

D3.1.5

Summary report

Document summarizing the work delivered
within Activity 1 of the Work Package 3

Introduction

This document is aimed to synthetize the work delivered, which includes stakeholders map, best practice collections and factsheet, thus, defining main elements of the ATLAS project.

The main aim of the ATLAS project is to tackle challenge of the development of rich and varied cultural heritage that is deeply permeating the programme area, while at the same time supporting the economic development in a sustainable way. Moreover, the lack of technological innovation in the tourism sector is affecting its competitiveness, thus, the entire ecosystem should be encouraged to work according to more integrated approaches driving stakeholders to embrace open and collaborative innovation.

Bearing all this in mind, the ATLAS project will be a pioneer in supporting a quadruple-helix based comprehensive supporting framework, which also includes demontstrative actions in the environmental and cultural tourism sector.

The overall objective of this report is to present the main elements of the Cultural Tourism Laboratory, that will be implemented in the framework of the project and demonstrated within the work package 5. This document should also serve to provide knowledge baseline to support the setting up of the cultural toruism laboratories and also reepresents the backbone of the project structure.

The analysis of the cultural tourism sector and the mapping of stakeholders in the programme area represents the first step in defining the assets, the criticalities and the competences in the field. This analysis has also produced fact sheets concerning topics of interest for further development of trainign formatand that can also be used to inspire the delivery of demonstrative actions. Thgese activities are of crucial importance, as they will serve as the basis for the start of further activites, such as the definition of training needs, identification of sites of interest to be promoted, as well as business sector to be integrated.

Field analysis on cultural tourism sector, which includes cultural tourism stakeholders map, represents one of the most important project outputs due to the fact that it will provide a comprehensive view of the sector in the programme area. Furthermore, the map will represent the outcome of the Field analysis delivered at the regional and crossborder level, which will include all the key players from public and from the private sector, as well as the non-profit associations and foundations.

Furthermore, this activity that deals with the field analysis on cultural tourism sector aims at analysing different business sectors for common promotion of tourism destinations, such as ICT providers and/or developers; tourism operators, craftsmen associations, hotels, tourism agencies etc. This also includes local communities and informal associations (stakeholders), as well as festivals and exhibition organizers.

The analysis provided in this document/report includes also specific focus on topics of interest for setting up of the laboratory – factsheet on tourism accessibility for less advantage target groups, the living lab methodology applied to the cultural tourism sector, as well as the potential of cultural and creative industries for tourism promotion.

ATLAS cultural tourism ecosystem map

Within Activity 3.1 and deliverable D3.1.1 project partners were actively involved in creating cultural tourism ecosystem map, which gathers relevant stakeholders from the cultural tourism sector and provides general information about them, as well as success and fostering factors, along with barriers and limiting factors. Furthermore, the map also includes the level of quality of digital solutions, which includes the existence of website, available languages, social media presence, accessibility for people with reduced mobility and other sorts of disabilities.

On the level of the programme area, a total of 159 stakeholders were mapped. The following table provides information on the number of mapped stakeholders per region.

Table 1: Mapped stakeholders

Region	Mapped stakeholders
Friuli-Venezia Giulia	18
Emilia-Romagna	10
Apulia	44
Veneto	14
Kvarner/Croatia	21
Istria/Croatia	52
Total:	159

The structure of mapped stakeholder differs between the regions. Partners from Croatia, who have mapped stakeholders from Istria and Kvarner, mapped predominantly stakeholders from public sector (national/regional/local tourist boards; nature parks, museums, projects runned by local or regional authorities etc.), while there are only few stakeholders that belong to the private sector.

On the other side, Italian partners (although depending on the region) mapped a significant number of stakeholders from the private sector.

Another rather important detail that emerged as a result of the analysis of mapped stakeholders is that a significant percentage of websites are available only in the local language (Croatian or Italian). The next most dominant language is English. This is not such a good aspect, since a lot of those destinations have a high number of tourists coming from Germany, Austria, or France, and availability of those languages are very important.

