



INNOVATIVE PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE URBAN TOURISM

Framework Approach and the European Experience

Dr. Krassimira Paskaleva-Shapira¹
Institute for Technology Assessment and System Analysis
Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe, Germany

Abstract

Europe's cities and towns contain a rich cultural heritage. Yet, maintaining this heritage presents many challenges, including dealing with the adverse environmental and social impacts of mass tourism. Demands from urban tourism alike are high and growing, hence the pressures and problems associated with the management of the sector have to be systematically tackled by all parties concerned. Public-private partnerships are an increasing aspect of the delivery of public policies and services across the world, yet with a limited application in sustainable tourism development. This paper explores some of the theoretical and policy issues concerning the reasons for development and operating partnerships to promote urban sustainable tourism practices. A comparative evidence of existing partnership cases in four European countries demonstrates the merits and the

¹ The author wishes to acknowledge the contributions of the entire *SUT-Governance* research team (see partners description at <http://sut.itas.fzk.de>) and Walter Kahlenborn and Jenny Atmanagara from *Ecologic* GmbH (Berlin) who helped in generating some of the information on partnerships for sustainable (urban) tourism in the four study countries – Germany, Austria, Greece and Bulgaria.

potentials of the approach, while emphasizing its, yet limited, utilization in public policy and management of urban tourism in cities across Europe.

I. Research Context

Tourism figures among the industries with major growth in Europe contributing with a 5 percent of GNP and generating 6 percent of all jobs in the European Union. Urban tourism alone represents 30 percent of the journeys and 20 of overnight stays, ranking respectively second and third among all tourist destinations (INTA 2001). Another large number of European cities is potential tourist destinations. Increasing investments in urban regeneration, heritage conservation and improving the quality of urban life to adapt the city to the needs of visitors of attractive facilities, comfortable transport, diverse events, and capitalisation of historical sites, among others, create new prospects for the industry and the local communities. These developments, however, create complex decision-making problems for the key stakeholders - city officials, planners and economic leaders, industry and the public. Involving sustainability considerations and long-term community advancement goals, poses even greater challenges to urban policy makers and tourism developers.

Sustainable urban tourism requires attention to varied elements, including (a) maintaining physical heritage in the context of living, developing cities; (b) allowing maximum access to available infrastructure, tourist sites, parks, and other green spaces; (c) strengthening the cultural and social viability of local community; (d) balancing interests of residents and visitors; (e) economic viability (providing sound long-term development and high quality employment opportunities); (f) minimizing adverse ecological impacts on sites from transportation, and (g) unsustainable consumption patterns. Achieving this involves advancing knowledge and practice about the types of partnerships that can be formed to promote urban sustainable tourism; the roles of government and other stakeholders; how local governments can apply such partnerships to local tourism development; and the critical issues and challenges to local governments seeking to create such partnerships. The paper addresses these complex multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral issues by contemplating a theoretical and policy framework supported by evidence of existing national practices of private-public-community partnerships for sustainable (urban) tourism in four European countries.

This research is part of a large international research and demonstration project ‘SUSTAINABLE URBAN TOURISM: Involving Local Agents and Partnerships for New Forms of Governance’ (SUT-Governance) administered by Germany’s Karlsruhe Research Center - Institute for Technology Assessment and Systems Analysis (ITAS) in collaboration with the University of Economics and Business Administration and Regional Consulting Ziviltechniker GmbH in Vienna (Austria), Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Greece), and the Veliko Turnovo University in Bulgaria.² The project presents an effort to work with public-private partnerships and urban governments in Europe to develop, validate, and deploy a general framework for *urban sustainable*

² This long-term project is a part of Key Action 4 “City of Tomorrow and Cultural Heritage” of the “Energy, Environment and Sustainable Development” Program within the “Fifth Framework Program” of the European Union.

tourism partnerships that is applicable to a variety of urban municipal and development contexts. The national and case study field research is focused in Germany, Austria, Greece and Bulgaria which present a mix of conditions for the analysis of urban sustainable tourism partnerships, with a range of contexts in terms of such factors as levels of economic, federal v. unified governmental structure, administrative capabilities, roles of local government and other non-governmental groups, types of tourism, and environmental policy frameworks. Within the four countries, case study efforts focus on partnerships in selected cities: Heidelberg (DE), Graz (A), Thessaloniki (Gr), and Turnovo (BG), all of which have been internationally recognized in their sustainable development policy efforts and have developed tourism as a strategic economic sector.

II. Theoretical Setting

The study conceptual approach builds on, yet not fully developed, three theoretical categories: (1) *sustainable (urban) tourism development*, (2) *role of tourism in integrated local community development*, and (3) *participatory governance* as an innovative form of achieving sustainable long-term solutions to existing local problems.

First, there is a fast growing – yet still not fully developed – body of work that focuses on sustainable tourism development in a global context. This work draws on detailed analyses of tourism growth, development trends, and economic, social, cultural, and environmental impacts. Second, an emerging area of analysis and debate about the role of tourism in local community (and urban) development, its benefits and costs to localities, and its local environmental impacts. Third, a well developed general body of literature on participation and governance. However, across all three areas, existing theories and practice are weak on specific challenges of how to establish effective decentralised decision-making and management for sustainable (urban) tourism. This section describes the state of current knowledge in these three areas, highlights gaps, and discusses the study approach to integrating these bodies of knowledge and advancing the state of the art.

There is large body of literature on the *tourist industry*, focusing on the sector's principles, basic concepts, philosophies, practices, forms of tourism, and its marketing. Opportunities and issues in the development of the sector and in its international management are relatively well defined (see Boo 1990; Cooper et al 1993; Doswell 1997; Gee, et al. 1997; Hetherington 1991; Kadt 1979; Kotler et al. 1993; Lea and Mointinhos (ed.) 1998; McIntosh 1994; Middleton 1994; Pearce 1996; Rogers 1993; Smith 1995; Smith and Eadington (ed.) 1992; WTO: various publications). Guidelines for the development of the sector have been established at international, national, regional, local, site-specific and architectural and engineering design levels (Gunn 1994; Inskip 1991; Lindberg et al. 1998; WTO 1994, 1998). Policy aspects and the responsibilities of the state have also been in focus of recent scholarly debates (Hall and Jenkins 1995; Johnson and Thomas (ed.) 1992).

