tourism development taking place outside the site's boundaries. In places such as Ha Long Bay and Jiuzhaigou for example some of the biggest tourism-related concerns are occurring immediately outside the site due to different government authorities being responsible for overseeing tourism development. The proposed Principles for Sustainable Tourism at World Heritage sites (Appendix III) recommends as noted above, the need to establish strong relationships between site management, local authorities and tourism operators in order to influence a productive tourism development/conservation dynamic.

4.3 Governance of tourism

This relates to the overall political context of the site but more specifically to the relationships between government institutions involved in managing the site or site resources as well as their interaction with those institutions responsible for tourism management in the destination. Good governance and a good working relationship between these institutions often results in sound tourism development and management whereas in places where there is lack of trust between these institutions and lack of transparency overall the opposite occurs. Although rules and regulations are also important, these should not replace open and transparent governance and open communication, they should instead serve as a framework for it. At a forum of World Heritage site managers at the 2008 World Conservation Congress, open, regular, two-way communication with tourism operators was cited repeatedly as one of the most important and productive strategies.

In both the Galapagos Islands and the Belize Barrier Reef governance related issues have created issues in relation to tourism development in these World Heritage Sites. With regards to the Galapagos, political instability at the national level and an incongruence of local and national policies have exacerbated tourism and other management issues in the property. Local authorities would like to see the number of permits to work on the Islands heavily restricted, and rather to train up existing local community, but national authorities keen to support tourism as a key contributor to the national economy have allowed unsustainable and unplanned migration to continue. National government representatives rarely stay in office for more than 12 months whereas local authorities are more stable serving regular terms, this tends to affect their priorities (Mission report, 2006). In Belize, the overriding issues are a combination of real estate pressures with a lack of strong protective legislation supported by effective institutions. However, lack of coordination between government agencies and a proliferation of agencies being responsible for different elements within the site (e.g. the forestry department is responsible for the mangrove areas and the fisheries department for the surrounding marine environments) exacerbate the problem making the overall management of the site difficult and loopholes for unsustainable tourism development easy to find.

Box 2 gives an idea of how governance can affect tourism development by contrasting the different approaches to site development in transboundary properties.

Box 2: Transboundary management: Same site, two approaches?

Quite a few natural World Heritage Sites cross national borders and are therefore managed by two (or more) countries. The relationship between the country entities involved varies considerably from site to site as does the approach to managing the sites. In some cases, countries decide to nominate each site separately whereas in others co-nomination and co-management is the approach chosen. Transboundary management adds to the complexity of managing a World Heritage Sites site but can also bring with it certain benefits including the ability of working together and learning from each other, as well as healthy competition.

For the purpose of this study, the sites below are interesting case studies because they provide the possibility of comparing and contrasting between different but very similar sites and extrapolating what are some prerequisites for good tourism development.

Iguazu/Iguaçu National Park (Argentina/Brazil)

Despite being adjacent to each other, Iguazu and Iguaçu are in effect two different World Heritage Sites that have been nominated and are managed independently. Collaboration between the sites has been difficult in the past due to political and sovereignty issues as well as to some extent competition for tourism revenues. However, this scenario is changing due to recent cooperation for aligning management and public use strategies in both sites and because of an increase in informal collaboration on the ground.

The tourism experiences on offer in both sites are similar and mainly centred around the area of the Iguazu/Iguaçu falls receiving 1 million visitors yearly on each side. Visitation is very well organised on both sides. Where the sites differ is in their approach to managing tourism and in their approach to stakeholder involvement in the site. Governance-related differences between the sites also exist. Over the years, these differences have led the Argentinean side to distinguish itself from the Brazilian side as promoting a more sustainable form of tourism.

In practice, the sites differ on a few key issues. In Iguazu the management authority has been collaborating with private sector players to minimise visual impacts on the property through well-planned concessions, whereas in Iguaçu collaboration between the private sector and the management authority is limited. In regards to infrastructure development, the Argentinean side has been able to create infrastructure that minimally intrudes on the site's scenic beauty, using materials that are ideal for the site, and making sure that any additional developments are made on previously built land at the edge of the park. On the Brazilian side, however, this approach has not been taken and there are several structures that stand out such as the restaurant, the visitor centre and the walkways.