Furthermore, a high number of mapped stakeholders do not use social media and some of the websites do not provide all the necessary information, while some projects/initiatives do not have a website at all. However, those who do not have a website usually disseminate information via social media channels.

SWOT ANALYSIS

OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
Local, regional and public authorities' support	Limited access to mountainous areas
Improved mobility of human resources in programme area	Poor accessibility
Virtualization and digitalization for improving accessibility for people with disabilities	Lack of public transportation and connectivity
Joint promotion of sites based on cultural and historic background	Infrastructure not adjusted for tourism and touristic activities
Promoting sustainable and innovative cultural tourism	Strong competition from different Mediterranean destinations
New technologies for associating	
Skilled professionals for mentoring and training	
Managing cultural and social events	
Extension of the season	
Making cultural tourism heritage sites live and contemporary	
Valorization of rural areas with the focus on cultural aspects of the regions	
Recognizable cross-border identity/brand, clusters and networks	
Establishing transnational connections	
Cooperation between different business sectors	
Networking of projects with shared interest	

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
Stakeholders diversity	Strong bureaucratic machinery
Rich cultural heritage and CH sites	Lack of accommodation units
Geostrategic position	Lack of content / content diversity
Regions' authentic and unique offer	Poor marketing
Good hotel and private accommodation offer	Lack of funds
High quality and professional service for individuals and groups	Poor social media usage
Creditable usage of social media	Lack of adjusted accessibility for the disabled people
Virtual walks and online stores	High costs/prices
Prominent international festivals	Low costs/prices
International awards and certifications	
Rich Eno-gastronomic offer	
Good traffic connection	
Tailor-made experiences	
High-valued natural sites	
Numerous non-profit organizations in different sectors	
Successful local and regional projects	

Living lab factsheet

The purpose of the Catalogue of Living Lab best practices in cultural and rural tourism is that of examining best examples of Living Labs in the above-mentioned domain in order to find suitable models to draw inspiration for the sketching of the Living Labs to be activated within the framework of the Adriatic Cultural Tourism Laboratories Project, (ATLAS) funded by the European Union, Interreg Italy-Croatia 2014-20, Call “Standard +”, PRIORITY AXIS 3: Environment and culture heritage.

By using publicly available data sources (websites, online reviews, articles, publications and open data), case studies have been selected and illustrated with the aim of evaluating qualitative data by taking into account the main indicators as internationally recognized.

Literature on Living Labs on cultural and rural tourism is almost completely absent mainly because few experiences have been activated in the field or because, as in many cases, tourism is considered as related to other sectors and represents one of the different areas of intervention of a LL. For example, research has also focused on some LL working on culture and creativity in which tourism represents one of the different axis.

The Catalogue of Living Lab best practices in cultural and rural tourism would contribute to bridge the gap of the absence of documents and publications in the field and to represent a starting point for a wider reflection on the sector.

The thematic domain of the Catalogue

Research should focus not only on “Living labs on cultural and rural tourism” in a strict sense, since all the domain of the so called “creativity” is related to tourism. There are many Living Labs focusing on creativity that develop touristic products or services and/or that explain their effects on tourism.

We may also argue that creativity is a key element in wider strategies of interventions i.e. in Smart Cities, in Role Model Cities, that are related to the Disaster Risk Reduction, or in strategies committed to the pursuing of the Sustainable Development Goals, and that, then, tourism is related to such a multitude of issues and goals that becomes hard to analyze it separately.

The thematic domain of the Catalogue

In order to select best practices, the identification of specific indicators play the major role so to analyze Living Lab characteristics and their outcomes. The monitoring and evaluation of the Living Labs according to these indicators may furnish us important details on whether LL have been conceived within an internationally recognized shared conceptual framework based on research activities conducted by Universities and Institutions all over the world as well as within the framework of some research projects conducted under the umbrella of the EU funds.

