

PICTURE



Pro-active management
of the Impact of Cultural Tourism
upon Urban Resources and Economies

Deliverable n° **D19 FINAL VERSION**

Deliverable title **Brakes and difficulties faced by
small and medium sized cities
in the vie of developing
European cultural networks**

Cultural Routes Cases

Task n° **2.4**

Task Leader: **ITAS**

Task partners: **LEMA, ITAM-ARCCHIP, EICR**

**Authors: Edith Besson, Sorina Capp, Claude Origet du Cluzeau,
Barbara Del Corpo, Krassimira Paskaleva, Caroline Rainette.**

Date: **February 18, 2007.**



**SIXTH FRAMEWORK
PROGRAMME**

The PICTURE project is financed by the European Commission, Sixth Framework Programme of Research
Specific Programme: Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area
Activity: Specific activity covering policy-orientated research under "Policy support and anticipating
scientific and technological needs"
Priority 3. Underpinning the economic potential and cohesion of a larger and more integrated European Union
Topic 3.6. The protection of cultural heritage and associated conservation strategies
Task 5: Cultural heritage and tourism. Contract n° SSP1-CT-2003-502491

Table of content

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| 2 | BACKGROUND: AN EMERGING FIELD FOR RESEARCH AND POLICY | 3 |
| 3 | THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE CULTURAL ROUTES | 6 |
| 4 | RESEARCH QUESTIONS..... | 6 |
| 5 | METHODOLOGY | 6 |
| 5.1 | CASE STUDY SELECTION | 7 |
| 5.2 | SURVEY DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION | 10 |
| 5.3 | RESULTS | 11 |
| 6 | FINDINGS..... | 12 |
| 6.1 | NETWORKING POTENTIALS FOR SMALL AND MID-SIZED CITIES | 12 |
| 6.2 | TOWNS' EXPECTATIONS..... | 13 |
| 6.3 | CULTURAL ROUTES' NETWORKING ACTIVITIES | 14 |
| 6.4 | IMPACTS OF PARTICIPATION ON CULTURAL TOURISM DEVELOPMENT | 15 |
| 6.5 | IMPACTS OF PARTICIPATION ON URBAN GOVERNANCE..... | 16 |
| 6.6 | CHALLENGES AND ADDED VALUE..... | 19 |
| 6.7 | TOWARDS INCREASING NETWORKING BENEFITS | 21 |
| 7 | CONCLUDING COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 25 |
| | REFERENCES | 26 |
| | ANNEX 1: PICTURE QUESTIONNAIRE..... | 27 |
| | ANNEX 2: CULTURAL ROUTES MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION..... | 41 |
| | ANNEX 3: CULTURAL ROUTES' NETWORKING ACTIVITIES | 45 |

1 Introduction

The aim of this deliverable is to present the results of research undertaken for the PICTURE task 2.4 “European Cultural Networks: Towards Integrated Cultural Policies”.

The objective of this task was to establish how European cultural links can be fostered across political and geographical boundaries to better market and exploit cultural products in cultural tourism strategies, with particular focus on the urban scale of tourism impact.

The development of such European cultural networks usually raises serious governance challenges for small- and medium-sized cities, as it depends on concrete initiatives that connect national, regional and local authorities, as well as private operators from different European countries – all of them with very different political, legal and administrative cultures and varying degrees of decentralisation. Often, the concrete impact of cultural networks on tourism development is complex to assess, and overall under-researched.

In this context, research aimed to (1) identify and analyse the potentials and benefits of networking for small and mid-sized cities in culture and tourism, (2) understand the difficulties faced specifically by the smaller towns in participating and benefiting from such European cultural networks, (3), assessing the contribution of participation to competitive urban cultural tourism development in and between the involved city destinations.

The European Cultural Routes supported by the Council of Europe have been chosen as case studies for this study. Involving a large number and variety of European cities and towns, they provide a great ground for research on the interlinks between European values, cultural and political exchanges and tourism development potentials.

2 Background: an emerging field for research and policy

Numerous networks of all kinds (supported or not by the EU, bi-lateral or multi-lateral, project or long-term based) exist in the field of cultural and/or tourist development. Stadler’s (1998) definitions of network and networking are exposed in Table 1 below, and are of particular relevance for this study.

Table 1: networks and networking

Networks

Networks are increasingly important in the area of cultural cooperation. What is different about networks in the context of the cultural sector? The following points represent a few characteristic features:

- Not hierarchical
- Independent from national government and other state organizations
- Open
- Not profit-oriented

Furthermore, they have:

- A common goal or goals
- Regular meetings of members
- A coordination office

Networking

Networking refers to processes taking place within the network, primarily the establishment and maintenance of contacts.

From: Stadler, 1998

Past studies on the topic are scarce, and have mostly focused on the sustainability of tourism networks (Fadeeva 2004, EC Tourism Unit 2004), the viability of cultural networks in Central and Eastern Europe (Stadler 1998, Minichbauer and Mitterdorfer 2000), or networking between heritage cities (ROSTE 1999). Van den Borg and Russo (in ROSTE 1999) strongly advocate for strategic networking between heritage cities in Europe in order to promote sustainable tourism approaches and prevent damage to heritage sites. One of their key recommendations to improve this as part of the UNESCO include widening the Heritage City Network towards emerging urban tourism destinations (especially in Eastern Europe), in order to prevent them from experiencing the same 'damage' than destinations that have exceeded tourism carrying capacity. They suggest in particular the promotion at the network level of pilot actions in the field of visitor management and decision support system development. Yet, other studies emphasise the inherent complexity of making transnational cultural and tourism networking successful in a variety of domains. Fadeeva (2004) for example insists on the governance challenge to make networks 'sustainable' and therefore contribute significantly to sustainability, which involves clear objectives - equally understood and interpreted by all the actors and organizations (public and private) involved in the network - as well as clear assessment criteria for the progress of objectives and results. A study undertaken for the European Commission (EC Tourism Unit 2004) on European tourism networks finds that many of the smaller networks have a relatively small member base and find long-term continuity difficult. The PICTURE deliverable D32, developed by COC, states that many cities networks have now been experienced since a number of years, and identifies a number of strengths and weaknesses that networks are facing:

Table 2: Strengths and weaknesses of city tourism networks

| STRENGTHS | WEAKNESSES |
|---|---|
| End of isolation for the staff in charge of tourism: meetings, share or information, mutual advice... | Costs of coordination among participants; to our opinion, not more than half of the budget of the network should be dedicated to coordination costs |
| Lower costs of scale supply | Misunderstanding between cooperation and competition among members |
| Strengths of a common decision | Common decision difficult to make |
| Impacts of a common promotion, especially on distant markets; global visibility | Difficulties in identifying common interests and themes of cooperation |
| The largest members of the network draw the improvement of the less notorious others. | The largest members of the network are not always ready to pay more, or to be the engine of the network because of their strength and notoriety |
| Lower costs of cooperation thanks to internet | The network relies often a few number of enthusiastic participants; if they disappear, their replacement is not automatic |
| Networks get easier access to regional, national or European funds | Difficulties in choosing the proper actions to implement, especially if the impacts are not equal in each city |
| The network often plays the role of a good label | There are already quite a number of city networks, and this does not help in promoting their quality label |
| The strength of a city network can be assessed by the way it is capable of rejecting cities that do not comply with the chart | Some networks are incapable of requiring a strict respect of the chart and of rejecting a member that fails to comply with it |

Source: COC, D15. 2005.

Misunderstanding relating to networks' objectives and responsibilities are very well illustrated in an Austrian study on cultural networking with Eastern European countries (Stadler 1998) that shows how cultural differences and unrealistic expectations can undermine the positive impact of cultural networks between Western and Eastern European countries. Overall, the specificity of smaller cities in joining and benefiting from these networks is often lacking the attention (see Paskaleva and Besson 2006). So is the impact of cultural networking itself on tourism development or strategies at the local and destination levels. Many cities in Europe wish to promote their cultural assets through tourism, and much of the PICTURE research (see for example PICTURE Deliverables D6 on urban governance and D33 on the PICTURE end-user group) has shown that a number of small and mid-sized cities do not feel fully concerned with complex tourism management guidelines aimed at famous and crowded tourism destinations. There is indeed a distinction to be made between cities that appeal to tourists because of outstanding cultural heritage or coastal location and less popular cities that adopt a pro-active approach to attract tourism from scratch with particular strategies. This is the reason why the cultural networks developed or supported by the European Institute of Cultural Routes have been chosen to illustrate the specificity of small and mid-sized cities in creating, developing and sustaining cultural networks, with special reference to cultural tourism development and sustainability.

3 The Council of Europe Cultural Routes

The cultural routes programme of the Council of Europe is coordinated by the European Institute of Cultural Routes, who is in charge of the evaluation, follow-up and technical assistance of the cultural routes and who is a full partner of the PICTURE project (see institutional description in Table 3). They have been chosen as privileged case studies as part of the current study for several reasons. First, their overall organisation is typical of our chosen definition of cultural networking (see table 1); second, one of their key objectives is to promote cultural tourism; and last but not least, contact-making with network coordinators and members could be to a great extent facilitated by EICR as part of this study.