Mosi-oa-Tuna/Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe)

The Mosi-oa-Tuna/Victoria Falls World Heritage Site is a transboundary site that is shared and jointly managed by Zambia and Zimbabwe. Until recently the institutional arrangements for managing and protecting this transboundary property 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. A newly approved joint management plan hopes to reverse this situation and improve collaboration between the two countries.

At present, tourism in the Zimbabwe side is very developed with considerable infrastructure existing close to the fall. On the Zambian side, much less development has occurred, although visitation to this side has increased considerably in the last three years. There is also a lot of interest from the government in beginning to develop the area. Based on discussions with a recent WH mission, Zambia aims to promote a more sustainable form of tourism dispersing visitors around the site to take pressure away from the fall area as well as working with the industry to develop lower impact bush camps in low sensitivity areas.

4.4 Stakeholder involvement in site governance and management

The present research identified stakeholder involvement and participation as extremely important elements for ensuring that tourism development is sustainable. Moreover, this engagement needs to be regular and not just part of a mandatory process. By making sure that all stakeholders are involved from the beginning and throughout, more holistic decision-making can be achieved and enhanced ownership from all parties is possible. Both local communities and the private sector are important players in supporting tourism development and should invariably be afforded a seat at the table.

Collaboration with local communities and their involvement in site management and tourism planning is considered extremely important. However, this adds a lot to the complexity as it is not always easy to determine who in the community needs to be involved and at what level of involvement. Consultation exercises are also often perceived as costly and time-consuming despite the fact that this will not be the case when they are made integral part of the management approach.

An example of successful community involvement is Wadi Al-Hitan, where tourism has been developed at a small scale and with local entrepreneurs. Capacity building around tourism and awareness raising about the site were some of the key priorities of the site management for local communities. Both Jiuzhaigou in China and Purnululu National Park in Australia have invested in community involvement in tourism but with somewhat mixed results due to issues of raised expectations and also due to conflicts between communities and the management authority relating to benefit sharing and land ownership.

Efforts to bring together all stakeholders and promote fully participative tourism development were not evident from the sites studied. Perhaps the “Steps to Sustainable Tourism” programme designed and promoted by the Australian government is the most striking example of a framework for participative tourism development. ‘Steps’ promotes an approach that “fosters a mutual understanding of issues and shows how to work together to achieve a range of sustainable benefits for tourism, communities, the environment and heritage” (Commonwealth of Australia, 2004). This program was designed in two formats in order to specifically address cultural differences in ways of learning and modes of participation amongst traditional Indigenous owners and non-Indigenous Australians.

4.5 The role of the private sector

The findings of this research indicate that links between the tourism industry and the management authority of World Heritage properties are often weak. The private sector is almost always a player in these sites, having a vested interest in ensuring that the expectations of tourists to the site are met. However, given the nature of the tourism industry, private sector involvement is often disorganised with a multitude of companies competing for the tourist dollar. Presence of industry players is most marked outside site boundaries in the form of tourism infrastructure (hotels, restaurants, bars, retail outlets etc.). Within the site, industry presence is regulated through concessions, going from operating tours, cafes, accommodation, through to providing more alternative tourist experiences such as helicopter, hot air balloon and boat rides. The management authority is responsible for the public use of the sites, managing the concessions within the site but has no control or formal influence over how tourism is managed immediately outside site boundaries.

A more coordinated and collaborative approach between site management and industry players would be beneficial in many of the sites studied to ensure sustainable tourism development and management. At present, site management authorities see tourism management almost exclusively as public use of the site and there is limited interaction with private sector players and tourism authorities in the area. Promoting collaboration between these entities would enable a more holistic approach to tourism in the wider area that the site is part of. The example in Australia of the National Landscapes programme is a joint initiative of Parks Australia and Tourism Australia, with extensive involvement of tourism industry bodies and operators at the national planning level and many small tourism businesses at the local area level (Parks Australia, 2010). The Greater Blue Mountains World Heritage Area is one of the national landscapes and the site manager plays an active role on local tourism boards and planning groups in order to influence the industry and to protect the integrity of the site values.