However, the concept of *sustainable tourism* is relatively new. It is a concept that has increasingly been the subject of study and activity over the last decade, as mass tourism has expanded. In the 1990s and particularly after the adoption of Agenda 21, a stronger connection was made between tourism and the environment and the sectors potential for more sustainable development. To date, research and policy approaches

have focused on varied topics, including principles of sustainable tourism and policy perspectives (Stabler (ed.) 1997), the European experience (Priestley et al. (ed.) 1996; Montanary and Williams (ed.) 1995) consumer awareness and practices for responsible tourism (Harrison and Husbands 1996), eco-tourism and protected areas (Ceballos-Lascurain 1993), rural tourism development (Hetherington 1991), parks and green spaces (Mertes and Hall 1995), the adverse ecological effects of nature tourism (Lindberg 1991), and creating environmentally sound resorts (Rapaport ed. no date). Environmental guidelines have been developed for large tourist corporations and eco-tour operators (The Eco-tourism Society 1993), as well as for special categories such as marine tourism (The Eco-tourism Society 1995), nature tourism (Whelan ed. 1991), the development of national parks and protected areas for tourism (WTO and UNEP 1992), coastal areas (WTO, UNEP and FEEE 1996), and tourism and food safety (WTO and WHO 1991). However, there remains considerable debate about the processes and outcomes that should or will result from certain sustainable development strategies. Also, much less attention has been focused on sustainable tourism in a developed urban context, and there are many underlying and unresolved questions about how best to promote sustainable urban tourism practices.

Recently, debate has shifted from global perspectives to local issues about *tourism's relationships with host communities* (WTO, WTTC and The Earth Council 1995; WTO 1998) and on industry-community relations and interactions (Pearce et al 1996; Murphy 1985). Instruments for local governments to promote sustainability, address legislative issues, adopt LA21 principles, and regulate land use have been explored (UNCSD 1999). However, despite existing studies on local planning for tourism development (see Harrison and Husbands 1996; Hawkins, et al. (eds.) 1995; WTO, 1994), few locality-based studies offer in-depth analyses in the context of principles of sustainability. Stephen Page, for example, in his book "Urban Tourism" (1995), looks at the impacts of tourism in the urban areas, but he fails to make a step further and address the problems interactively from the perspectives of sustainability and its principles.

Just as there are gaps in global and local approaches to sustainable tourism, there are also weaknesses in knowledge about how *new forms of governance* can support *sustainable urban tourism*. Tourism raises many issues that are in the domain of city government, including issues related to urban fabric and infrastructure, the conservation of historic and cultural buildings and zones, controlling pressures for development, overcrowding, pollution, the quality of jobs, and accommodating new technologies and business forms. But local authorities alone cannot resolve such problems, requiring instead involvement of all stakeholders, the development of consensus, and the promotion of public-private-community partnerships. It has been argued that *innovation in participatory and governance* systems is a critical issue in Europe, and that research of the interactions society and the government must become an integral part of the process of innovation itself (Paraskevas and Muldur 1997).

It is apparent that the *sustainable management of urban tourism* focuses attention on the challenges that new decision making systems must overcome. Decision-making processes are diffused, reflecting the multiple and diverse stakeholders, points of responsibility, and gaps in authority that characterize the industry. To find solutions, *representative and responsible governance* requires that sustainability initiatives foster

tighter relationships and *partnerships* as the foundation from which to attack and solve these problems.

Various technologies and measures for sustainable development of the tourism sector, such as heritage preservation requirements for site developments and building designs, programs to exchange land and development rights from non-suitable to suitable development areas, private heritage and green space stewardship programs, tourism taxes and development fees to support construction and maintenance of required infrastructure have been advanced. However, as the experiences of hundreds of local authorities demonstrate, through their engagement in broad-based sustainable development planning through *Local Agenda 21*, the appropriate application of these technologies and resources requires effective and *accountable partnerships* (ICLEI 1999). If industry and government are to protect and sustain the social, cultural and environmental wealth that attracts tourists, they should build partnerships to plan, manage and invest in this wealth.

A growing number of books in recent years offer evaluations of public-private partnerships in a broad range of theory and policy areas - education, health care and health policy, welfare, environmental and energy policy, technology research and development, and transportation (see Osborne (ed.) 2000; Bennet and Krebs 1991). Partnerships are also articulated as key to improving urban life (Colman 1989; Davis (ed.) no date). However, none of the literatures have explored the opportunities that multi-stakeholders' cooperation provides for development of sustainable tourism practices in various settings.

Finally, *participation*, as a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives and the decision and the resources which affect them (World Bank 1998), has been defined as a key principle of sustainability by all major international organizations promoting sustainable development. In tourism, however, the issue of participation and stakeholders involvement in development has been only addressed to-date in the context of national tourism administrations (WTO 1996). Studies on the local perspectives of participation are still missing. In-depth analysis of successful complex urban tourist management involving sustainable principles is sparse. Examples of urban cases that have explicitly sought to develop sustainable forms of tourism by involving all principle actors in local decision-making are even more rare. It is difficult to locate case studies of sustainable urban tourism which are detailed enough to assist policy-makers in making decisions about the methods and the mechanisms to undertake joint activities with other principle stakeholders. Many local community participants in these efforts also lack convenient access to policy-oriented framework to reflect commonalties and principles. Therefore, we assert that an integrated framework of stakeholders' participation is needed to assist future efforts in sustainable urban management of tourism.

III. Theory and Policy of Urban Partnerships for Sustainable Tourism: Concepts and Definitions

The concept of partnerships is at the core of the approach of innovative participatory governance which “allows the mobilisation and co-operation of a great number of actors in order to mould the necessary political and operational consensus to affect directly the every day life of all members of society” (ISSC-UNISCO/MOST

1997). Fundamental to effective urban governance is considered the establishment of public-private-citizen partnerships involving the principles of sustainability and Agenda 21. The creation of tangible, working local partnerships is also a key issue in the current sustainable tourism debate, as argued earlier in this paper.

The term ‘partnerships’ covers greatly differing concepts and practices and is used to describe a wide variety of relationships in a myriad of circumstances and locations (Mc Quaid 2000). This section considers aspects and definitions of partnerships from the perspectives of governance, policy, and public-private cooperation in the context of urban sustainable tourism development.