4 Research questions

In this context, research was planned in two main directions:

□ **Smaller cities and cultural tourism networking**

- 1 – Potentials of networking for small and mid-sized cities in culture and tourism
- 2 – Participation level of small and mid-sized cities in selected European networks
- 3 – Networking benefits to small and mid-sized cities
- 4 – Cities' needs: unfulfilled expectations and overlooked networking potentials
- 5 – Identification and analysis of cities' difficulties

□ **Contribution of the networks to sustainable urban cultural tourism development in small and mid-sized cities**

- 1 – Contribution of the network to common cultural tourism strategies
- 2 – Contribution of the network in promoting good governance of cultural tourism in participating cities
- 3 – Contribution of the network in promoting the development of innovative cultural tourism products
- 4 – Contribution of the network to raising the profile of city destinations, both individually and collectively.

5 Methodology

The object of this study is qualitative in nature; the aim of this research being to get opinions, perceptions, expectations and policy recommendations more than hard numbers, it has been decided to focus on a limited amount of networks and obtain some deep enough qualitative material. This, added to short timeframe for this study, led to the conception of an original and time-efficient methodology, including background research, case study selection and development of a semi-structured survey followed by phone interviews; The scale of this study does not allow to claim representativeness regarding the global functioning of the European Cultural Routes. It simply aims to provide insights in the operation of selected networks and to suggest lessons to be learnt from these diverse experiences.

5.1 Case study selection

The first methodological step has been the appropriate selection of European Institute of Cultural Routes, in partnership between ITAS and EICR. Main rationale for selection was:

1. Level of small and mid-sized cities involvement in the networks;
2. High success of the networks in terms of programmes, projects, survival beyond project duration and sustainable management;
3. Significance of small, mid-sized cities and villages in the network, as compared to historical sites – clear urban dimension of the networks;
4. Size of the networks – manageable number of actors, and unified steering committee for research purposes;
5. Strong emphasis on cultural tourism development, or vision – cultural tourism potentials.

According to this framework, the following seven networks have been selected:

■ **Mozart Route - www.mozartways.com**

In his life, Mozart travelled through Belgium, Germany, England, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Austria, Switzerland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic and visited more than 200 places and cities. The association 'European Mozart-Ways' was founded in 2002 as a platform for the exchange, development and realisation of projects between over 50 Mozart cities and regions. It aims to **promote the Mozart heritage through an international trademark for Mozart's admirers**, host cities' populations and cultural tourists. The network has been habilitated by the Council of Europe in 2003 and received excellent evaluation according to the Programme criteria¹ in 2006-2007. Mozart Ways has been designated a 'Major Cultural Route by the Council of Europe.

¹ To be habilitated, the networks must: (1) choose a theme or an aspect of a theme forming part of the Council of Europe's Cultural Routes Programme; (2) present a conceptual framework based on research carried out into the theme chosen and accepted by the different network partners; (3) involve several member countries through all or part of their project(s), although this does not exclude activities of a bilateral nature; (4) plan to involve, where possible, at least one of the recent signatories of the European Cultural Convention; (5) ensure that the projects proposed are financially and organisationally viable; (6) have a legal status, either in the form of an association or a federation of associations; (7) operate democratically; (8) provide all the necessary material for the appraisal of their project(s) and for the evaluation of their activities

In order for a proposed network to be accepted, it must undergo, following a favourable opinion of the competent governmental bodies, an appraisal procedure based on the following criteria: (1) the proposed theme must correspond to the eligibility criteria set out in Part I.1 or fit into an existing theme of the Council of Europe's Cultural Routes Programme; (2) the proposed network must offer a comprehensive programme and specify its objectives, methods, partners, participating countries (current and envisaged), the fields of action involved and the overall development of the programme in the medium and long term; (3) identify, in the various member countries, the main initiators, participants and other potential partners likely to form a network; specify, where appropriate, at international level, other partner organisations; (4), specify the regions concerned by the project must be specified; (5) provide details of its financing and operational plan; (6) append the basic text(s) relating to its legal status.

In order to retain their approved status, networks must submit, every two years, a report enabling the Council of Europe: (1) to evaluate their activities in order to ascertain whether they satisfy the basic criteria (see point 1 above); (2) to verify whether the implementation of their projects corresponds to the criteria selected for the development of a theme and its fields of action (see above).

Source: Council of Europe, 1998. Resolution (98) 4 on the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe.
[https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=Res\(98\)4&Sector=secCM&Language=lanEnglish&Ver=original&Back](https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=Res(98)4&Sector=secCM&Language=lanEnglish&Ver=original&BackColorInternet=9999CC&Back)

Table 3: The Council of Europe Cultural Routes

The Council of Europe Cultural Routes

The Cultural Routes Programme was launched by the Council of Europe in 1987. The initial concept was to demonstrate in a visible way, by means of journeys through space and time, how the heritage of the different countries of Europe represented a shared cultural heritage.

The first example, the Santiago de Compostela Pilgrim Routes served initially as a source of inspiration, and then became the reference point for the development of future activities. The main aims of the Cultural Routes are:

- a. To raise awareness of a European Cultural Identity and European Citizenship, based on a set of shared values given tangible forms by means of cultural routes retracing the history of the influences, exchanges and developments which have shaped European cultures;
- b. To promote intercultural and inter-religious dialogue through a better understanding of European history;
- c. To safeguard and enhance the cultural and natural heritage as a means of improving the quality of life and as a source of social, economic and cultural development
- d. To give pride of place to cultural tourism, with a view to sustainable development

All 48 countries signatories of the European Cultural Convention can make proposals for routes, which must satisfy the following criteria to be eligible for the programme:

- a. Be centred on a theme representative of European values and common to several countries
- b. Follow a historical route or (in the case of cultural tourism), a newly created route
- c. Give rise to long-term multi-lateral cooperation projects in priority areas (scientific research, heritage conservation and enhancement, cultural and educational exchange among young Europeans, contemporary cultural and artistic practices, cultural tourism and sustainable development)
- d. Be managed by one or more independent, organised networks (in the form of an association or a federation of associations)

A technical body, the European Institute for Cultural Routes, was set up in 1998 for operational purposes. It examines applications to new projects, monitors activities in the field, coordinates the work of partner organisations, disseminates and archives information documents.

The Council of Europe defines policy directions, adopts new themes and routes, approves the networks and gives the awards "Cultural Route of the Council of Europe" or "major Cultural Route of the Council of Europe", a certification that depends on the project's pan-European scale.

Source: Council of Europe, 2004.

■ **Via Regia - www.via-regia.org**

The 'Via Regia' is the longest and oldest road link between the East and West of Europe. It crosses Spain, France, Belgium, Germany and Poland and leads to Ukraine, linking many towns and places from Santiago de Compostela, Reims, Saarbrücken to Brugge, Antwerpen, Frankfurt, Görlitz, Wrocław, Krakow, L'viv and Kiev. The Via Regia cultural route was founded 2004 and gathers 141 partners, including 56 cities. This network aims at reviving this historical goal and one of the main objective of this project is to promote **the development of internationally competitive tourism along the road**, strengthened by a common marketing system while respecting the uniqueness and characteristics of individual destinations, in a spirit of sustainable development. Since 2005, it is a 'Major Cultural Route of the Council of Europe'.

■ **Via Francigena – www.viafrancigena.eu**

The 'Via Francigena' is a historical route, a major road once walked along by thousands of pilgrims on their way to Rome. The objective of the European association of the Via Francigena, founded in 2001, is to **elaborate and develop a cultural tourism product, which favours activities and locations connected with this route, while providing tangible benefits for the regions concerned**. In 2004, the Via Francigena was recognized Major cultural route of the Council of Europe, and is seen as a model of the European road network system. It gathers over 70 partners - most of them Italian small and mid-sized towns. The network has been habilitated by the Council of Europe early 2007

■ **Small Atlantic ports - www.atlantic-ports.com**

'Small Atlantic Ports' is a project born in 2003 under the EU INTERREG programme. It has been set up to **highlight the value of common culture and heritage of the villages and small coastal towns of the Atlantic Arc, that have traditional links to fishing and navigation**, notably through tourism development. It involves partners in the ports of Luanco, Baiona and Punta Umbria in Spain, Tazacorte in the Canary Islands, Tavira in Portugal, Saint Gilles Croix de Vie in France, Scalloway in the Shetland Islands and the East Cork ports of Ballycotton, Cobh and Youghal in the South West of Ireland. It is currently applying to become a European Cultural Route.

■ **Transromanica - www.transromanica.com**

'Transromanica' is a 3 years INTERREG project which **promotes Romanesque art, culture and landscapes" through sustainable tourism development**. It aims specifically to develop and implement a transnational marketing strategy, cooperation structures, product and management standards for cultural tourism on Romanesque heritage, and to improve protection and innovation of management and presentation of Romanesque heritage sites, itineraries and landscapes. It involves 17 partners from Germany, Austria, Italy and Slovenia, most of which being regional tourist boards and cultural organizations. Although cities are not formally part of the partnership, they are involved in the activities of the Romanesque Road initiative, on which the project builds. The project will turn into a cultural route at the end of 2006.