The research shows that in sites where collaboration occurs between the management authority and the private sector, tourism concessions are better planned and the industry is more amenable to requests from the management. This is particularly important for ensuring that visitor pressure is minimised and invasive infrastructure avoided. In the aforementioned case of Iguazu national park, the Argentinean management authority worked with the private sector to plan tourism concessions and infrastructure, therefore minimising impacts to the site (Box 2).

It is also important to recognise that there are many other benefits from collaboration such as resource and expertise sharing, mutual capacity and knowledge building, enhanced visitor experience, and conflict management. The role of the private sector extends beyond minimising impacts to the site. Collaboration and partnerships with the industry are also important in awareness raising and capacity building for tourism development as is shown in the Lindblad Expeditions case study below (Box 3). In Canaima National Park in Venezuela, a partnership between UNESCO, The Nature Conservancy and the industry has been formed to provide planning and business skills to site management, train local communities as entrepreneurs and help find creative approaches for financing the park through sustainable tourism development.

Furthermore, as was demonstrated by a recent IUCN study, “The Time for Biodiversity Business” (IUCN, 2009), private sector has a vital role to play in building capacity for site management on tourism-related issues as well as building the capacities of other local stakeholders in running tourism businesses. The industry has expertise in a multitude of business skills that would support site managers in managing their sites more effectively for tourism, including, monitoring of tourism numbers, product design as well as marketing and promotion. The industry also has the ability to help identify indicators of tourism sustainability that could be used both in World Heritage nomination documents and for monitoring missions.

Box 3: The case of Lindblad Expeditions and the Charles Darwin Foundation

Lindblad Expeditions is one of approximately 70 tour operators operating in the Galapagos. They run high yield tours selling exclusive products/services and are at the same time setting the benchmark for other operators in terms of sustainable tourism development. Lindblad works in partnership with the Charles Darwin Foundation (CDF) providing support in terms of awareness raising and raising funds for conservation. The CDF is a scientific NGO and independent from the government so Lindblad can feel confident that their money is being used to improve the site.

Some key initiatives that have been undertaken through this partnership are:

- **Awareness raising:** A number of campaigns have been undertaken to raise tourist awareness to the importance of this World Heritage Sites including, communication materials with information biodiversity and conservation issues occurring in the Galapagos (e.g. package of postcards with biodiversity conservation messages) and visits to the Charles Darwin research station where visitors can talk to experts and learn about the site.
- **Fundraising:** At the end of each tour Lindblad ask their customers for a cash donation of around 200USD that is reimbursed through a discount voucher of the same amount on their next trip with Lindblad. The donations go directly to the Charles Darwin Research Station and have contributed to their work with more than 4.5 million USD since 1977 (Lindblad is CDF’s biggest donor). Lindblad has recently set up a shop in the centre of town where they also raise tourist awareness of the importance of protecting this unique site as well as supporting the local economy by selling handicrafts made by local community members.
- **Capacity building:** Lindblad also provides training to local people on the different skills necessary for working in tourism, including guiding and cooking (to become chefs in their operations) in order to reduce their dependence on employing immigrants.

4.6 Making use of effective communication tools to add value to a site

In sites where innovative interpretation has been implemented there is clear evidence of visitors engaging with the conservation values and issues of the site. In the Galapagos Islands the partnership between the National Park, the Charles Darwin Research Station and private operators allows visitors to see and hear first hand the alarming facts about the impacts of human activity on the flora and fauna of the site throughout its interesting history, including inappropriate human behaviours

on the island today. The employment of research scientists as guides around the research station provides visitors with privileged insights. In return visitors leave happily knowing their tourist tax is going to a good cause, many purchase souvenirs from the research station which is an important source of revenue, and many of the souvenirs are DVDs and books providing detailed information about the islands natural and social history. The visit to the research station also greatly supports the effort of tour operators like Lindblads to encourage traveller philanthropy. (see Box 3). The use of appropriate communication tools can serve the purpose of both protecting and promoting a site's values. The power of such tools should not be underestimated in achieving sustainable tourism at World Heritage Sites. Communicating World Heritage and conservation values to local communities, the tourism industry and tourists through a variety of mechanisms raises public awareness and promotes the site and its OUV. Well-designed and effective interpretation which can include access to materials and information before, during and after a visit, not only contributes to the visitor experience, it also provides explanations of why the site is precious and should be preserved for future generations, thus meeting the obligations of the World Heritage Convention. Through exciting and innovative interpretation, site managers can foster strong attachment to the site in individuals regardless of the age or background of the visitor.