In this document we mention the key points that are emerged from a deep analysis on the logical aspects at the basis of the consequent LL steps:

- The creation of a Living Lab should be preceded by analyses involving all the actors and identifying key and practical problems;
- At the start of the initiative aspects related to strategy and to the infrastructure to be adopted should be discussed since they underpin the real intention of the Living Lab with the aim of creating value and share it with everyone;
- The creation of the value proposition within the framework of a Living Lab represents a fundamental step to be developed;
- The Living Lab should be conceived as a platform for the continuous co-creation of the value proposition;
- Community engagement is crucial as well as a minimum set of users.

Indicators concerning Living Lab environment:

- real world context: users should be studied within a real-life context;

- technical infrastructures: technical components should be available as well as the monitoring of technical performances;
- lifespan that is to say the duration of a living lab;
- scale;
- ecosystem approach: it is important to create value to attract and retain members, and to share it in order to create long term engagement and identification on the Living Lab;
- openness to partnerships: the innovation process should be as open as possible because a multitude of perspectives might speed up the development and bring more innovative ideas;
- community: users should be part of a community of interest or a community of practice; it is important to choose useful drivers to keep all motivated and engaged (see the above-mentioned community engagement)

Indicators related to the Living Lab approach:

- Evaluation, content research, co-creation: Test users should be given the opportunity to shape the innovation in interaction with researchers and developers. Co-creation should be iterative and make use of, for example, participatory methods.²⁹
- User role user roles depend on the view that companies pursue for integrating users in living labs and the degree of user activity within these living lab activities.

These indicators go further to the previous internationally recognized model that have had established a framework to assess the performance of Living Labs according to their relevant dimensions and characteristics.

Ultimately, the selected indicators are the following ones:

- analysis
- value proposition
- community engagement
- technical infrastructures
- lifespan

- scale
- eco-system approach
- innovative outcomes

Living Lab best practices in cultural and rural tourism

Living Lab in Rivière du Loup

Responsible body for implementation Living Lab en innovation ouverte- LLIO is a research center of the College of further education (CEGEP) in Rivière-du-Loup that offers training and research activities on open and collaborative innovation as well as services for the management of Living labs.

Funding source Quebec government

Location The Rivière du Loup is a regional county municipality (RCM) in the administrative region of Bas-Saint-Laurent in eastern Quebec, Canada. It is considered as a rural area with rural landscapes and beautiful countryside.

Website <http://llo.quebec/index.php/portfolio-item/tourisme-riviere-du-loup>

Description

A destination marketing organization (DMO) of rural Québec, Canada, wished to actualize its tourism circuits by creating an experience enhanced by a mobile application to meet the expectations of visitors. To overcome this challenge, the application has been designed in a collaborative mode by involving users in its conceptualization. Stakeholders involved were higher-

education institution, a destination management organization, a technology developer, tourism providers, and tourists.

It represents a study case of a rural context that have adopted the LL to work on tourism innovation whose initial gaps and results can be optimally compared thanks to some interesting publications furnished on it. In this case an analysis on the preconditions and gaps has been elaborated before the implementation of the LL with the aim of analysis and identify key and practical problems.

Andorra Living Lab

Responsible body for the implementation Massachusset Institute of technology Media Lab's City Science

Location Andorra, a 468-square-mile nation of about 77,000 people

Funding Andorra government

Website <https://www.media.mit.edu/projects/andorra-living-lab/overview/>

Cultural/rural site “Cultural heritage is one of the main testaments to the history, identity and creativity of a country.” (Art. 34, Constitution of the Principality of Andorra). The LL insists on all the Andorra country, that preserves, among different cultural attractors, two cultural and natural assets that are part of the World Heritage List drawn up by the UNESCO as well as interesting rural areas.

Description

The Case of Andorra Living Lab is really interesting because it has been developed by the first US-based living labs research consortium that is recognized as the City Science Initiative at the MIT Media Lab. Researchers from Massachusetts Institute of Technology Media Lab’s City Science have been working in initiatives to prototype, deploy and test urban innovation on Andorra that has been selected because of its geographical dimension in relation to the importance of the tourist cultural sector since with more than eight million visitors a year, tourism represents almost 30% of the economy of Andorra.