■ **Red de Juderías - www.redjuderias.org**

The 'Red de Juderías de España' - Route of Judaism in Spain - is a cultural and tourist network created in 1999 which brings together 10 Spanish towns. Each of these towns **has highlighted its ancient Jewish heritage and manages a programme of animations, tours and training**. It belongs to the European Route of Jewish Heritage, which has been recognized as a Major Cultural Route of The Council of Europe in December 2005, and which aims to enhance and maintain the Jewish heritage in Europe and to make know the importance of Jewish culture to European culture as a whole.

■ **Cluny sites - <http://fsc.cluny.free.fr/>**

The Federation of Cluniac Sites was founded in 1994 with the **threefold objective to forge close links between sites, enhance their Cluniac heritage and support their initiatives through action in the fields of education, culture and tourism**. Several hundred people - elected representatives and private owners - cultural and tourism associations, are actively involved in the pursuit of these objectives. It involves around 85 villages and towns, across France, Italy, Switzerland, Spain, Great Britain and Germany. Cluny Sites have been awarded 'Major Cultural Route of the Council of Europe' in 2005.

5.2 Survey development and administration

The method used to investigate our object has been a combined collection process of quantitative and qualitative data. A (mostly) open questionnaire has been developed² (see Annex 1), designed to be answered by a large variety of respondents: city representatives, network coordinators and managers, representatives of the tourism and cultural sector notably. For practical reasons it has been intended for two main categories of respondents: (1) network coordinators and/or managers, who respond on behalf of the whole network and (2) respondents reflecting primarily on their city in the questionnaire, including city council representatives, tourism and cultural actors talking on behalf of their city. The respondents involved in the cultural route both as a city and as a coordinator (even only for selected/local activities), could answer the questions from both categories. In most cases, the collection of completed questionnaires was followed by semi-directed phone interviews with key informants selected from the management committee and members of each network. In order to obtain a good variety of interests and backgrounds in cultural tourism management and network development, a sample including respondents from the following sectors has been identified:

- Network coordination/management, involved in the technical and financial implementation
- City representation
- Tourism organisations' representation
- Cultural heritage stakeholders

A total number of 40 people were approached as part of this study, with contact being facilitated by the European Institute of Cultural Routes. The respondents were provided with questionnaires and study information in English, German and French languages, thanks to translation work undertaken by EICR and ITAS. Follow-up Interviews were conducted in English, French, German, Italian (thanks to FEEM) and Spanish, in order to clarify the data provided.

² The authors would like to acknowledge the study by Minichbauer and Mitterdorfer (2000), which provided the basic structure for questionnaire development in the current study.

5.3 Results

A total of 21 questionnaires has been collected, with a significant number resulting from collaborative contributions of several network members (c.f. Via Regia, Transromanica, Via Francigena); 28 people overall formally participated in the study and most questionnaires have been concluded by in-depth phone interviews. Additionally, a questionnaire from Bamberg (Germany) was returned by a member of the PICTURE End-User group, providing insights on the German “Castle Road” linking over 70 cities, the Burgenstrasse³, extremely relevant to this study.

Basic statistical analysis using Excel has been conducted on the answers to the closed questions of the survey. Qualitative material has been recorded in a comprehensive data table, analysed and matched against the quantitative results.

Overall, a good balance is reached in terms of respondent variety (see table 4 below): the study involves 17 representatives of small and mid-sized cities and 14 network coordination representatives⁴ from, tourism offices, city cultural services, museums, city information and tourist centres, city councils, regional authorities, city marketing offices, economic development agencies, non-profit associations, researchers and consultants. The countries covered include Ukraine, France, Poland, Germany, Italy, Ireland and Spain. About half of the represented cities are developing tourism destinations, two consider themselves as early stage tourism cities, and 3 of them as mature destinations.

Table 4: PICTURE Cultural Networks Study – List of respondents’ origins

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| City representatives | <p>- Via Regia</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City of Rivne (250 000, Ukraine), culture, tourism and international relations department 2. Museum of Regional studies in Rivne (250 000, Ukraine) 3. City of Château-Thierry (16 000, France), culture department 4. City of Tarnów (120 000, Poland), city information centre. <p>- Transromanica</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. City of Naumburg (30 000, Germany), tourism and conference service department 6. Regional Landesmarketing Sachsen-Anhalt (Germany), tourism and marketing department. <p>- Via Francigena</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. City of Fidenza (23 148, Italy), city council 8. Opera Romana Pellegrinaggi in Rome (2 554 000, Italy). <p>- Small Atlantic Ports</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Cork (350 000, Ireland), South West regional authority 10. City of Punta Umbria (14 000, Spain), local development department 11. Saint Gilles Croix de Vie (7 000, France), city services. <p>- Cluny Sites</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. City of Cluny (4800, France), city council, network coordinator 13. City of Cluny (4800, France), city council, network treasurer 14. City of Cluny (4800, France), city council, central services <p>- Mozart Ways</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15. City of Mannheim (325 000 Germany), marketing service. <p>- Red de Juderias</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 16. City of Girona (94 000 – Spain), municipal patronate association. |
|----------------------|--|

³ See <http://www.burgenstrasse.de/>

⁴ Some respondents answered both as city and network coordination representatives, hence the total is not 21.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>- Burgenstrasse (German Road) 17. Bamberg (70 000, Germany), tourism and congress office.</p> |
| Network coordination representatives | <p>- Via Regia Via Regia coordinator, Erfurt, Germany 2. Via Regia local coordinator, Rivnes, Ukraine</p> <p>- Transromanica 3. Transromanica coordinator, Berlin, German 4. Landesmarketing Sachsen-Anhalt GmbH (LMG), Transromanica member, Germany.</p> <p>- Via Francigena 5. Via Francigena coordinators, Fidenza, Italy 6. Association Lubilantes, assistant to Via Francigena coordinators, Como, Italy.</p> <p>- Small Atlantic ports 7. Small Atlantic Ports coordinator, Cork, Ireland 8. Small Atlantic Ports member, Saint Gilles Croix de Vie, France</p> <p>- Cluny Sites 9. Cluny Sites coordinator, Cluny, France 10. Cluny Sites treasurer, Cluny, France</p> <p>- Mozart Ways 11. Mozart Ways local coordinator, Manheim</p> <p>- Red de Juderias 12. Red de Juderias coordinator, Girona, Spain 13. Tea Cegos, Red de Juderias Consultant, Barcelona, Spain.</p> <p>- Burgenstrasse 14. Burgenstrasse member, Bamberg, France.</p> |

6 Findings

The European Cultural Routes investigated as part of this study are very diverse in terms of size, themes, membership and objectives. The broad European relevance of some themes such as Judaism, Mozart, or monastery cultures has allowed the development of large pan-European networks (see Via Regia, Mozart Ways or Cluny Sites). In other cases, it is the success of 'practical' European urban and regional development projects that has led to the creation of smaller cultural routes (see Transromanica or Small Atlantic Ports). In all cases, the cities involved in such international partnerships seek to have a unique opportunity to promote their cultural heritage and tourism resources at a local, regional, national and European scale.

6.1 Networking potentials for small and mid-sized cities

The study revealed that overall, cultural networking is very popular among European small and mid-sized cities. All city representatives approached in this study sustain that the benefits of participation are well known and/or understood among local politicians, even in the smaller towns, including for example increased visibility of the town at the European and regional level, improved city image, valorisation of local cultural resources, cultural and economic development, leverage of interest and funding for the protection of local cultural resources (and particularly built heritage), learning from other experiences...

Some city representatives (for example from Cluny, France or Via Regia, Germany), emphasise the more symbolic benefits too, i.e. the reinforcement of cultural identities and European exchanges thanks to the promotion of common histories and memories. In terms of 'what is possible to do' within a transnational cultural network, there is no drastic difference between the perceptions of city representatives and those from network coordinators. Not surprisingly, the latest tend to describe more comprehensive sets of potentials for their activities, including cultural tourism but also European wide political and strategic objectives: for example the Via Regia aims to become a 'symbol of European Unity and develop forms of work giving more value to the future possibilities of European cooperation in the fields of tourism products, partnerships and knowledge'; Transromanica aims to position itself as 'an international competitive tourism destination through the promotion of Romanesque landscapes'. Yet, most networking activities are driven by clear operational objectives declined at the local, regional and route levels, with clear reference to urban and regional impact of direct interest to the partners. At the city level, tourism development truly emerges as a – if not THE - key objective. Network members interviewed as part of the PICTURE study notably mentioned that belonging to the cultural route procure the following advantages, described in tables 5 below:

Table 5: Potentials of cultural & tourism networking for small and mid-sized cities

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Promoting local cultural, artistic and historical resources at the European level; ➤ Attracting funding for safeguarding cultural heritage; ➤ Raising the image of the town (ex: from 'industrial' to 'cultural'); ➤ Raising awareness of common cultures throughout Europe; ➤ Reinforcement of local identity; ➤ Developing awareness in the local and tourist populations of the value of heritage and culture in the small and mid-sized cities; ➤ Developing awareness among the local authorities of the benefits of cultural tourism for sustainable economic development and long-term competitiveness; ➤ Encouraging common visions and joint projects between towns of similar size. |
|--|

6.2 Towns' expectations

The networks were chosen on the basis of their significant involvement of small and mid-sized cities and towns (see annex 2 on membership information). Yet, the conditions, forms and impacts of their involvement were still to be understood.