Appropriate marketing serves a similar purpose to interpretation for tourists who are yet to visit the site. Selective and evocative marketing can target and encourage particular types of visitors to the site. The iconic value of the World Heritage 'brand' is well understood by the tourism industry, and serves as an important aspect of the value adding of the site to the destination as a whole, and as a very significant point of leverage in gaining the cooperation and support from the industry and local authorities.

Overall, the interpretation of sites, the explanation of World Heritage as a concept and use of the World Heritage emblem is not well done in many natural World Heritage Sites. The educational and emotional value of visitation is underestimated. There is need for focus to be placed on reinforcing the use of these tools for both promotion and protection of natural sites.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

This study calls for avoiding a one-size fits all approach to sustainable tourism development in natural World Heritage Sites. In fact, it suggests that a case-by-case and values based approach to tourism developments is more appropriate and will ensure better long-term outcomes. The research draws attention to the diversity of inscribed natural World Heritage Sites and their social contexts and difficulties therefore in finding commonalities amongst them. Common positive and negative impacts of tourism development are identified but not simple or shared reasons. The key negative issues are associated with visitor pressure and inappropriate infrastructure development, and key benefits related to community development and revenue for conservation. For successful and sustainable tourism development there is a common need for:

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

Many of these factors of success need to be put into place at the local/destination level. However, considering that these are World Heritage Properties, certain mechanisms and processes can be put into place at a higher level to support local implementation. The expert interviews generated some key recommendations that can support tourism management in natural World Heritage Sites:

1. The World Heritage Committee needs to support site management more closely particularly with regards to the development of management and visitor plans. At present, there is a reactive approach as opposed to proactive one which leads to issues only being tackled when they become fully fledged problems. One way of doing this is at entrance level by clearly specifying minimum tourism standards for nomination. A complementary approach would be to make sure that missions to the different sites occur at regular intervals as opposed to only when a problem has been identified. Such missions should also be asking the right questions with regards to tourism development.
2. A landscape/destination approach to World Heritage management is required. Through this approach, sites adjacent to World Heritage properties would also be promoted in an effort to reduce pressure on World Heritage Sites and spread the benefits of tourism development in the region. This need can be partly addressed through collaboration between the different stakeholders in managing the site and wider area for tourism. Such an approach is already used in many areas and the tourism industry could provide guidance to individual sites on how to achieve this. The Committee on the other hand could encourage such an approach through language in the nomination documents as well as by promoting areas that already do this.
3. Good indicators/criteria for preventing the loss of OUV should be developed. This could again be incorporated in Committee rules both for the nomination of new properties and in monitoring existing ones. The tourism industry would be an important ally developing such indicators/criteria.
4. Learning that exists from the different sites needs to be captured and transferred to other sites. Moreover, this transfer of knowledge should extend beyond site managers and serve also to influence decision-makers.

Section 6 takes the conclusions and recommendations one step further looking at implications for future studies.

6. Implications for further studies

This study served as a preliminary research into the root causes of impacts of tourism to World Heritage properties. It also extrapolated on the factors needed for tourism development to bring benefits to these properties. However, there are some limitations to interviewing a select group of experts and relying largely on information provided by the States Parties themselves. The research method is suitable for gaining an overview of the relationship between World Heritage Sites and tourism, but in order to obtain an actionable set of recommendations, additional research is required. It would be particularly important to obtain a deeper understanding of:

- The role of the World Heritage Committee and the technical advisory bodies (IUCN and ICOMOS) in improving tourism management of World Heritage Properties;
- The relationship between the tourism industry and the World Heritage Site management, and;
- The insertion of World Heritage Sites in the wider destination.

In order to achieve this, follow up studies should further investigate conditions on the ground through stakeholder interviews as well as examine ways in which the pre-nomination, nomination and monitoring processes can better integrate sustainable tourism management.

At the site level, it is important to involve key stakeholders including, site managers, government officials, industry players and community groups. A starting point would be to investigate the presence of tourism industry within key sites, their impacts to the site and wider area as well as their role in promoting sustainable tourism. The relationship between industry players and site management should also be investigated. Further research at the site level could then focus on determining mechanisms for promoting collaboration between stakeholders, particularly the tourism industry and World Heritage Sites management authorities. Appendix IV proposes a set of questions based on the proposed “Principles of Sustainable Tourism at World Heritage Properties” that could be used in this follow up study. Another need at the site level is to build capacity of site managers to manage the increasing numbers of tourists.