The case has demonstrated that given a wider territory, ie. an entire country, LL can positively affect the development in terms of innovation, whether external studies – not developed in the same countries-may contribute to push the innovation. It may be argued that some innovation elements for cultural and rural tourism are replicable and scalable. This has given the challenge of turning Andorra into an “Internationally Recognized Intelligent Country.”

Europeana Lab

Responsible body for the implementation Europeana Foundation

Location The Netherlands

Funding Connecting Europe Facility, Innovation and Networks Executive Agency (INEA), European Commission

Website <https://pro.europeana.eu/what-we-do/creative-industries#about>

Description

The Europeana Living Lab has been analyzed in order to understand whether the Open Data access on cultural and tourist heritage may represent an ideal pre-condition for the development of innovation in LL on cultural and rural tourism. Europeana Lab represents an example of LL connected

to the exploitation of previous results. In this case starting from the Europeana online portal providing access to more than 30 million digitised cultural heritage objects from Europe's libraries, museums, archives and audiovisual collections, the idea of the project was that of demonstrating that the same platform can facilitate the creative re-use of digital cultural heritage content and associated metadata. The publication of the Europeana metadata under the terms of the Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication (CC0) took place in September 2012; starting from there further development of innovative applications based on this metadata has taken place. Partners have developed a number of pilot applications focused on design, tourism, education and social networks.

Swiss Open Laboratory for E-tourism (SOLET)

Responsible body for the implementation Institute of Information System, Bern

Location Switzerland

Website www.ifitt.org

Description

From the ENOLL website we read that “SOLET is devoted to the use of information and communication technology (ICT) in tourism. It aims to create a playground for innovative ideas that may be used to improve the work of agents in the tourism and hospitality industry, the collaboration between different players in the value chain, the relationship of tourism agents and their respective customers. It links scientists and practitioners with an interest in the field and allows for sharing their ideas, developing new concepts and tools, as well as validating them in scientific experiments”.

SOLET has been developed with the research and technical contribution of 3 Institutes with a strong expertise on Information System (Institute of Information Systems (IWI), University of Bern; Technology Center Information Systems (TEWI), Brig; Department of Informatics (IFI) at the University of Zurich) and 2 Institutes for Tourism (Institute of Economics and Tourism within the University of Applied Sciences Valais; Institute for Tourism of the Lucerne School of Business).

Smart Cities Living Lab Siracusa

Responsible body for the implementation Municipality of Siracusa

Location Siracusa, Italy

Funding winner of the national call “energy from renewable sources and TIC for energetic sustainability” promoted by National Council of Research and National Association of Italian Municipalities

Website <http://smartcities.cnr.it/>

Description

Siracusa is one of the three Municipalities selected under the national call “energy from renewable sources and TIC for energetic sustainability” promoted by National Council of Research and National Association of Italian Municipalities with the aim of studying and experimenting innovative solution to make cities sustainable in their energetic and environmental aspects.

Nevertheless, TIC is conceived as a tool and not as the scope of the project. This is why there isn’t any wonder the project has focused on heritage valorization and on tourism through the adoption of multimedia tools and with innovative services and solutions. Precisely because of this original approach to the themes of culture and tourism Siracusa has won the prize. According to the guidelines of the call implemented results should act as levers for the transformation into Smart Cities through the installation of technological tools. In this sense Siracusa has been indicated as the first Italian smart city and as a best practice among the international cities that are willing to become Smart Cities.

Centralab – Living Lab in Gorejinska in e-tourism

Responsible body for the implementation E-Zavod E-Institute for Comprehensive Development Solutions (Head of Centralab Project) ;the University of Maribor (Slovenia) was responsible for the implementation of the pilot action on e-tourism

Location Gorejinska, Croatia

Funding Central Europe Programme, cofinnaced by ERDF

Website Centralivinglab.eu

Description



STEPRI

The experience is relevant because it may furnish key details for a user centered design of a web-based platform for sustainable development of tourism services in the Living Lab context of a rural area. The Living Lab was developed within the framework of the Centra-Lab project.