All network coordinators agree: the expectations of small and mid-sized towns towards the cultural routes are higher than those of the bigger cities, who often possess sufficient resources to promote their cultural and tourism resources without networking support. Most commonly cited are expectations such as 'increase the fame of the city', 'promote the improvement of local infrastructure', 'promote the city abroad in other languages', 'improve local awareness of the value of cultural heritage' or 'give impulse to the local tourism economy'. Again generally, economies of scale in tourism marketing are very much expected, especially in the smaller towns and sites that lack the means to implement large scale marketing operations on their own. The small and mid-sized cities, when joining the networks, hope they will benefit from being promoted in the same 'circle' as the bigger ones (magnet effect), that they will become to some extent 'equal' to them, especially when it comes to their place in promotional material, tourism maps and guides.

Yet many respondents from coordination office and cities insisted on the fact that compared to other types of cultural networks, the Cultural Routes give a strong cultural – and not only commercial – image to the network, with which even the smaller cities can identify and work with. Many wanted to develop tourism as mean to valorise their cultural resources and promote economic development, but sought at all costs to avoid the negative side effects of mass tourism development. Some respondents mentioned that the main reason for joining was not about economic impact, but rather about sharing common history and cultures (Via Regia, City of Château-Thierry, France). Yet most respondents insist that it is the unique combination of authentic cultural roots and strong tourism focus that make the cultural routes particularly attractive for the smaller cities.

The coordinator of the Via Regia also emphasises that all members are equal, that there is no hierarchical structure: “Partners can find each other following their interests and competences in order to afford special tasks. Individual projects and presentations are implemented by some or all members, depending on their goal, their place and their dimension. The coordination informs all partners about respective projects, publishes abstracts of the actions, translates documentation, etc. The members are now working to a long-term work programme and are developing durable structures”.

Table 6: towns’ expectations towards joining cultural networks

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Possibilities for smaller cities to join a ‘brand’ with strong historical identity and tourist visibility;</i> ➤ <i>Competing against traditional mass tourism industry through more sustainable and context-sensitive initiatives;</i> ➤ <i>Developing common cultural tourism products, events and services (economies of scale and quality promotion);</i> ➤ <i>Magnet effect: small cities included in tourism circuits, along with bigger cities; attraction of more visitors</i> ➤ <i>Benefits from the large-scale and multilingual communication, promotion and marketing strategies of the cultural route</i> ➤ <i>Common publications, brochures, tourist guides;</i> ➤ <i>Attendance to international tourism and cultural fairs;</i> ➤ <i>Organisation of common cultural events;</i> ➤ <i>Increased protection and rehabilitation of cultural heritage</i> |
|---|

6.3 Cultural Routes’ networking activities

Many types of networking activities are undertaken by the cultural routes (see the survey table in Annex 3 on the cultural routes’ networking activities). The largest activity area is not surprisingly concerned with the building of the network itself, through regular meetings between members and internal newsletters. The second biggest area relates to promotion and marketing activities (conferences, marketing, publications, and public information...). Then comes the development of common cooperation projects in the area of culture and/or tourism, as well as the development of exchange programmes between members, through best practice dissemination and promotion. Lobbying, research, expertise (including professional tourism forecasting) and programme evaluation come last, with few initiatives developed.

In some fields, the activities covered are systematically concerned with cultural tourism. For example, there are many working groups within the cultural route networks that are (or will be) dedicated specifically to tourism issues; many events and projects organised by the coordinators are related to the marketing and promotion of the route, which has impact on tourism development. Yet, a large part of activities concerned with cultural cooperation most often do not relate to tourism: conferences, exchange programmes, best practice exchange, lobbying, expertise and evaluation exercises are often focused exclusively on cultural issues.

6.4 Impacts of participation on cultural tourism development

Testimonies from a majority of city representatives and network coordinators allows to state that participation in the cultural routes has some positive impact on urban cultural tourism development. In the Mozart and Via Francigena Routes specifically, tangible effects are already visible, due to these routes being established for a longer time than the others. Often, the respondents mention it is too early to assess the concrete impacts. Yet, most of them trust that objectives and expectations can be met in the future years.

Examples of concrete positive initiatives include:

“Joint participation in fairs for this sector with other national networks (Heritage of the Humanity, Route of the Castilian Language), which would have been impossible any other way” (coordinator of the Red de Juderias network, Girona, Spain);

“Our association has its own instruments for information and territorial marketing [that include] a website with a focus on the web map system, a chartered roadmap on the itinerary, a guide mark and a manual including road signs, a quarterly journal issued in Italian and English that assembles projects, activities and events which concern the Via Francigena, a subject that has attracted not only the attention of pilgrims and tourists but also that of institutions, universities, national and international media www.rivistaviafrancigena.it” (Via Francigena coordinators and City of Fidenza, Italy);

“In Switzerland there is a very active site, with a very federative spirit: the people who visit the site are very much incited to discover the other [Cluny] sites in Europe... (-)... Sites that promote other Cluny sites create a real synergy” (Cluny Sites Coordinator, Cluny, France);

“Manheim is perceived in a different way... (-)... There has been English and Japanese TV broadcasting on the Mozart year in Manheim, and many articles on us produced as part of the cultural route” (Mozart Route, City of Manheim, Germany);

“Thanks to the cooperation in the network, our city and its touristic offer is included in a wide range of touristic advertising efforts... (-)... Besides the publicity effects, the exchange of experiences upgrades the quality of touristic offer in the cities” (Transromanica, City of Naumburg, Germany);

“Participation has promoted the development of the city infrastructures, and also our international relations” (Via Regia, City of Rivne, Ukraine);

“Exchange of song, music, dance and arts” (Small Atlantic Ports Coordinator, City of Cork, Ireland);

“The publishing of a large-scale book that was brought out in Spain over the course of the year, including a presentation at the National Library in Madrid involving the Foreign secretary, as well as in other countries such as at the Instituto Cervantes in Tel Aviv” (Red de Juderias coordinator, City of Girona, Spain);

“We have a common signpost in each port to identify our network and better sign our city; we are present in events such as the Nautica Fair in Paris in December to promote our network/city, an event that was previously unknown to us; There are leaflets promoting our city in each tourism department of every port which belongs to the network” (Small Atlantic Ports, City of Punta Umbria, Spain);

“As a key benefit, we registered in our city an increased number of tourists. Furthermore Fidenza and the European Association of the Vie Francigena appeared on important national and international newspapers (Corriere della Sera, Times On Line 14 November 2005 and specialized magazines)” (Via Francigena coordinator and City of Fidenza, Italy);

“Common marketing, brochures, website, shared visit of trade fair...etc... (-)... Press reports in nationwide newspapers about the Burgenstrasse where Bamberg was mentioned and described (Burgenstrasse, City of Bamberg, Germany);

“We can provide as a good practice Souvigny in the Allier département. The town belongs to the network for ten years and this had important impact in terms of tourist visits: the Clunisian museum rates among the first in the département” (Cluny Sites Coordinator, Cluny, France);

“The travelling exhibition presented in 2005 was a great success and an opportunity for all citizens – youngsters as well as older people – to get involved together and to know about this link between Eastern and Western Europe. The cultural benefit has been very important” (Via Regia, City of Rivne, Ukraine).

Beyond tourism development aspects, participation also promote new ways of working in the fields of cultural, tourism and international relations, at the city and route levels.

6.5 Impacts of participation on urban governance

It is interesting to note that a large majority of the cities that participated in the study (11 out of 13) have formal tourism or cultural tourism strategies and/or partnerships.

Cultural tourism strategies

11 out of 13 cities who answered this question have tourism strategies that take various forms, such as a section of the city economic development plan (Rivnes, Ukraine), part of supracommunal strategies for tourism (Château-Thierry, France; Fidenza, Italy), strategic documents at the city level (Naumburg, Bamberg, Germany; Tarnów, Poland) or a tourism action programme (Cluny, France).

Although most of these plans existed prior to the creation of the Cultural Routes, it is interesting to note that the content of a large majority of them have been – or is currently – influenced by the network’s themes and values. Many respondents (from Rivnes, Fidenza, Mannheim, Girona) emphasise the fact that the Cultural Routes provide some orientation in the choice of cultural themes and related activities, and in this way, has direct impact on the development of cultural tourism strategies.

The coordinator of the Red de Juderias Route, also representative of the city of Girona (Spain) explains: “through the network, we have a strategic development plan that is helping us enormously in the organization and planning of our strategy for the development of the Jewish district”.