At the global level, emphasis should be placed on ensuring that sites have the right protection mechanisms in place prior to being inscribed but also that monitoring missions ask the right questions with regards to tourism management. A starting point would be to examine how the draft “Principles for Sustainable Tourism at World Heritage Properties” could be applied in practice through the development of criteria and indicators. A next step would be to look at concrete standards which could eventually be part of the obligations. It would also be interesting to incorporate some key questions related to tourism into the briefs for monitoring missions. In order to ensure that the right questions were being asked and the right elements measured, the approach would be to carry out a consultation with experts on sustainability within the tourism industry and also to bring them to the table with World Heritage Site managers.

Implications for IUCN

As the technical advisory body for natural World Heritage, IUCN is well-placed to lead some of the work proposed above. Considering the IUCN structure and ability to provide multi-stakeholder platforms, it is particularly well-positioned for bridging the gaps between protected area managers, government actors, civil society and the tourism industry. IUCN’s ability to draw upon expert knowledge through its commissions and partnerships is also an asset in carrying out the proposed work, especially through the World Commission on Protected Areas and partnerships with the private sector.

IUCN can also leverage its network to build capacities at the site level. The private sector is an important knowledge base and could provide site managers with tips for the effective management of their site for tourists. A project building on this concept will begin in 2011 in Kenya and Tanzania, with the objective of providing business skills to NGOs and protected area managers (especially World Heritage Site managers). If successful, this pilot project run by IUCN and Kuoni can be replicated in other regions in order to promote a closer working relationship between the private sector and site management as well as to promote the destination approach.

With regards to elaborating standards, a starting point for IUCN could be to introduce a list of questions on tourism development and management for IUCN evaluators going on mission. This list would be elaborated through an expert consultation with industry players that operate sustainable operations in areas with World Heritage Sites. The experts would give guidance on what are the key points that need to be examined to make sure that tourism is being managed sustainably. These points could eventually be elaborated to integrate Committee documents.

7. References

- Ashworth, G. J. & van der Aa, BJM. (2006) *Strategy and Policy for the World Heritage Convention: Goals, Practices and Future Solutions* in, A. Leask & A. Fyall (eds) *Managing World Heritage Sites*, Oxford: Elsevier
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Kothari, A. & Oviedo, G. (2004) *Indigenous and Local Communities and Protected Areas: towards equity, and enhanced conservation*. Best Practice Protected Areas Guideline Series No. 11. IUCN, Gland.
- Buckley, R. (2004) *The Effects of World Heritage Listing on Tourism to Australian National Parks*. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. 12(1): 70 – 84.
- Edroma, E. (2004) Linking Universal and Local Values for the Sustainable Management of World Heritage Sites. In, *Linking Universal and Local Values: Managing a Sustainable Future for World Heritage*. World Heritage Papers:13. Paris: UNESCO. pp 36 – 42.
- ERA (2009) An Economic, Social and Cultural Impact Study of the Jurassic Coast. http://www.jurassiccoast.com/downloads/news/economic_impact_study_09.pdf (accessed 17/07/10)
- Figgis, P. & Bushell, R. (2007) *Tourism as a Tool for Community-based Conservation and Development*. In R. Bushell & P. F. J. Eagles (Eds.), *Tourism and Protected Areas: Benefits beyond Boundaries*. Wallingford ; Cambridge, Mass.: CABI Pub. & IUCN - The Vth IUCN World Parks Congress.
- Gillespie Economics and BDA Group (2008) *Economic Activity of Australia's World Heritage Areas*. Pp. 5 – 10. Report to the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts. Denistone, New South Wales, Australia. <http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/publications/report/index.html> (accessed 17/07/10)
- Hall, N. and Testoni, L. (2004) *Steps to sustainable tourism*. Commonwealth of Australia: ISBN 0642 55013 1. Canberra, Australia.
- IUCN (2009) *The Time for Biodiversity Business*. Publication series. Available from: http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/business/bbp_our_work/biobusiness/ (accessed 09/07/10)
- Parks Australia (2010) Australian National Landscapes Program. Dept Environment, Heritage, Water & the Arts (<http://www.environment.gov.au/parks/national-landscapes/index.html>) (accessed 18/07/10)
- Pedersen, A. (2002) *Managing Tourism at World Heritage Sites: a practical manual for world heritage site managers*. World Heritage Manuals:1. Paris: UNESCO.
- Redbanks Consulting & Trends Business Research (2009) World heritage Status: is there opportunity for economic gain? Lake District World Heritage Project. UK. <http://www.lakeswhs.co.uk/documents.html> (accessed 17/07/10)
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre (2008) *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris, France. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide08-en.pdf> (accessed 30/06/10)