As the first step key stakeholders of the area were identified: tourist service providers - among those the Bled Regional Tourist Organization-; policy makers; researchers; developers. A work on the identification of problems has been carried out by identifying the main gaps as weak collaboration and participation. The platform was conceived as a web based one with the possibility of content re-use and of adding further contents from end-users and tourism service providers, as well of furnishing insights, suggestions to improve contents and develop new services. The main innovative element of this platform stands in its functional mechanism that enable collaboration at all levels, with the possibility of commenting, ratings, adding multimedia contents, updating and re-using them. It may be assumed that it represents a good result deriving from a multi stakeholder approach according to the LL methodology.

A deep analysis of the process would help us to understand the limits of this model, since with regards to the main service/product - the web-based platform- it seems that an empirical approach has been adopted more than a service design one. That is to say that, for example, the first prototype of platform should have been derived from a collective process more than from specific technical expertise.

“ROCK -Regeneration and Optimization of Cultural Heritage in Creative and Knowledge Cities”

Responsible body for the implementation Municipality of Bologna

Location Bologna, Lisbon and Skopje

Funding Horizon 2020, EU Programme

Website www.rockproject.eu

Description

The Bologna, Lisbon and Skopje Living Labs have been developed within the framework of the “ROCK42 -Regeneration and Optimization of Cultural Heritage in Creative and Knowledge Cities” project. The project involves 10 cities, 7 Universities, 3 networks of enterprises, 2 networks of cities and several companies and development agencies, a foundation as well as a charity organization.

These Living Labs have been activated with the aim of adding Bologna, Lisbon and Skopje in the list of the Role Model cities, that are authorities or local governments that have implemented innovative, creative, inclusive and efficient measures to realize strong political will in the field of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) at local level.

By taking into account that the DRR includes many different fields, the ROCK project management has selected 7 role model cities (Lyon, Turin, Cluj, Eindhoven, Athens, Vilnius, Liverpool) that are characterized by a knowledge-based economy and that have selected their most successful actions related to culture and creativity as Models. That is to say that the same 7 cities represent best practices of urban Living Labs processes in the field of creativity. Regardless to results and outputs that have not been still achieved since these are ongoing projects, the Bologna, Lisbon and Skopje LLs represent best practice in themselves because of the specific methodological process that has



STEPRI

been adopted for the case, by taking into account the best experiences all over the world that have been classified and recognized within the wider framework of the Role Model Cities.

Tourism accessibility factsheet

Analysis on the best practices related to the accessibility for the benefit of unpaired groups

Accessible tourism is about making it easy for everyone to enjoy tourism experiences. Making tourism more accessible is not only a social responsibility – there is also a compelling business case for improving accessibility as it can boost the competitiveness of tourism in Europe. Evidence shows that making basic adjustments to a facility, providing accurate information, and understanding the needs of disabled people can result in increased visitor numbers. Improving the accessibility of tourism services increases their quality and the enjoyment of all tourists. It also improves the quality of life in local communities.

Taking Europe as an example, the accessible tourism market has been estimated at approximately 27% of the total population and 12% of the tourism market. These figures take into account the large proportion of senior travellers, (since people over 60 years of age will constitute 22% of the global population in 2050), people with disabilities and families with small children.

The accessible travel market presents an opportunity for destinations that are ready to receive these visitors, since they tend to travel more frequently during the low season, usually accompanied or in groups, make more return visits and, in some parts of the world, they spend more than average on their trips. Facilitating travel for people with disabilities is therefore not only a human rights imperative, but also an exceptional business opportunity. Yet, a change in mind-set and in the model of tourism services provision is needed in order to meet this major market demand.

Accessible environments and services contribute to improve the quality of the tourism product, thus increasing the overall competitiveness of tourism destinations. Accessibility, therefore, must be an intrinsic part of any responsible and sustainable tourism policy and strategy.