In Mannheim (Germany), the Mozart route has not explicitly promoted the development of such strategies but that the joining of the Cultural Route has: “The process of Mozart made us aware of how little there is and how much could be done in this area, how much opportunities we have... (-)... Now, we always combine the portrait of Mannheim with the Mozart Route. The promotion of the Mozart way has become integral to the communication strategy of Mannheim”.

In the city of Tarnów (Poland), the document was created prior to the city’s involvement in the Via Regia project. Yet, “because of the changes in the competitive environment that were not predicted nor considered during the preparation of the strategy, it has to be revised as soon as possible”.

Finally, all cities that do not currently have a clear strategy claim their objective to develop one in the future. The city of Château-Thierry plan to change its organization of tourism management at the city and supracommunal levels, with more professional structures; The city of Punta Umbria, partner of the Small Atlantic Ports network, will develop a strategy for cultural tourism: “we discovered how important it is to develop a short and long term strategy. We have a local agenda 21, but we are thinking of developing this area specifically” (City of Punta Umbria, Spain).

Urban cultural tourism partnerships

10 out of 12 cities that answered this question possess some form of multi-stakeholder partnership for cultural tourism in their city. It is very interesting to note that all of them are formal in nature, divided almost equally between permanent and had hoc arrangements for certain projects.

Apart from Rivnes (Ukraine) all the formal arrangements are established in the French cities, which could be explained by the fact that tourism is often managed at supracommunal level of competences, hence highly formalised.

In the other cities, multi-stakeholder partnerships between city culture and tourism departments are punctual for certain events, including for example cultural years (Mozart), festivals and cultural events.

Most of the time, participation in the Cultural Route has no direct impact on its initiation and organizational arrangement. Only in Rivnes (Ukraine), the Via Regia has influenced the creation of the coordination committee for tourism development. This committee gathers representatives of the private and public sectors at the city level.

Yet, most Cultural Routes promote actively the development of such multi-stakeholder partnerships – not only at the city level, but also at the regional and especially transnational (cultural route) levels.

Table 7: Advantages of participation for urban governance

- *Belonging to a **federative and non-profit organisation**, aiming at maximizing the benefits of all its members;*
- *Promotion of **concrete partnerships between culture and tourism services** in towns and regions, notably in the French case within structures involving more than one entity (see section 4);*
- *Promoting the creation and/or development of **formal cultural tourism strategies** at the local and regional – including local agendas 21 for cultural tourism;*
- ***Exchange** of experience, know-how and good practices with a diverse network of partners*
- *Finding **new contacts** for other development and cultural projects;*
- *Development of new ‘mentalities’ and work ethics towards **integrated cultural tourism development**.*

6.6 Challenges and added value

The previous elements show that most small and mid-sized town representatives appreciate the concrete benefits of participation, as compared to their initial prospects. Yet, both network coordinators and members expressed a number of concerns regarding the specific difficulties and challenges faced by the smaller cities in maximizing the benefits of networking. This study identifies a number of brakes and difficulties that are also relevant for the participation of the smaller cities in other types of cultural and tourism networks.

The challenge of resources

Some of the very recent Routes (Small Atlantic Ports, Transromanica, Via Regia) are organised without legal framework (voluntary horizontal non-hierarchical structure). The others are more formally structured, including Mozart (association with boards of directors), Red de Juderias (complex administrative structure composed of a Mayors' Assembly, a chairmanship, a General Secretary, delegates and technical experts), Cluny Sites (French association) and Via Francigena (Italian association). Transromanica should turn into a German law association in 2007. Both Small Atlantic Ports and Transromanica are financed by INTERREG programmes, which means they benefit from a mix of EU and local authorities funding for a limited time. The challenge for them is to turn the project into a longer-term initiative. Via Regia is one of the biggest Route - crossing Europe from France to Russia – as such it is strongly supported by the UNESCO and Council of Europe and was launched during an international symposium in 2004. Yet, like all other routes, no funding is provided by EU institutions, and resource are levered mostly among network partners, and to some extent from other public and private sources (sponsors, product sales).

Therefore, the small and mid-sized cities' key problem – stressed by a majority of respondents – is the lack of financial, technical and human resources necessary to invest as much as wanted into the network activities. In the smallest towns, it is rare to have a person specifically in charge of tourism, or sufficiently skilled to take in charge complex cultural and collaborative tourism projects.

Another issue is the location of some towns, outside of traditional tourism circuits; finally, for the towns with very restricted budgets, culture and tourism are not considered as priorities in public policy. Thus, the cities are very much in demand for tourism projects but often lack the professional capacity to promote and implement them.

Regarding the membership conditions for the small and mid-sized cities, most networks have put in place special mechanisms to adapt to the resources and possibilities of the different partners. The biggest ones - Via Regia, Via Francigena and Cluny Sites – have developed structured funding systems based on membership, with contributions adapted to the number of inhabitants (Via Francigena, Cluny sites), country of origin and population (Via Regia). In the Burgenstrasse, some small cities are allowed to share the membership fee, reducing in this way the amount per head. Yet, the multiplication of competing networks is also problematic for the smaller cities as they cannot afford to join several ones (Cluny Sites Coordinators, Cluny, France).

Table 7: Weaknesses of smaller cities

- *Most cultural routes encourage the participation of small and mid-sized cities in their networks, for example through reduced membership fees. Yet, taking part actively in such networks remain a **big financial effort** for the smaller cities, especially in rural areas;*
- *Smaller cities often lack the necessary **human resources** to actively take part in the network activities and coordinate local actions;*
- *The key priority for the smaller cities is to attract more visitors; yet they often lack **experience in implementing integrated cultural tourism projects** that include competitive tourism products and offers.*

Added value of small and mid-sized cities

It is very interesting to note however, that the networking benefit is not only one-way. The coordinator of the Via Regia is very strong about this: it is rather easier to network small cities than bigger ones, and they often bring much more to the network, and this for several reasons: first, citizens in the smaller cities tend to identify more with their town or village than in bigger cities where civil engagement is less strong. Second, while bigger cities often belong to several networks, the smaller cities tend to engage more fully in a single one and try to maximise the benefits. Finally, the networking between small and mid-sized cities seems to be easier to manage: in small cities, fewer decision-makers are involved and decisions are taken quicker.

The Red de Juderías consultant from Tea Cegos in Barcelona also emphasises that the resolute participation of small and mid-sized cities compensates for the possible shortage in terms of the provision of equipment or the amount of resources dedicated to tourism. Faced with limited resources, the small cities take on a more eager and active role, which contribute to bringing a more diverse and richer tourism product at the route level.

A 'non-problem'?

In this context, the Cultural Routes' coordinators do not consider the small and mid-sized cities as particularly 'needy' - in terms of additional resources and advice. On the contrary, most of the time their objective is to promote equality of participation in the networks and avoid any differentiation between the partners. This is the reason why no working groups have been put in place so far specifically for the smaller towns.

This is particularly accurate for the coordinators of the Via Francigena, Transromanica, Cluny and Burgenstrasse, who do not consider the creation of specific working groups as a priority for their activity, and this for several reasons: first, in the early stage of the network progress, it appears more important to focus on the development strong working themes that will have the power to federate the cities, no matter how big or small; second, it is seen as very important to treat all cities in the same way, giving them the same rights and duties in the implementation of common projects. Yet, The coordinator of Red de Juderias - while explaining that the network's commissions are transversal through communities' interests and do not depend on size – also stresses that some projects would be very difficult to implement if they were not supported by medium or large-sized cities. Finally, the coordinator of the Small Atlantic Ports plan to set up special working groups for small and mid-sized cities in the future for the purpose of enlarging the network.

Most often, the working groups developed by the networks are thematic, with the themes being defined within the work programmes of the transnational management committees. For the coordinator of the Via Regia, however, if the smallest cities feel the need to create a special group, there is room for this and they should create it bottom up – as no such decision would be taken top-down for them. This approach seems to be shared by many other network members.

Most routes investigated as part of this study are still very early in their organisational process⁵, which makes it difficult to assess precisely in which domains the cities are lacking support measures. A number of respondents however, have provided very interesting insights on their current remaining expectations, from both network coordinators and city administrations.

6.7 Towards increasing networking benefits

The small and mid-sized cities expressed strong commitment towards reinforcing their role in the cultural route and expressed several proposals for improvement towards both networks coordination and city representatives.

Expectations of towns from network coordinators

The cities (and often coordinators themselves) have expressed a number of concerns, brought to the attention of the cultural routes' coordination offices. First, most cities would like the Routes' communication at the European level to be further developed in order to attract international tourism. It is worth noting that the Eastern European cities

⁵ Via Regia since 2004, Transromanica since 2003 and Romanesque Road since 1993, Via Francigena since 1994, Cluny since 1994, Red de Juderias since 1995, Mozart Route since 2005, Burgenstrasse since 1954!

specifically (for example Rivnes in Ukraine) also ask for more communication at the national level, in order to raise awareness of national governments towards the importance of cultural development and reinforcement of European cooperation.