1. Urban Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships

The need for a greater partnership in policy-making and implementation is considered a key principle of participatory *Governance*.

a. Governance

The concept of *governance* has been articulated widely in the last decade and can generally be conceived as actions between actors to foster democracy and overall societal and community prosperity (UNESCO 1995). The “Commission on Global Governance” (1995) underlines three main aspects of the above definition. First, governance is not only government. Governance as a concept involves recognition that power exists inside and outside the formal authority of government. In many existing formulations, governance includes government, the private sector and civil society. Second, governance is a neutral concept. Governance can employ various forms: effective and incompetent, oppressive or benevolent. Third, governance also emphasizes ‘process’. It recognizes that decisions are made on the basis of complex relationships between many actors with different and sometimes conflicting priorities (UNCHS 2000).

The *city level adaptation of governance* could be taken as the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, plan and manage the common affairs of the city. The UN’s Habitat Program regards it as a “continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and cooperative action can be taken. It includes formal institutions as well as informal arrangements and the social capital of citizens”. Furthermore, urban governance is inextricably linked to the welfare of the citizenry. Generally, *good urban governance* can be characterized by sustainability, decentralization, equity, efficiency, transparency and accountability, civic engagement and citizenship, and security, and that these norms are interdependent and mutually reinforcing (UNCHS 2000). The UNCHS “Draft Declaration on the Norms of Good Urban Governance” argues “good urban governance, to deserve that qualification, must ensure that everyone shares equally the benefits of urban life”. To attain a maximum representation and benefits for all, partnerships between the stakeholders must be developed and operated.

b. Delivering effective public policy: Why have partnerships?

A key recommendation of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit was to foster public-private collaboration in the global and local search of sustainability. Public-private partnerships (PPP) alone have been an increasing aspect of the delivery of public policies and services

since the 1970s developing first in the USA and then spreading at various rates in other countries (Carroll and Steane 2000:38). The 1990s have seen the establishment of PPP as a key tool of public policy across the world as part of the governments' efforts to promote employment and local economic development in partnership with business (Waltzer and Jacobs 1998). Today, PPPs offer alternatives to full privatisation, the trend of the 1980s, combining the advantages of both the public and the private sector. They represent the second generation of efforts to bring competitive market discipline to bear on government operations. Unlike the first generation of privatizing efforts, partnering today involves sharing both responsibility and financial risk. In the best situations, the strengths of each sector maximize the overall performance. In these cases, partnering institutionalizes collaborative arrangements in which the differences between the sectors become blurred. While this is still the case today, the role played by the non-profit sector is recently also increasing with non-profit organizations entering partnerships for generally altruistic reasons or political objectives (Carroll and Steane 2000: 50).

Overall, as Osborne (2000: 1) convincingly argues 'not only have partnerships been seen as a co-efficient and effective mechanisms for the implementation of public policy across a range of policy agenda, they have also been perceived as bringing significant benefits to the whole community'. In the UK, PPPs are a core stone of the development of stakeholder society of the Labor Government enjoying a particular success in urban regeneration and social inclusion (Falconer and Ross 1998). Within the European Union policy development, PPPs are essential integrative mechanisms both to combat social inclusion and to enhance local community development (Jones 1998). In the US and Canada, PPPs have been central to state-government initiatives to regenerate urban communities and promote local economic development (Aspen Institute 1997; Podziba 1998).

In tune with the sustainability debate of the 1990s, one can ask the question 'why forming partnerships for *sustainable local development*?'. Most of all, because in their nature, partnerships seek to develop a consensual approach to the joint pursuit of a medium- to long-term strategy, which advances both the individual and collective interests of their various members. PPP also recognise that both the public sector and the private sector have certain advantages relative to the other in the performance of the specific tasks. Thus, by allowing each sector to do what it does best, public services, infrastructure, and sectors' performance can be provided in a more efficient manner (Municipia 2001).

Furthermore, PPPs in their various forms are especially appropriate for securing economic, social, and community development in the current period showing tendencies towards expansion of governance (Irish National Economic and Social Council 2000). Partnerships are viewed as effective forms of governance because they can build collective responsibility for planning, decision-making, problem solving, project implementation and evaluation. They can also create network to share knowledge, resources, and common goals. Participation, local ownership and shared responsibility are important aspects of this innovative approach. This complementary approach with a flexible design and a constant feedback mechanism contributes to the success of public-private partnerships. Finally, PPPs can be catalysts of sustainable community dialogue, integrated solutions, and long-term local change.

c. What are public-private partnerships for the urban environment?

Following the recommendations of the Rio Conference on Sustainable Development, the United Nation's Urban Program has been largely supporting the development of innovative and sustainable partnerships in cities around the world (UNDP 2001). Governments, businesses, non-governmental organizations, members of the scientific and academic community, and other institutions have been encouraged to promote sustainable models of public-private cooperation in urban areas to address infrastructure and environmental problems, in the most part. Stakeholders involvement in planning, action, and assessment and feedback of policies have been seen as a more responsive and more effective method of urban governance in context of the Local Agenda 21 principles by lead development organizations. Key to this innovative plural model of service delivery have been broad participation, local ownership and shared responsibility for urban problem solving among all partners and interests. The above forms the core of the urban governance framework context of public-private partnerships evolving community gains and benefits (Ross and Osborne 1999).

Why are partnerships essential for the long-term prosperity of our cities? Today, it has become apparent that urban problems, environmental and social in particular, are becoming more acute as available government services and resources are overwhelmed by expanding populations, accelerating growth, and diverse management responsibilities. Although limited government funds represent a key challenge, the need for promoting an integrated long-term development of the European (and other) cities creates opportunities to use partnerships to optimise the application of available public and private resources to benefit all citizens and communities. In recent years, PPP is one of the most attractive tool being used to help address the urban environmental crisis based on the recognition that both the public and private sectors can benefit by pooling their resources of basic services (UNDP PPP 2001).

Public-private partnerships are becoming increasingly important in the local economic development efforts of many cities. Local partnerships are now a feature of how public policies are implemented, and are particularly used as the mechanism for the implementation of area-based regeneration and development actions under the Structural Funds. Yet, there has not been sufficient learning from these experiences yet - some partnerships have been more effective than others. Many have not been particularly effective in promoting wider representation of interests in decision-making and are considered to lack legitimacy. They have not fit well with structures and processes of representative democracy and there have been inequalities in representation of interests and influence. The conditions for effective partnership (organisation of interests, parity of resources, cultural factors etc. – see further in text) are often not well developed. Ways of achieving better balance along all of these lines needs to become part of the criteria and the focus of capacity building support in urban policy.