Appendix I: Criteria for the assessment of Outstanding Universal Value

Taken from Chapter II.D of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

77. The Committee considers a property as having outstanding universal value (see paragraphs 49-53) if the property meets one or more of the following criteria. Nominated properties shall therefore:

- (i)** represent a masterpiece of human creative genius;
- (ii)** exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;
- (iii)** bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;
- (iv)** be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;
- (v)** be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;
- (vi)** be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria);
- (vii)** contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;
- (viii)** be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;
- (ix)** be outstanding examples representing significant ongoing ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals;
- (x)** contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.

78. To be deemed of outstanding universal value, a property must also meet the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding.

Appendix II: Detailed information on the case study sites

Country	Site	Criteria of inscription	Sources of information	Negative tourism-related issues	Positive tourism-related issues
Argentina/ Brazil	Iguazú National Park/ Iguaçu National Park	vii; x	Dec.31 COM 7B.38/9 Rep. 31 COM 7B Dec. 32 COM 7B.31/2 Rep. 32 COM 7B.Add Mission Report 2008 Expert interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exponential increase in visitor numbers and no limit to visitation in place - High congestion around the fall area with most activities/facilities taking place there (no diversification of offer beyond walk to see waterfall) - Visual and sound impacts from industry concessions – helicopters, boats, hotels - Limited cooperation between states regarding tourism development - Need for revision of management/public use plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Well-organised visitor flow - Positive infrastructure development with minimal visual impacts in Argentinean side - Collaboration between private sector and management for development of concession plan in Argentinean side
Australia	Purnululu National Park	vii, viii	SOC Rep. 32 COM 7B Reports: Economic Activity of Australia's World Heritage Areas (Gillespie Economics & BDA Group, 2008); Steps for Sustainable Tourism, Purnululu (GoA, 2005) UNEP &WCMC factsheet Experts interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Difficult access (remote area, bad roads, access mainly through helicopters) and high seasonality (only accessible 2-3 months per year due to climate) - Tourism staffing difficult - Visitor safety issues (exposure, distance, low staffing) - No infrastructure to support tourism growth - Issue of expectations of local communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low key tourism development and growth - Since nomination, tourism facilities have been improved to ensure safety and minimise impacts - Pilot site in Australia for integrating tourism development and cultural heritage (with local communities and tourism industry) – Steps for Sustainable Tourism

Country	Site	Criteria of inscription	Sources of information	Negative tourism-related issues	Positive tourism-related issues
Australia	Tasmanian Wilderness	iii, iv, vi, vii, viii, ix, x	Rep. 32 COM 7B Periodic Report 2002 Reports: Economic Activity of Australia's World Heritage Areas (Gillespie Economics & BDA Group, 2008); Web-based system for PA management (PPT) Expert interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong stakeholder commitment but hostile relationship between these - Small problems of congestion, waste management in the 3 key tourist centres - Issues of erosion of river bank near town of Strahan due to tourist boats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very large area so tourism spread out with 3 higher volume centres - All tourism dev must be assessed through a rigorous process & all commercial operators need a license to operate in the park - Nature-based tourism - Infrastructure dev that enhances experience and minimizes impacts - Increase of public awareness & support for PA through tourism
Belize	Belize Barrier Reef	vii, ix, x (Danger listed in 2009)	Dec. 33 COM 7B.33 Rep. 33 COM 7B Dec. 32 COM 7B.33 Mission report 2009 No expert interviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uncontrolled tourism growth (tourist numbers, helicopter flights from private companies and cruises) - Mangrove cutting & coral dredging for tourism infrastructure (including homes) - Sale, lease and development of lands within the property - No differentiation between management of World Heritage Sites and areas outside - NGO co-managers developing excessive tourism to procure funds for conservation - Lack of coordination between stakeholders, particularly government institutions 	