Then, strong communication, management and coordination within the network emerge as another key demand from the small and mid-sized cities: not only to support marketing efforts, but especially to support the local actors in their activities linked to the cultural route. In this context, it seems very important for the cities to be able to communicate swiftly with the network coordination office, as well as with other member cities on a permanent basis. It is suggested that the quality of management in terms of developing trust, agreement, harmony and fruitful cooperation between the partners could be reinforced through the development of 'work ethics' by the coordination committee (Small Atlantic Ports coordinator, Cork, Ireland).

The development of more stable partnerships with other networks and organisations working in the same area are also put forward. The coordinator of Red de Juderias advocates for the consolidation of the administrative management for the full development and performance of the network, and for the inclusion of private entities within the partnership, corporately organised for example as consortiums. Many city representatives from France would like the local actors to be coordinated better, across for example the institutions responsible for national monuments, tourism offices, and supracommunal structures.

Another key expectation from small and mid-sized cities towards the network coordinators is the promotion, development and integration of new, concrete and competitive cultural tourism products and services at the route and local levels. There is indeed a high demand that the 'value' brought by the cultural route image translates into concrete and targeted tourist offers immediately identifiable by tourists. The coordinators of the Via Francigena for example, emphasise the need to create tourism products adjusted to different categories of people. The president of the association Lubilantes (Via Francigena, Como, Italy) also stresses the necessity to professionalise the Routes' tourism activities while keeping close to the demands of cultural tourists, which can be very specific in some cases (such as pilgrims). She recommends for example the creation of low cost accommodation facilities specifically aimed at pilgrims, the development of a network of tour operators specialised in sustainable/green tourism and the development of train tourist guides. For the city of Manheim local coordinator (Mozart Route, Germany) also, there is a need for a stronger commercial orientation in building a very professional tourism product, through, for example more cooperation concerning catalogues and leaflets and more concrete offers that include combined packages for inter-city visits or combines tours with common attractions.

A number of city representatives consider that the first step towards developing common itineraries is the organisation of exhaustive inventories of the potential cultural tourism attractions along the Road, which would allow a collaborative and rational choice of development options (Via Regia, City of Château-Thierry, France; Via Francigena coordinators and City of Fidenza, Italy).

Some respondents (from the Cities of Naumburg, Cluny and Fidenza) wish that the route coordinators developed and promoted the use of quality standards and charters. These would be used for the development and management of the cultural tourism products and services offered along the destination, in the name of the Cultural Route.

Table 8: Town's expectations towards network coordinators

- *To reinforce **communication** at the European and national levels;*
- *Strong and competent **management**;*
- ***Inventories** of the cultural heritage and cultural tourism attractions among partners cities and territories;*
- *To improve **communication** within the network;*
- *Development of **work ethics**;*
- *Develop new tourism products that reinforce the **identity** of territories;*
- ***Quality standards**;*
- *Promote **participation to fairs and events** linked to the tourism sector;*
- *Promote the implementation of **concrete projects** at the local level;*
- *Develop a **real identity link** across the member places*

Expectations of towns from local and regional authorities

The main concern of a majority of respondents is that their city administrations should more fully acknowledge the importance of cultural and tourism development in local policy priorities. Most often, this includes creating sustainable plans, strategies and programmes for cultural tourism that include the objectives and themes of the cultural route, as well as local specifics and potentials⁶.

At the conceptual level, city representatives wish for more research into local history and identity, in partnership with local populations and cultural institutions. At the operational level, this means allowing more budget and resources to cultural and tourism development, including for tourist infrastructure, professional tourism offices and promotion material.

Also, many cities wish that their cities developed better marketing strategies, learnt better from other good practices available throughout the network, and worked in good partnership with competent bodies in and outside the city, for example in the organisation of cultural fairs and events. The respondent from the city of Mannheim (Mozart Route, Germany) considers for example that a person from the cultural department should be specifically appointed to assist the mayor in compiling and distributing the cultural route and related tourism information to all partners within the city, acting as an internal coordinators between the mayor and other city services. Some respondents would also like their city to provide more financial support to preserve the city's heritage (Transromanica, City of Naumburg, Germany).

It is generally agreed among the participants that the more the city invests in the network (in terms of financial, organisational, promotion and cultural resources), the more it will get out of it.

⁶ On urban cultural tourism governance and policy issues, see PICTURE Deliverable 6 by Paskaleva et Al. (2004).

Table 9: Expectations of towns from local and regional authorities

- *An improvement in **tourism infrastructure**;*
- *Further research and promotion on their **specific cultural identity** and how this relates to the network image;*
- *The development of **detailed lists** of typical local products and attractions;*
- *The creation of **tourist thematic offers**;*
- *The organization of **more events and cultural initiatives**;*
- *Openness and **willingness to learn** from other partners' experience and success stories;*
- *More **funding opportunities** for local involvement in the cultural route.*

The challenge for network coordinators

Results from the survey have shown that overall, many cities wish for more cultural tourism focused activities to be organised as part of the Cultural Routes. This would include not only a stronger support of practical cultural tourism development projects, but also setting up monitoring and evaluation procedures.

Indeed, the lack of monitoring and evaluation activities is salient in the survey results (see Annex 3). Several city representatives have raised the issue directly, emphasising the difficulty to precisely measure the concrete impacts of participation in the Routes on tourism numbers, current impacts and foreseen projections. For the City of Bamberg local Burgenstrasse member, this is related to the insufficient institutional funding, "typical of cultural and tourism networks". The coordinator of the Via Regia also emphasise the need to secure funding to widen the action spectrum but stresses that financial involvement should primarily be secured by the cities: "the concept of an international working group implies also the creation of a long-term common funding system. Graduated contributions of the members should finance the creation of relay stations of the Via Regia at the national level and basic work of coordination and translation, as well as other costs". Overall, successful implementation of cultural tourism development schemes within the cultural route destinations relies on a shared commitment by both cities and coordinators, with the later convincing cities on the cultural – but also touristic/economic – impacts of investment in the network activities. Precise measurement of targets, progress and achievement of cultural tourism objectives appears as essential to secure cities' financial commitment in the long run.

7 Concluding comments and recommendations

Results from this PICTURE study have shown the strong interest of small and mid-sized cities in the European Cultural Routes: the increasing number of Cultural Routes in Europe, as well as the increasing number of their members, prove a good level of satisfaction in sharing common identities and in cooperating. As far as these two factors are concerned, the involvement of small and mid-sized cities in cultural networks should be further encouraged and maintained.

Many cities, when joining these networks, hope that their participation will increase the number of visitors in their localities, that they will be given the opportunity to develop joint projects with other European partners and be able to reinforce their international profile; many of them are also faced with challenges, due to their small size: small budget, limited human resources and sometimes lack of awareness of potentials other than commercial or marketing related. This may end with unequal results among the city-members, especially in terms of added revenue from visitors.

The study also reveals that small and mid-sized cities also bring key assets to the networks: motivation, civil engagement and active decision-making, which increase the chances for the networks to become more sustainable in the long run. Maximising the benefits however, requires strong commitment of the various parties and good management of local cultural tourism resources, as well as the development of competitive tourist products at the local and route levels.

Finally, it is suggested that the key challenge for the network-coordinating structures concerns monitoring and evaluation: some mechanisms will need to be developed as part of the network management activities of the cultural routes, in order to assess the level and nature of networking activities, the efficiency of the projects, the adequacy of the communication strategies and the quality of the tourism products and services developed along the roads. This evaluation may come from the upper coordinator of several networks, or from external experts. According to the PICTURE experience, this should be done at least every 10 years as after this time, the local actors, the local policies, and the expectations of each member may have drastically changed. Attracting the resources to implement such mechanisms will require negotiations with the member cities and towns, on the basis of mutual benefits, added value and shared outcomes from this process.

References

Council of Europe, 1998. Resolution (98) 4 on the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe.

European Commission, Tourism Unit, 2004. Feasibility and preparatory study concerning networking and partnership of tourism stakeholders and destinations, and of bodies developing and providing knowledge and competence regarding tourism. Feasibility Study Networking. Final Report.

Fadeeva, Z. 2004. "Development of the assessment framework for sustainability networking". *Journal of Cleaner Production* 13, pp. 191-205.

Minichbauer, R. and Mitterdorfer, E. 2000. European Cultural Networks and Networking in Central and Eastern Europe. European institute for Progressive Cultural Policies / eiPCP, IG Kultur Österreich in cooperation with kult-ex, Verein für internationalen Kulturaustausch, Vienna 2000.

Origet du Cluzeau, Claude, 2005. Cultural tourism strategy in the city: the role of consultants. *EU FP6 PICTURE* project, Deliverable 32, March 2005.

Paille, S. and Rainette, C. Constitution and organization of contact and exchange network. *EU FP6 PICTURE* project, Deliverable 33, January 2007.

Paskaleva, K. and Besson, E. 2006. Integrated management of urban cultural tourism in European small and mid-sized cities: a governance approach. In: *Sustainable Tourism II*. Edited By: C.A. BREBBIA, Wessex Institute of Technology, UK and F.D. PINEDA, Complutense University, Spain, 384 pages.