Despite the difficulties, however, partnerships are continuing to receive widespread support from across political spectrum including policy makers, officials and urban communities. They are likely to remain high on the policy agenda on all levels. At the local level a wide range of pragmatic factors such as resource constraints and ideological factors (see Leach et al. 1994) justify continued or greater involvement in partnerships approaches. Other factors include the move towards enabling local government to

implement sustainable policies, a recognition that anyone local actor does not have the resources or competences to deal with the interconnected issue raised by multiple policy areas of urban development, and a general agreement that urban regeneration and long-term progress should involve a genuine participation of the local community.

Various multi-stakeholder partnerships form the bases of innovative urban governance: between central governments and local authorities; between private and public sector for the management and development of urban sectors, state organs and citizens, and voluntary organizations to maintain social, cultural, and environmental viability of cities. A special interest in the delivery of urban governance is to support innovative forms of partnerships in the triangle of governments, businesses and civil society (UNDP 2001). Within the context of the urban environment, PPPs in general involve cooperation between the public and private sector for mutual benefits contributing to the improving of the urban economy and the quality of life (Harding 1990). This approach incorporates a voluntary nature of the relationship, the need for an agreed strategy, a long time scale, and agreed contributions of resources (presumably in a variety of forms) to the process.

The MUNICIPIA International Consortium for Urban Decision Making (2001) defines *PPP for the urban environment* as a “partnership between the public and private sector for the purpose of delivering a project or service traditionally provided by the public sector”. The United Nation’s development program considers PPP as innovative partnerships at the local level, particularly well working in small and medium-sized cities, where potential stakeholders are involved including investors, providers, regulators, users, and experts to meet the challenge of providing various urban services and promote integrated development. We can thus use the term “Public-Private Partnership” (PPP) to describe a spectrum of possible relationships between public and private actors for the co-operative provision of services and development³.

Using this innovation approach, PPP can support cities in meeting their *urban sustainable objectives* by promoting a closer collaboration between the private and the public sectors. Thus, a working definition of PPP for sustainable urban environment could be taken as a the mobilization of coalition of interest drawn from more than one sector in order to develop and implement an agreed strategy for various activities which entails sustainable outcomes based on a broad local vision for the area and community. PPPs obviously offer alternatives to joint ventures (through divestiture of government assets) by combining the social responsibility, environmental awareness and public accountability of the public sector, with the finance, technology, managerial efficiency and entrepreneurial spirit of the private sector. The “right” relationship is thus the one that best meets the needs and goals of the partners in the local urban context.

From a *policy perspective*, partnership can be viewed as a coalition in which risks, resources and skills are shared in projects that benefit each partner as well as the community (Stratton 1989). It is not enough, however, to just build partnership structures; it is also important to build up a culture of partnership. This needs longer

³ In the context of *public-private partnerships* (PPP), we use a broad definition of the private sector, including local, national and international businesses, as well as informal enterprises, non-governmental organizations and communities.

timescales for development and is an important part of the wider capacity building process of urban governance.

2. Urban Partnerships: Sustainable tourism perspectives

The issue of *urban tourism* sets up the spatial framework of exploring partnership formation.

a. Urban tourism: Opportunities for cooperation

Tourism is one of the fastest growing sectors of the European and global economy. On our continent, as long as 1970, P. Hall (1970:445) predicted that ‘the age of mass tourism is the biggest single factor for change in the great capitals of Europe - and in many small historic cities – in the last 30 years of this century’. According to Law (1993:1) “‘large cities are arguably the most important type of tourist destinations across the world’ and yet urban areas have been neglected in most academic tourism studies. Major components of tourism and its wide-ranging effects on urban places remain relatively unknown. The operation and the management of this process have been generally poorly understood in theoretical and conceptual terms.

Cities as tourist destinations have multiple functions: they serve as gateways to enter the country, as centers for accommodation, and base for excursions to rural areas and destinations of their own right. Moreover, urban areas are not simply destinations where populations concentrate together with economic activities, cultural life and the control of political powers but they also have a great role as centers of tourism activities. This suggests that research and practice should focus on *urban tourism* rather than tourism in cities.

What constitutes *urban tourism*? These can be a number of activities and motivations (tourism demand). Though varying by destinations and its attractions, these could be visiting friends, business/convention, outdoor recreation, entertaining and sightseeing, shopping, and education. The tourist city thus embraces all of the above functions and their resources. However, tourist infrastructure, services and activities (the supply of urban tourism) side has multiple users including the city residents, city-region residents, and people working within the city.

Unfortunately, urban tourism, because the supply and demand side of tourism is entwined with other urban functions, it has been viewed as ephemeral phenomenon which is seasonal in character and transitory, as an adjunct to the way in which cities operate. As a result, local planners have considered tourism as a managerial activity with limited concerns over the effects of such a transitory activity rather than activity with potentials towards sustainable urban development. Thus, with little research on urban tourism, the public sector has not seen the necessity of detailed research to understand urban tourism.

However, with tourism studies gaining a strong recognition in the last decade it is appropriate for academics and practitioners to examine the wide-ranging effects of tourism in localities in different social, cultural, and political environments. As it was noted earlier, urban tourism constitutes a complex nature within the multifunctional nature of cities as tourist destinations. Urban tourist functions are very rarely solely

produced for, or consumed by, tourists but a whole range of users (Shaw and Williams 1994: 201). This requires a system approach to understand the interrelated nature of tourism activities within cities. This holistic view of urban tourism also helps considering long-term community benefits.

Whether these are capital cities, or metropolitan centers, large historic cities or inner-city areas, cultural cities, revitalized waterfront sides or industrial cities, the issues of multifaceted relationships and complex impacts of tourism remain consistent. The development, expansion, and operation of tourism in urban areas, despite the economic merits⁴, have led to a number of *negative impacts for the cities* and their population. Yet the concern of the sector's impacts is not confined to urban areas only – it's a part of a growing concern for the impact and long-term sustainability of both tourism and the host community. These constitute the social and cultural impacts on changing value systems, individual behaviors, family relations, collective lifestyles, safety levels, moral conduct, creative expressions, traditional ceremonies and community organizations (Fox 1977).