Country	Site	Criteria of inscription	Sources of information	Negative tourism-related issues	Positive tourism-related issues
China	Jiuzhaigou Valley Scenic and Historic Area	vii	Periodic Report 2003 Field Assessment of Jiuzhaigou World Heritage Site (IUCN Monitoring Team, 2006) Expert interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exponential tourism growth from 32,000 in 1984 to 1.91 million in 2004 (carrying capacity set at 28,000 per day – raised from 12,000 in 2005) - Infrastructure outside park mushrooming - Waste – but are developing treatment facilities - Conflicts between local communities also with management of property 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very good zoning system - Careful management has allowed tourism to grow at this rate without loss of OUV but park management needs to stop thinking of profit and monitor development - Revenue from tourism is important for park management - Work with Tibetan minorities on developing community tourism - All hotels are outside the park
Ecuador	Galápagos Islands	vii, viii, ix, x (Danger listed in 2007 and removed from list in 2010)	Dec. 30 COM 7B.29 Rep.30 COM 7B.29 Mission Report 2006 Dec. 31 COM 7B.35 Rep. 31 COM 7B.35 Mission Report 2007 Dec. 32 COM 7A.13 Rep. 32 COM 7A Dec. 33 COM 7A.13 Rep. 33 COM 7A Dec. 34 COM 7A.15 Congress session on WH & Tourism with PPT from Charles Darwin Foundation Experts interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bad planning in tourism and tourism enterprises - Policies at national level not aligned with local level planning - Rapid growth of tourism sector (no. of visitors, cruise ships, hotels, flights, etc.) => current move away from cruise tourism to land-based could increase impacts dramatically - Migration from continent for better paid jobs in tourism (often illegal) - Invasive species related to transport systems - Sports fishing - overfishing - Lack of benefits for local communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A lot of progress particularly on combating invasive species by placing mechanisms to reduce their introduction - Examples of collaboration with the Private sector - Work done by the Charles Darwin Foundation in pushing for more sustainable tourism - New model for tourism that includes stakeholder collaboration

Country	Site	Criteria of inscription	Sources of information	Negative tourism-related issues	Positive tourism-related issues
Egypt	Wadi Al-Hitan	viii	Dec. 29 COM 7B.5 Mission Report 2007 Dec. 32 COM 7B.5 Promotional material for site. Expert interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vehicle traffic (4x4) - Multiple access points but working towards limiting access - Lack of funds for maintaining infrastructure - No efforts to limit tourist numbers - No visible collaboration with the private sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - After nomination worked to develop suitable infrastructure and interpretation - Government has taken nomination very seriously and made Al Hitan a priority - Community involvement in tourism and capacity building for understanding importance of site (small scale tourism development) - Friends of Al Hitan – organisation for funding work through private sector investment
Mexico	Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve	vii	Dec. 32 COM 8B.17 (nomination of property) Report: Optimizing PA entry fees across stakeholders: the MBBR, Michoacan Expert interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Congestion due to lack of visitor planning (poor visitor management) => use of one main trail - Concession system for local businesses outside the entrance => there does not seem to be collaboration between management and PS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There does not seem to be any infrastructure within the park (maybe 1 campsite)
Solomon Islands	East Rennell	ix	Nomination doc (1998) Dec. 29 COM 7B.10 Dec. 31 COM 7B.21 Expert interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expectations raised that WH nomination would help develop the island and bring tourism but this did not occur - Lack of support from government - Lack of marketing and infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support from Australian and New Zealand government in developing low impact infrastructure and capacity building for tourism (and management)