Paskaleva, K., Besson, E. Hoffmann, B., Wintzer, S. (2004). Urban Governance of Cultural Tourism in Europe. Local Authorities Perspectives. *EU FP6 PICTURE* project, Deliverable 6, December 2004.

Stadler, B. 1998. "Eastward expansion in the cultural sector". Reports from Central and Eastern European Members of Cultural Networks. Study Commissioned by Kulturkontakt and IG Kultur Österreich, Vienna 1998.

Van den Borg, J. and Russo, A. (eds) 1998. "Proceedings of the International seminar 'Tourism Management in Heritage Cities'". University of Venice CA Foscari, 18-19 December 1998 - Venice, Italy

Annex 1: PICTURE questionnaire



PICTURE

Pro-active management of the Impact of Cultural Tourism upon Urban Resources and Economies

Study on the Role of Cultural Networks in Promoting Sustainable Cultural Tourism in European Small and Mid-sized Cities.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions

This short questionnaire is designed to be answered by a large variety of respondents: city representatives, network coordinators/ managers, representatives of the tourism and cultural sector. For practical reasons it is designed for two main categories of respondents: (1) network coordinators and/or managers, who respond on behalf of the whole network – labelled as '**network coordination representatives**'; (2) respondents reflecting primarily on their city in the questionnaire, including city council representatives, tourism and cultural actors talking on behalf of their city – labelled as '**city representatives**'.

Please note that if you are involved in the cultural route both as a city and as a coordinator (even only for some activities), you may answer questions from **both categories**.

Please detail your answers as much as possible.

We plan to follow-up the questionnaire with a quick phone interview (no more than 30 minutes) to clarify and precise the information provided.

1. CONTACT

1.1. Please fill in your contact details

| | |
|--|--|
| Name | |
| Acronym of your organization (if relevant) | |
| Organisation | |
| Address | |
| Postcode | |
| City (please include size of the city (number of inhabitants)) | |
| Country | |
| Phone | |
| Fax | |
| e-mail | |
| Homepage | |
| Comments (e.g. other key information or contacts on the cultural tourism aspect of this study) | |

1.2. Please describe briefly the aims of the cultural route and the relative importance of cultural tourism objectives in it.

1.3. Please describe briefly the coordination structure of the network, and the way you see the role/ place of small and mid-sized cities within it.

1.4. Please describe briefly your position/ role in the network: from a coordination standpoint (role/responsibilities) AND/OR from a city representative standpoint.

2. PROFILE – CITY REPRESENTATIVE

2.1. Date at which your city joined the network:

2.2. Which city department(s)/organisation(s) is/are mostly involved in the activities of the cultural route?

2. PROFILE – NETWORK COORDINATION REPRESENTATIVE

2.1. Year and place of launch of the cultural route:

2.2. Legal status of the cultural route:

2.3. Please describe the basic structure of the cultural route:

2.4. Briefly describe the financial structure of the cultural route (main funding sources, allocation of budget to management, coordination, meetings, projects, specific cultural tourism projects).

2.5. Which sectors are covered by the cultural routes' members (multiples choices possible – please tick all relevant boxes)?

| Culture | Tourism | Urban/regional development |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| City municipal services for culture | City council tourism departments | City Council economic/development departments |
| Cultural centres/ organisations | City tourism offices | City central services (mayor's office) |
| Music | Tourism urban/regional partnerships | Metropolitan/ <i>Département</i> , <i>Pays</i> (France) / Regional councils |
| Visual arts | National Ministries for Tourism | Research organisations |
| Architecture | Hotel Associations | Socio-cultural organisations |
| Literature | Marketing companies | Education/ training organisations |
| Crafts | Tour operators | Development agencies |
| Media/Internet/new technologies | Other (please specify) | Other (please specify) |
| Performing arts | | |
| Other (please specify) | | |

3. POTENTIALS AND BENEFITS FOR SMALL AND MID-SIZED CITIES – CITY REPRESENTATIVE

3.1. Prior to joining this network, how did your city get informed about the potential benefits of cultural networking in general?

3.2. Which specific reasons/ foreseen advantages influenced your city's joining of this one (*name of the cultural route*).

3.3. Which were/are your main expectations from the cultural route network in terms of your city's cultural tourism development and promotion?

3.4. In your opinion, how does the involvement of your city contribute to raise the profile/ image/ competitiveness of the cultural route?

3.5. In your opinion, has participation provided the expected benefits so far?
(please circle or bold your choice)

YES

NO

If yes: please describe in which specific areas:

If not: please explain in which specific areas you are being disappointed.

3.6. In your opinion, what should be done to increase the networking benefits of the cultural route for small and mid-sized cities?

3.6.1. On the part of the network

3.6.2. On the part of the city

**3. POTENTIALS AND BENEFITS FOR SMALL AND MID-SIZED CITIES –
NETWORK COORDINATION REPRESENTATIVE**

3.7. Please include a recent membership list (name, country, membership status)

3.8. Within this list, how many partners would you qualify as representing small and mid-sized cities interests?

Villages (= ≤ 10 000 inhabitants):

Small town = 10 000 - 50 000 inhabitants:

Mid-sized town = 51 000 – 300 000 inhabitants:

Big cities: over 300 000 inhabitants:

Total:

3.9. What are, in your opinion, the specific expectations of small and mid-sized European cities within your network?

3.10. In your opinion, what specific benefits does the cultural route provide to small and mid-sized cities, as compared to:

3.10.1. bigger cities in the network (if relevant)

3.10.2. other types of cultural networks

3.11. Are there special membership conditions/advantages for the smaller cities/villages? (please circle or bold your choice)

YES

NO

If yes, please can you describe:

3.12. Did you (or do you plan to) set up special working groups/committees dealing with the smallest cities' matters in your network? (please circle or bold your choice)

YES

NO

If yes, under what form and for which purpose?

If not, why?

3.13. Can you identify specific difficulties and challenges faced by the smaller cities in maximizing the benefits of networking, as compared to the bigger ones? (please circle or bold your choice)

YES

NO

In both cases, please explain your answer:

- 3.14. In your opinion, what should be done to increase networking potentials and benefits of the cultural route for small and mid-sized cities?

4. NETWORKING BENEFITS FOR CULTURAL TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SMALL AND MID-SIZED CITIES – CITY REPRESENTATIVE

- 4.1. What is the level of cultural tourism development in your city? (please circle or bold your choice)

Beginning Developing Mature

- 4.2. Does your city have a formal tourism and/or cultural tourism strategy? (please circle or bold your choice)

YES

NO

4.2.2 Please describe its form (ex: specific policy, plan, strategic document...)

If yes: Did/does the belonging to the cultural route had/has an impact on its initiation, development and/or content? How?

If not: do you plan to develop one in the future? Why?

4.3. Is there a multi-stakeholder form of partnership for cultural tourism in your city? (please circle or bold your choice)

YES

NO

4.4. If yes (1), is it: (one answer only, please circle or bold your choice)

Formal (permanent)

Informal

Had hoc for certain projects

If yes (2):

Did/does the belonging to the cultural route had/has an impact on its initiation, development/organisational arrangements and/or activities? How?

4.5. Does the cultural route promote the development of such partnerships? (please circle or bold your choice)

YES

NO

4.6. If yes (multi-choice possible, please circle or bold your choice)

At the city level

At the regional level

At the cultural route/destination level

4.7. In your opinion, what are the key benefits provided by the network specifically to your city's successful development of competitive cultural tourism?

Please provide at least one example of a recent key benefit provided by the network for cultural tourism, either in your city or in your region/ destination.

4. NETWORKING BENEFITS FOR CULTURAL TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SMALL AND MID-SIZED CITIES – NETWORK COORDINATION REPRESENTATIVE

4.8. Please select your main activities in the left column (networking activities) by ticking (multiple choices possible) and indicate if they are concerned with urban cultural tourism (by ticking directly in the "urban cultural tourism" column).

| Networking activities | Urban cultural tourism activities? (If yes, please tick) |
|---|---|
| Meetings between members | |
| Conferences with enlarged audience | |
| Working groups | |
| Exchange programmes between members | |
| Marketing | |
| Cultural products/events development | |
| Best practice dissemination and promotion | |
| Cooperation projects | |
| Information for the public | |
| Expertise for members | |
| Lobbying/ representation of interests | |
| Magazine/ newsletter | |
| Research/ publications | |
| Database | |
| Evaluation programmes | |
| Other | |

Do the cultural route's activities include the following?

| | Yes | No |
|--|------------|-----------|
| Creation and development of common cultural tourism products/events | | |
| Common marketing strategies at the destination (cultural route) level | | |
| Tourism forecasting exercises | | |
| Promotion of collaboration between the cultural and tourism sector | | |
| Development of common cultural tourism strategies for the destination/cultural route | | |

Remarks: (please feel free to add information you may consider crucial to this study, as well as recommendations to the research team).