Finally, the *environmental dimensions and impacts of tourism* in the cities are assuming a growing significance with their number steadily increasing due to tourism expansion: architectural 'pollution', urban sprawl in absence of planning, overloaded infrastructure, traffic congestion, pollution of ecosystem from sewage, litter (Mathieson and Wall 1982). Thus tourism may lead to changes in the urban environmental and physical characteristics, visual impacts on the environment, requirements of urban infrastructure, urban forms, and decline of quality of the urban environment (Green and Hunter 1992) due to lack of planning.

On the other side, however, tourism can also assist the improvement of the urban ecology. Shaw and Williams (1992), for example, report on not just the environmental concerns in inner city areas, but also claim that tourism can actually enhance the environmental quality particularly where the industry is used to regenerate entire inner city districts, or, as Law (1993) argues too, redundant urban spaces. Evidence from multiple cities indeed indicates, that tourism could be beneficial to the urban environment in the restoration of specific features in the historical and cultural environment or architecture of buildings and reuse of redundant buildings.

The impact phenomenon of tourism thus involves a wide range *participation of local actors*. A wide range of agents of development become involved in either directly meeting the needs of tourists or to facilitate control, planning and regulation, commonly being the responsibility of the public sector. In the age of public-private partnerships this is important to understand who is responsible for urban tourism and what organizations can do to improve their experience. Other important questions are: What are the principal partners for shaping and implementing policies? What is the organizational strength for tourism development strategies – is there formal or informal urban organizing capacity oriented specifically to further common interest and goals and to what extent are the urban authorities involved in shaping the development of tourism and leisure activity in the cities? In urban tourism, it is important to define the *range of actors involved* and the power devolved. Because of the decentralized management of the sector, we argue, these

⁴ As Law (1993) argues, many urban governments are primarily viewing tourism as a mechanism to aid the regeneration of ailing economies, a perception carrying their one problem since tourists are not noted for their high level of customer loyalty to tourism destinations.

are the main stakeholders: local authorities, the private sector, the voluntary sector and the local community.

Multiple *opportunities for cooperation* exist. Key is the stakeholders' involvement in long-term strategic planning and development. Other areas include innovations in management of urban tourism problems such as visitor managing in small history sites, museums and galleries, theaters and concerts; development of (a) activity places such as cultural concert halls, exhibitions, museums and art galleries or sport facilities and organized events, or (b) leisure settings such as ancient buildings and monuments, harbors, historical street pattern, parks and green areas, or ecclesiastical buildings, and (c) socio-cultural features as folklore, friendliness, language, liveliness and ambience of the place, local customs and security. Additional opportunities include community markets, residents-friendly shopping areas, and secondary elements such as site accessibility and parking areas, information offices and programs.

b. Urban Tourism: Issues of sustainability

Understanding the concepts of sustainable development in general and sustainable tourism in particular requires that we consider several considerations (1) what should be sustained (2) over what temporal and social organizational scale (3) for whom and (4) why. Ideally, sustainable tourism combines and must seek a balance between (a) present benefits with (b) the protection and enhancement of future opportunities (in context of natural resources, natural and cultural heritage and socio-economic prosperity) for the population of the host community while (3) maintaining its cultural, environmental, and biological quality, diversity, integrity, and viability (Based on UN CSD and the WTO approach to sustainable tourism and Lopez de Avila 1995). Furthermore, sustainable tourism should benefit all citizens, regions, and tourism industries (OECD 1997). Far-reaching views assert the importance of social participation, including the local communities as well. Furthermore, on a large scale, sustainable tourism must serve broad community goals, such as maintenance of the socio-economic welfare or a positive level of residents' attitude, for example. Moreover, it also has to reinforce the cultural integrity and social, historic and cultural norms of the whole society. In the above context, sustainable tourism implies too that the historic and cultural resources of tourism are preserved and/or enhanced for continuous use for the future and the present while seeking preservation and consolidation of its cultural values and traditions (OECD 1997). Therefore, sustainable tourism means that tourist development does not generate environmental and socio-cultural problems. In these complex relations, *Local Agenda 21* can bring to light the links between tourism, local prosperity and sustainability.

Theoretical and empirical research, however, also indicates that the above goals may be best achieved by cooperation of all groups at all levels with a view of facilitating Local Agenda 21 principles of sustainable development so widely shared benefits among community members and society as a whole can be accomplished. Thus three main gains can be achieved: increased local social welfare; greater and more equitably distributed local economic wealth, and enhanced integrity of local ecosystems. In this larger context, one can claim that a proof of 'sustainable tourism' is the 'sustainable development' of local communities that serve as tourist destinations (ICLEI 1999).

c. Partnerships for sustainable urban tourism: Pros and Cons

The discussion so far suggests a number of factors, which may promote or hinder partnerships for sustainable urban tourism. A range of merits was described in the previous sections. In summary, for partners, PPPs allow several key *advantages*:

Resource availability: Pulling or leverage, or increasing the scale and level of resources, in terms of finance, marketing, administration or production;

Increased effectiveness and efficiency of individual organizations through improved coordination and decreased wasteful duplication therefore achieving a greater output and cost savings⁵;

Building local capacity for action and control by the local community and other stakeholders;

Allowing a greater legitimacy for policy involving actors directly rather than the Representative democracy of local government (although this raises questions about the form of participation where in tourism, we argue that a stakeholders participation is more beneficial than a broad-based public participations).

Avoiding conflict, create confidence and trust and increase participation of community members is another aspect of partnerships.

However, partnerships also present *multiple problems*, which may vary according to the type of partnership. These revolve around resource costs, power distribution and inequality (between bodies and over time), unclear goals, resource costs, unequal power, impacts upon other mainstream services, differences in philosophy among partners, and operational difficulties and organizational problems (Hastings 1996). In terms of sustainability, key among them is the importance of the future relative to present. Short-term profits versus long-term integrated objectives often pose challenges to the various stakeholders. 'Long-term relationship can overcome the dilemma and achieve the optimum outcome', says Kay (1993). Therefore stable cooperation is considered necessary involving frequent interactions between individuals binded by in long-term multi-level relationships between the organizations. An active private sector and persistence of policies suggests greater potential for long-term co-operations. In order to attract greater involvement of the sectors it is also important that the most appropriate pay-offs for each actor individually are considered. Next, local characteristics, capacity building networks and the potentials for participation of the local community are also important in assisting PPPs.