Best practices about possible solutions regarding accessibility

Within Activity 3.1 of ATLAS project the main characteristics of cultural tourism in the Adriatic area were analyzed.

Moreover, in relation with deliverable 3.1.3, some case studies on topics related to accessible tourism should be listed. The following catalogue collects 5 good practices, reported by the partners of the ATLAS project, which describe the best initiatives related to accessible tourism in the Adriatic regions.

For each best practice the general descriptive elements, the references and the aims of the project were identified. A SWOT analysis was also prepared, with a summary- for each case study- of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

The examples analysed are the following:

1	Village4All	Ferrara
2	The Routes of the Frankopans	The Kraljevica visitors center / Primorje-Gorski kotar County
3	Jesolo 4 All	Jesolo - Venice
4	SAC for All	Province of Lecce
5	N.O. BARRIER - New Objective tourism without BARRIER	Apulia Region
6	Will Easy	Martignacco - FVG Region
7	COME-IN! (Cooperating for Open access to Museums – towards a wider INclusion)	Istria, Croatia (Italy, Slovenia, Austria, Croatia, Germany, Poland)

The best practices described provide an overview of the solutions and activities concerning accessible tourism in the Adriatic Programme area. There is an increasing attention of public bodies in offering and financing projects of this type and at the same time a consistent involvement of

private stakeholders who support and create innovative solutions to facilitate holidays for people in difficulty or not self-sufficient.

Much work remains to be done, especially as regards the connections of individual projects or interventions with the surrounding realities and the transport system, but it must be pointed out, however, the presence on the territory of an ever-growing number of bodies and entities that deal with accessible tourism.

While these examples provide a small sample of possible solutions regarding accessibility, they will hopefully inspire others to take steps towards broadening the availability of accessible offers in tourist destinations.

The very first step is to open one's mind to the idea that "Tourism is For All". From then on, with the help of the appropriate guidance and know-how, accessible tourism can become part of every tourism experience.

Conclusions

This document has been created with the aim to summarize all the deliverables within the Activity 1, Field analysis on Cultural Tourism sector, of the work package 3, Design of the Adriatic Cultural Tourism lab.

The main goal of the Field analysis on Cultural Tourism sector was to define the main elements of the Adriatic Cultural Tourism Laboratory. First step implied creating a cultural tourism ecosystem map, which included mapping of all relevant stakeholders from the field of cultural tourism sector. In six regions, a total of 159 stakeholders have been mapped. The structure of mapped stakeholder differs between the regions. Furthermore, significant percentage of websites are available only in the local language, and to the most part in English. Moreover, a high number of mapped stakeholders do not use social media and some of the websites do not provide all the necessary information, while some projects/initiatives do not have a website at all.

With regards to the living lab factsheet, it is important to highlight that its main aim is to bridge the gap of the absence of documents and publications in the field and to represent a starting point for a wider reflection on the sector. The purpose of the Catalogue of Living Lab best practices in cultural and rural tourism is that of examining best examples of Living Labs in the above-mentioned domain in order to find suitable models to draw inspiration for the sketching of the Living Labs to be activated within the framework of the Adriatic Cultural Tourism Laboratories Project.

Tourism accessibility factsheet has provided an overview of the solutions and activities concerning accessible tourism in the Adrion Programme area. There is an increasing attention of public bodies in offering and financing projects of this type and at the same time a consistent involvement of private stakeholders who support and create innovative solutions to facilitate holidays for people in difficulty or not self-sufficient. Much work remains to be done, especially as regards the connections of individual projects or interventions with the surrounding realities and the transport system, but it must be pointed out, however, the presence on the territory of an ever-growing number of bodies

and entities that deal with accessible tourism. While these examples provide a small sample of possible solutions regarding accessibility, they will hopefully inspire others to take steps towards broadening the availability of accessible offers in tourist destinations.

Therefore, this analysis of the cultural tourism sector and the mapping of stakeholders in the cross-border area, summarised in this document, represents the first step in defining the assets, the criticalities and the competences in the field.