Contact person (in respect of this questionnaire)

Please enclose documentation about your organisation and return the questionnaire to:

Edith Besson
 Institute for Technology Assessment
 and Systems Analysis (ITAS)
 Karlsruhe Research Centre
 POB 3640; 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany
 Phone: +49.7247/82-6794
 Fax: +49.7247/82-4811
 E-mail: besson@itas.fzk.de

Electronic versions are welcome !

Thank you very much for your time.

Annex 2: Cultural Routes membership information

1. Via Francigena – membership list

Municipalities:

Canterbury (UK); Abbadia San Salvatore, Acquapendente, Alseno, Altopascio, Aosta, Aulla, Berceto, Bolsena, Buonconvento, Calendasco, Camaiore, Capranica, Castelnuovo Magra, Castelfranco di Sotto, Castiglione d'Orcia, Cavaglià, Chignolo Po, Colle Val d'Elsa, Fidenza, Filattiera, Fiorenzuola d'Arda, Forno Taro, Fosdinovo, Ivrea, Lucciana Nardi, Lucca, Montalcino, Montefiascone, Monteriggioni, Nepi, Olcenengo, Noceto, Orio Litta, Ortonovo, Piacenza, Pontenure, Pontremoli, Radicofani, Roma, Ronciglione, Roppolo, San Quirico d'Orcia, S. Stefano Magra, Sarzana, Senna Lodigiana, Siena, Sutri, Terenzo, Vercelli, Vetralla, Villafranca Lunigiana, Viterbo, Viverone;

Provinces:

Provincia Bella, Provincia La Spezia, Provincia Lodi, Provincia Massa Carrara, Provincia Parma, Provincia Piacenza, Provincia Viterbo, Provincia Vercelli;

Mountain communities:

Comunità Montana Monte Cervino, Comunità Montana Grand Combin;

Region:

Regione Lombardia

Villages (= ≤ 10 000 inhabitants): 36

Small town = 10 000 - 50 000 inhabitants: 14

Mid-sized town = 51 000 – 300 000 inhabitants:4

Big cities: over 300 000 inhabitants: 1

Total: 70 partners

2. Transromanica – membership list

| Partner | Organisation ⁷ | Country |
|---------|---|---------|
| LP/PP1 | Ministry for Building and Traffic of Federal Land Saxony-Anhalt | DE |
| PP2 | Ministry for Economy and Labour of Federal Land Saxony-Anhalt | DE |
| PP3 | dwif- Consulting GmbH – Bureau Magdeburg | DE |
| PP4 | Ministry for Economy, Labour and Infrastructure of Federal Land Thuringia | DE |
| PP5 | Registered charitable society „New Monastery Ichtershausen“ | DE |

⁷ These are the EU-project partners. We are dealing most of the time with regional tourist boards and/or regional culture organisations and not with cities. Cities are involved in the project work but are not directly members of the projects. Cities do not also finance Transromanica.

| | | |
|-------------|---|----|
| PP6 | Alpen-Adria-University of Klagenfurt | A |
| PP7 | Province of Modena | IT |
| PP8 | Thuringia Tourism GmbH | D |
| PP9 | Chamber of Commerce Carinthia | A |
| PP10 | Industriestiftungsinstitut e-Business | A |
| PP11 | State Marketing Society of Saxony-Anhalt | DE |
| PP12 | Tourism Association of East Bavaria e.V. | DE |
| PP13 | Bavaria Tourism Marketing GmbH | DE |
| PP14 | „Open churches“ project coordination body of the evangelic church of Saxony | DE |
| PP16 | Paradies Coach Tours Reisen GmbH A | A |
| PP17 | International Tourism Institute at National Tourist Association of Slovenia | SI |

3. Small Atlantic Ports – membership list

The list is not a final one, for the moment include villages with less than 10.000 inhabitants.

Total: 8 for the moment

4. Cluny Sites – membership list

Villages (less than 10 000 inhabitants) : 72
 Small towns (= 10 000 - 50 000 inhabitants) : 14
 Mid-sized towns (= 51 000 – 300 000 inhabitants) : 0
 Big cities : (plus de 300 000 habitants): 0

Total:

86 cities in France. There are alltogether 1400 Cluny sites but either they are not part of the network, or they are private properties.

5. Red de Juderias – membership list

Avila, Barcelona, Cáceres, Córdoba, Girona, Hervás (province of Cáceres), Jaén, León, Oviedo, Palma de Mallorca, Ribadavia (province of Ourense), Segovia, Toledo, Tortosay Tudela. The six partner cities are: Besalú, Calahorra, Estella, Monforte de Lemos, Plasencia y Tarazona.

Villages (= ≤ 10 000 inhabitants): 3 (Ribadavia, Hervás and Besalú)

Small town = 10 000 - 50 000 inhabitants:: 7 (Tortosay Tudela, Calahorra, Estella, Monforte de Lemos, Plasencia and Tarazona)

Mid-sized town = 51 000 – 300 000 inhabitants: 8 (Ávila, Cáceres, Girona, Jaén, León, Oviedo, Segovia, Toledo)

Big cities: over 300 000 inhabitants: 3 (Córdoba, Palma de Mallorca, Barcelona).

Total: 21

6. Via Regia – membership list

| | | |
|----|---------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Kiev | Ukraine |
| 2 | Rivne | Ukraine |
| 3 | Luck | Ukraine |
| 4 | Wolodymyr-Wolhynsk | Ukraine |
| 5 | Brodi | Ukraine |
| 6 | Lviv | Ukraine |
| 7 | Mostiska | Ukraine |
| 8 | Lublin | Poland |
| 9 | Przemyśl | Poland |
| 10 | Jarosław | Poland |
| 11 | Przeworsk | Poland |
| 12 | Rzeszów | Poland |
| 13 | Dębica | Poland |
| 14 | Tarnów | Poland |
| 15 | Kraków | Poland |
| 16 | Opole | Poland |
| 17 | Wrocław | Poland |
| 18 | Legnica | Poland |
| 19 | Nowogrodziec | Poland |
| 20 | Görlitz | Germany |
| 21 | Reichenbach | Germany |
| 22 | Weißenberg | Germany |
| 23 | Bautzen | Germany |
| 24 | Dresden | Germany |
| 25 | Königsbrück | Germany |
| 26 | Großenhain | Germany |
| 27 | Wurzen | Germany |
| 28 | Grimma | Germany |
| 29 | Leipzig | Germany |
| 30 | Markranstedt | Germany |
| 31 | Weißenfels | Germany |
| 32 | Naumburg | Germany |
| 33 | Camburg | Germany |
| 34 | Gera | Germany |
| 35 | Jena | Germany |
| 36 | Erfurt | Germany |
| 37 | Gotha | Germany |
| 38 | Eisenach | Germany |
| 39 | Vacha | Germany |

| | | |
|----|--------------------------|---------|
| 40 | Fulda | Germany |
| 41 | Frankfurt/ M. | Germany |
| 42 | Mainz | Germany |
| 43 | Alzey | Germany |
| 44 | Kirchheimbolanden | Germany |
| 45 | Winnweiler | Germany |
| 46 | Kaiserslautern | Germany |
| 47 | Homburg | Germany |
| 48 | Saarbrücken | Germany |
| 49 | Verdun | France |
| 50 | Reims | France |
| 51 | Soissons | France |
| 52 | Chateau-Thierry | France |
| 53 | Compiègne | France |
| 54 | Senlis | France |
| 55 | St. Jean d'Angely | France |
| 56 | Bordeaux | France |

Villages (= ≤ 10 000 inhabitants): 16

Small town = 10 000 - 50 000 inhabitants : 14

Mid-sized town = 51 000 – 300 000 inhabitants: 14

Big cities: over 300 000 inhabitants: 12

Total: 56

Annex 3: Cultural Routes' networking activities

Coord = coordinator

Y = Yes

N = No

CT = concerned with cultural tourism? (1= yes, 0= no)

| Question 2.8 Networking activities | Via Regia (coord) | | Via Regia (Rivnes) | | Transroma nica (coord) | | Transroma nica (Saxony) | | Via Francigena (coord) | | Via Francigena (Ilubilantes) | | Cluny Sites (coord) | | Cluny Sites (treasurer) | | Small Atlantic ports (coord) | | Small Atlantic ports (St Gilles) | | Red de Juderias (coord) | | Red de Juderias (Tea Cegos)) | | Burgemstr asse (Bamberg) | | TOTAL | |
|--|----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|----------------|--|----------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|---|----------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|------------|----------------|
| | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 | Y1 N0 | CT Y1 N1 |
| Meetings between members | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 8 |
| Conferences with enlarged audience | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4 |
| Working groups | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 8 |
| Exchange program between members | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 |
| Marketing | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 8 |
| Cultural products/ events devpt | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 9 |
| Best practice promotion | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 |
| Cooperation projects | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 |
| Information for the public | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 9 |
| Expertise for members | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| Lobbying | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| Magazine/ newsletter | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 7 |
| Research/ publications | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 |
| Database | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 |
| Evaluation programmes | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 13 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 14 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 11 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 15 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 132 | 87 |