Overall characteristics of *effective development partnership*, may include: clarity of objectives; agreement on operation (structure, resources, responsibilities, management longer term strategy); clear line of communication; clear exit routes (what happens when and after objectives are met); supportive institutional structure; suitable system of incentives to encourage change of behavior; and last, but not least, trust between institutions

A successful partnership can lead to number of *public-policy and community gains*: (I) To integrate sectors and utilize resources from public and private sectors of local communities to combat inequality and exclusion; (ii) To reform services to become more accessible and responsive to consumer's needs; (ii) To use local networks for

⁵ For certain tourism policies partnerships are crucial for creating a positive external and community perceptions (Kotler et al. 1993), or in the long-term, to increase economic effectiveness through creating stability, building local confidence and minimizing risks for partners and investors.

implementation of PPP; (iv) To attain a more flexible and improved public-policy making process by utilizing community and business links, and (v) To create basis of governance and civil society.

3. Public Policy Context of Partnering: The city role in catalyzing PPP for sustainable urban tourism

In view of the growing complexity of urban development, it is increasingly necessary to make all active participants in the urban environment, the so-called *urban decision makers*, face up to their responsibilities and let the citizens they represent have a say in the running of cities. Urban decision makers are not usually individuals but organizations, groups and businesses. This chapter considers some of the issues concerning the role of urban authorities in promoting PPPs for sustainable tourism.

As it was discussed earlier, the social, economic and environmental impacts of tourism are interrelated, overlapping and mutually reinforcing. Partnerships therefore are essential in order to tackle problems of local tourism, their causes and the externalities. This view apparently must underpin urban policy for sustainable tourism, as it has been done in urban regeneration or employment and social inclusion programs in the 1980s and more recent EU policies to generate partnerships in support of local and regional development programs.

An important question is why should the public sector and others seek forming a partnership rather than carrying out the activity by itself. This section considered some of the arguments in favor of forming and implementing partnerships as part of urban governance policy-making. First, a number one point is that by cooperating the sum of benefits may increase using a given level of resources. Moreover, partnerships are considered to be an effective way of overcoming market imperfections caused by externalities. Therefore the government should provide the Good and the services.

Thus the issue of the role of the local authorities in entering and enforcing partnerships comes into play. Why should cities catalyze and sustain partnerships? A strong incentive should be sustaining long-term community sustainable development, or bringing in external resources (funding, expertise, links to other schemes), avoidance of duplication, replication of good practices on other joint activities, and hence more effective and efficient policy development and implementation. In summary, while the private sector could be largely motivated by profit, the public sector, in contrast, may become involve in tourism for a set of reasons, among which most important are: (i) Economic (aid local economies, diversify the economy, increase employment, increase revenues form taxes, generate new employment opportunities (Based on Pearce 1989); (ii) Social and cultural (ensure well being and health of individuals is protected, promote cultural awareness of an area and its people); (iii) Environmental (undertake the stewardship of the environment and tourism resources that the agents of development do not destroy the future basis for sustainable tourism development; (iv) Political reasons (further political objectives and broaden political acceptance of the local administration (Based on Page 1995).

However, despite the apparent core role, as Pierce (1989:44) rightfully acknowledges, 'the public sector is by no means a single entity with clear cut

responsibilities and single policies for tourism development'. Rather it becomes involved in variety of forms at different levels and through many agencies and institutions. A key factor in promoting successful partnerships is strong political leadership. City authorities have a central role to play, as the structures of local democracy.

IV. Understanding and Analyzing Partnerships for Sustainable Urban Tourism: Framework Approach

Efforts to implement partnerships at the local level, however, face many challenges. A successful realization itself is a great challenge. A wealth of literature deliberates on most important issue of partnerships⁶. All of these literatures are important on their own. Missing, however, is a framework to link management and impact considerations of partnerships across communities in various contexts. Understanding the nature and goals of PPPs, the instructional characteristics, the components, the process and governing of PPPs is key to understanding the role of partnerships. However, divergent of public-policy contexts for PPPs need to understand such partnerships in terms of their national and local context and impacts where the public sector assumes a leadership role.

To deal with the complexity and the relationships, which co-exist within urban tourism, one needs to develop an analytical framework, which can synthesize the multiplicity of factors, processes, and issues affecting the process of urban tourism in different contexts. The objective of developing such framework is to encompass a range of multidisciplinary perspectives, the total experience of urban tourism and its impacts on the host community. To reduce the complexity of the holistic approach, a number of main attributes and certain components will be defined which highlight the interrelated nature of the different factors affecting the effectiveness and success of urban sustainable tourism. In this section, we offer a framework for horizontal partnerships at the local level (public-private-voluntary sector) in host communities involving the factors that are useful in understanding partnerships in different circumstances but particularly for sustainable tourism practices in urban contexts.

To operationalize the theoretical setting, we employ a conceptual model. We hypothesize that, first, a system of urban community-specific factors determines the results of an individual type of tourist partnership activity. Cities and towns are comprised of systems that are economic, social, institutional, and environmental in nature. Without accurate information on how these systems function together, decision-makers cannot effectively analyze the systems in their care. Second, an instituted government decision-making framework for partnerships and sustainable tourism development is needed to ensure an effective partnership process and its implementation. In return, we argue that it is important to view PPPs not as a describe phenomenon but rather within the broader

For example, (1) the nature of organization, structure, resource dependency of collaboration, and institutional paradigm (Huxham and Vangen 1996, Benson 1975; DiMaggio and Powell 1988); (2) the public management emphasizing on issues of relationships, management and costs (Osborn 1997); (3) a public-governance perspective of PPPs emphasizing on the political and social context of relationships within networks (Kooiman 1993; Kickert 1997); (4) community development perspectives of PPPs within the context of needs of the local community (Oakley 1991); (5) empirical evidence describing the process and the impact of PPPs upon provision of local services and the local community development (Taylor 1997).

institutional framework within which they operate. When the latter is explored then the strength and weakness of the government and other stakeholders within it become apparent. Third, key to its success is the establishment and operation of an effective partnership process using the appropriate methods and approaches. And finally, the employment of effective implementation methods, including high technical skills and up-to-date technologies followed by assessments of the impacts and feedback for use in other relevant projects and activities is critical for success. In this context, we argue that a vital issue of the evolution of PPPs is the complex impacts on community development, capacity building and civil society, and finally the contribution, which PPPs can make on public-policy-making. In this line of analysis, in order to be able to identify, among other factors, those that lead to the project's success, all factors need to be analyzed in a holistic way.