Country	Site	Criteria of inscription	Sources of information	Negative tourism-related issues	Positive tourism-related issues
Venezuela	Canaima National Park	vii, viii, ix, x	No recent information on WH website. Reports: Promoting conservation through sustainable local tourism development at World Heritage Sites (TNC, 2007); UNEP & WCMC Factsheet Expert interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourism is developing in a non-structured way not taking into account sustainability - No collaboration between government and industry - Lax park management allows industry to do what they please - Local communities have no capacity to run tourism in area and the government is relying on them to do this - Migration to lagoon area leading to impacts and particularly pollution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TNC/UNESCO and private sector project to develop skills for local people in running tourism (site management) - Creation of promotional materials for park - TNC collaborating with private sector for sustainable tourism dev
Viet Nam	Ha Long Bay	vii, viii	Mission Report 2003 Dec. 30 COM 7B.17 Rep. 30 COM 7B Dec. 31 COM 7B.23 Rep. 31 COM 7B Dec. 33 COM 7B.20 Rep. 33 COM 7B Report: Current tourism status in Ha Long Bay and Recommendations for visitor management strategy (Haynes, 2008) Experts interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased tourism pressure and development as a main threat => Visitor numbers increased from 850,000 in 2000 to over 1.5 million in 2008 - degradation of water bodies from construction of tourism and recreation facilities - congestion in specific areas due to bad visitor management and lack of coordination with industry - Lack of collaboration between stakeholders - Uncontrolled tourism development outside site boundaries - Little opportunities for collaboration with industry because government is also the competition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most tourists are concentrated in a small are of the site - IUCN helping management to develop a management plan and build capacities within the site for tourism

Country	Site	Criteria of inscription	Sources of information	Negative tourism-related issues	Positive tourism-related issues
Zambia/ Zimbabwe	Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls	vii, viii	Mission report 2006 Dec. 30 COM 7B.8 Rep. 30 COM 7B.8 Dec. 31 COM 7B.4 Rep. 31 COM 7B.4 Dec. 32 COM 7B.4 Rep. 32 COM 7B.4 SOC Rep 33 COM 7B Expert interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unplanned tourism development as a main threat => affects loss of wilderness and aesthetic value - High congestion around the fall area with most activities/facilities there - No determined visitor carrying capacity - noise pollution from helicopters, microlight aircrafts, boats, riparian activities - moratorium on construction and development of tourism infrastructure, WH property was in place until joint management plan approved but now possible in the Low ecologically sensitive zone and envisaged by both SP - Bad signage and information on WH status and values 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approval of joint management plan and collaboration between countries - Victoria Falls Green Fund aimed at encouraging conservation and community development in the falls area - Zambian side largely undeveloped and they are planning to develop it in a more responsible way and diversify the current offer

Appendix III: Proposed Principles for Sustainable Tourism at World Heritage Properties

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.

Appendix IV: Survey questions for follow up study

1. Is there a process for stakeholder involvement at the site? What does it consist of? (PRINCIPLE 1)
2. To what extent is the tourism industry involved with the site management authorities in the site? How do you perceive the relationship between these entities? (PRINCIPLE 1)
3. How is the site promoted? Please describe the different channels of promotion and provide examples of promotional materials (PRINCIPLE 2)
4. Is the World Heritage emblem used? What are the issues in using it? (PRINCIPLE 2)
5. Do promotional materials allude to the outstanding universal value of the property and emphasise the importance of protecting it? How? (PRINCIPLES 2 & 3)
6. Are there any guidelines to guide tourism behaviour in the site? If so, what are these? Please provide a copy if available (PRINCIPLES 2 & 3)
7. What systems do you have in place to measure visitor satisfaction and industry response to the tourism facilities and activities available in the site? (surveys, measuring popularity...) (PRINCIPLE 3)
8. What characteristics of sustainable tourism development, planning and management have been particularly successful in the site? What efforts are being undertaken in the site to reduce tourism impacts and promote sustainable tourism in the site? (PRINCIPLE 1, 4 & 5)
9. How are local communities involved in site management and tourism development? What are the results of this involvement? (PRINCIPLE 1 & 5)
10. How could changes to the World Heritage monitoring process improve the future management of the site for tourism? (PRINCIPLE 6)
11. What (if any) are the key issues arising from ineffective planning, management or other aspects of tourism development? (PRINCIPLE 4)



**INTERNATIONAL UNION
FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE**

WORLD HEADQUARTERS
Rue Mauverney 28
1196 Gland, Switzerland
mail@iucn.org
Tel +41 22 999 0000
Fax +41 22 999 0002
www.iucn.org