Our conceptual model thus builds on three classes of attributes and the interfaces between and among them. The three attributes are *context*, *activity*, and *resolution*. The interfaces between and among these attributes are *public involvement* and *multi-stakeholder partnerships*.

Context Attributes include (1) specific activity-related factors pertaining to the context in which tourism development issue exists, including: (a) demographic characteristics of the community affected by tourism development such as income and education; (b) economic development issue such as ownership, growth rates, employment opportunities and unemployment; (c) environment and land-use considerations including such as energy and resource utilization, location of site/activity within the urban space, : accessibility, environmental issues, and zoning restrictions; (d) cultural and historic preservation issues and (e) and community organizational structure including whether the community has a formalized structure with defined leadership roles and responsibilities and the capacity to delegate responsibilities, workers associations, and the availability of consumer and other interest groups; (2) Specific characteristics of the established process of decision-making for tourism management, including considerations of the Local Agenda 21 principles, commitment to partnerships, training, dissemination and awareness raising, and networking locally, regionally, and beyond; (3) The level of commitment of the local government to Local Agenda 21, creating partnerships and sustainable tourism development (Local Agenda 21 Action plan and the link to tourist industry, institutionalized decision-making for sustainable development, action to involve directly and indirectly affected partners including the non-joiners, and commitment to openness, transparency, and awareness-raising).

Activity/Program Attributes include features of the activity being proposed or pursued: Understanding the capabilities and limitations of the technology (methodology) selected for the activity; costs, the time necessary to establish and conduct the activity and possibilities of affect on future development opportunities; the socio-political, regulatory, and legal implications of the proposed activity; and the sustainability of the proposed activity including the ability of the design team to account for the externalities, including environmental, social, economic, and cultural impacts.

Project Resolution Attributes comprise the union of all other classes of attributes. This class includes features describing the design and the implementation of the activity including effectiveness, efficiency, evaluation and feedback, communication, applicable statutes and regulations, and principles of urban sustainability.

Public Involvement Attributes present the first interface class of attributes, defining the overlap between context attributes and resolution attributes. This class of attributes includes features such as general awareness of problems and the level of community concern, commitment by the community to support the proposed activity to successful completion, and specificity of goals, public perceptions of risk including the degree of risk, and assurance that all parties are working to minimize risk; degree of community empowerment to resist adverse impacts, providing the community with ownership, maintenance, and a financial stake in the outcome of the action. Other attributes include the establishment of relationships between the public and the technical providers through free flow of information, the development of trust in each of the parties, clearly defining roles and responsibilities through memoranda of agreements or similar methods with the objective being the creation of openness and integrity among parties; and, the understanding of the community's long-term interests, facilitated by the efforts necessary to get to know the community and the willingness to listen to the community .

Establishing Effective Partnerships is the second and key to the issue of effective governance of local sustainable tourism, the focus of this project, which includes features such as establishing an institutionalized (government) approach to involving partnerships in the decision-making process for tourism development, including (a) identification of areas of concerns and the "right" partners for funding the best solutions, (b) involving the stakeholders in participatory planning and decision-making, (c) collaborative evaluation of impacts, (d) effective implementation and monitoring, (e) assessing feedback for considerations in future projects. The methods by which partnerships are constituted (e.g. time limited agreements, focus on specific issues) and structures and ways of working in order to manage a process of wide participation (e.g. through sub-structures of partnerships, working groups on specific themes) need further attention.

While extensive knowledge exists about the subsets of the attributes, to date no integrated framework has been established to reflect the relationships between all these attribute classes to show their relative and/or collective influence on the success of a tourism-focused urban project. The larger *SUT-Governance* project seeks to create and establish such a unified framework based on empirical review and evaluation of existing success cases. The framework can assist evaluation of SUT PPPs' success.

V. Partnerships for Sustainable Urban Tourism in European Perspective: Context & Development

In this chapter we discuss some of the key findings of the first phase of the *SUT-Governance* project examining (1) Framework development: Influences on decision-making for PPP for SUT and (2) Country context assessment in Germany, Austria, Greece, and Bulgaria. A range of cases from the four countries is brought in highlighting their nature, goals and links with sustainability. A detailed investigation on the application of PPPs in promoting urban sustainable tourism in Europe will be the focus of the next phase of the *SUT-Governance* project.

The initial findings of the detailed country framework analysis, empirical review and the evaluation of existing projects in the selected four countries, indicate that, though a number of PPPs for (sustainable) tourism have been established on all levels of both government and industry policy and action efforts, they are mostly in the area of

marketing. The cases come from a number of tourism activity fields. On local urban level specifically, some partnership projects deal with traffic related problems in tourist areas (Heidelberg, Germany) or seek improvement of the industry performance towards sustainability (ECO-LABEL in Vienna and Graz, Austria). In Bulgaria, the newly established local and regional tourism associations have practically opened the door to various stakeholders allowing a greater participation in promoting more sustainable local forms of tourism. The cultural basis for PPPs is differently established in the selected countries. However, while each partnership is a function of particular historical, economic, social, and political context, there are many common natures and trends. Apparently, while many urban pressures are encouraging PPPs, the local political and sectoral cultures are generally far less open to this model of service delivery. Greece represents an exception since tourism is high on all policy agendas nationwide.

As a result, the role of partnerships in promoting urban sustainable tourism, by and large, has been insignificant in all four countries. Moreover, the impact of the existing programs on urban decision-making and management of tourism in the direction of participatory governance and sustainable community development has been minimum. Germany, for example, represents one unambiguous case demonstrating the general lack of interest and action in catalyzing partnerships for sustainable urban tourism, on part of all sectors, including public authorities, industry, tourism associations, and non-governmental interest groups and organizations due to its generally rigid administrative system. Moreover, the institutionalization of this innovative approach by local authorities is usually not a priority on their policy agendas. However, some successful cases demonstrate that partnerships maintain strong potentials for improving tourism practices towards a more sustainable future. Here are some examples:

- In Munich (GE) the local tourist board and some private companies have set up a programme to provide tourists with the opportunity to visit the city either walking or by bicycle, bus, tram or coach. A special brochure promotes the program.
- Also in Munich, hotel booking via the “Munich Key” (Münchener Schlüssel) includes automatically a ticket for public transport services.
- Freiburg (GE) has stipulated an agreement with local hotels and restaurants to exclude of packaging waste tax those hotels and restaurants, which do not use disposal packaging and serving utile.
- Baden-Baden (GE) operates a biodegradable facility and a number of restaurants and hotels now participate in the established treatment scheme.
- The city of Worbis (GE) runs a project aimed to revive local traditions and arts through exhibitions and other events attempting to increase the attractiveness of the city for the tourists.
- The city of Leutenberg (GE) strives to become a model city for "tourism and environment" in Thuringia. A key initiative involves strengthening of the co-operation between local restaurants and local organic farms.

Noticeably, partnerships are being used more and more often in tourism across the study countries. Most of them have economic pursuits. Partnerships, aimed at improving the environmental performance of the sector are few and involve primarily the private and public sectors where the main actors are local authorities and local businesses. Community-partnerships, i.e. partnerships involving NGOs are less frequent. In Germany, for example, they are typically not relevant to the administrative tradition,

therefore have been generally less welcome. Furthermore, the partnerships at the local level are more common in the area of implementing tourism policies than in the phase of formulation and planning, and have not been generally used as instruments in the decision-making process.

Despite the slow progress and considering current trends, it appears likely, however, that partnerships will more and more be regarded as an important policy implementation instrument. With respect to sustainable tourism, multi-stakeholder partnerships will likely be of growing importance, since tourism-related environmental objectives cannot be achieved through the implementation of hard instruments alone. Pressures for improving the quality of jobs in the sector will place social concerns on the spotlight as well.

It is also important to acknowledge the different types of partnerships which exist - some focus on building agendas for cooperation, and agreement on strategy only and have no role in execution while others have been created with more comprehensive implementation roles. On the other side, some seek to introduce the PPP idea into ongoing local governance programmes in the countries building on established relationships. Other uses the Local Agenda 21 frameworks to facilitate a sustainable tourism joint venture. Such example is the City of Lübeck's (GE) 'Conception for Tourism', which incorporates the concept for sustainable local tourism with the view to optimize the number and quality of jobs in the local tourism industry, promote biking and pedestrian areas across the city and offer diverse opportunities for families with children.

Generally, such schemes have functioned well. Their main liability, however, is the one-sided orientation towards economic growth. Environmental and social aspects are less considered. Partnerships promoting explicitly sustainability are less common. The focus in the future should be obviously on these other important aspect.

PPP appear particularly beneficial especially in the less developed countries, such as Bulgaria and Greece where the private sector participation can contribute substantially to the reforms of basic public services. High-level political commitment of the central government to support multistakeholder participation in tourism development has been critical. A strong decentralization policy in place that gives local governments sufficient autonomy for PPP development is also central. Potentials for domestic and international private sector investments in city infrastructure and tourism services, such as in Vienna and Thessaloniki, appear key to success. Local institutions with the capacity to execute the partnership policies and programs with a high standard of managerial and substantial know-how are important too. Finally, potentials for cost-sharing arrangements with bilateral and multi-lateral agencies, governments, private sector or other funds on the local city country level are essential as well.

VI. Concluding Remarks

The previous sections have suggested that there is a need to form a framework to allow a meaningful analysis of partnerships aiming sustainability goals, to distinguish between different types of PPPs and to increase their effectiveness. We have also underlined that despite the diversity, there are general dimensions, which allow the development of a more general framework for analyzing and improving partnerships. This would allow linking individual studies and polices in general circumstances.

Investigating individual cases using this framework provides evidence of the real benefits that partnerships bring or do not bring, considering if and how the costs and benefits of cooperation can be reconciled. This would improve our understanding of policy development and implementation, provide models useful to practitioners and researchers, help us learn what types of partnerships are helpful for sustainable tourism, clarify advantages and disadvantages and how these can be dealt with.

An apparent paradox was set out, that single institutions like local authorities have to deal with multifunctional nature of policies resulting in the need of a partnership form of strategy development and implementation involving participation of the non-public sector key actors. We also underlined some factors likely to assist the development of effective partnerships. Certainly success must be viewed in terms of what partnerships bring, how legitimate their legitimacy is, the resources used, the issues that are dealt with, the time span of the impacts, the management and evaluation.

The local government may craft the approach that best fits their local needs, drawing from the lessons learned in partnership arrangements elsewhere. Lessons can be learnt from practical experience that is generated through a detailed case studies carrying out public-private partnerships.

Efforts to implement these partnerships at the local level, however, face many *challenges*. *For governments*, the challenge is to find ways to fulfill their responsibility for ensuring that tourism development benefits all citizens and the community in the long run while meeting the needs of the private inventors and entrepreneurs. This implies a new and often difficult transition for many governments, from provider and manager of basic services, to enabler, regulator, and collaborator. An examination of the present legal, structural, financial, and political underpinnings of those policy areas of domestic urban government appear most critical. It is also important to understand the current and emerging agenda of state and local governments and the growing number of private profit and not-for-profit organizations that are assuming increasing responsibility for leadership and performance in state and local tourism affairs.

Government offices have to facilitate an effective co-ordination with other bilateral and multilateral actors to ensure harmonization of policies and action with and the pooling of resources through joint programming and cost sharing. PPPs must not more be used solely a policy implementation tool, rather they have to assume an important role in the design of policy initiatives. At the end, PPPs must impact the policy-making process towards participatory urban governance.

For private tourist firms, the challenge is to be convinced that investing in any particular project offers more attractive returns than other available investment opportunities. Most importantly, entrepreneurs must be encouraged by the long-term benefits that sustainability considerations will bring into their businesses and the community. Drawing that conclusion depends on the firm's comparison of the potential returns against the potential risks, considering not just economic but social, cultural, and environmental outcomes.

Overcoming these challenges could be complicated, however, by a range of *gaps* in the capacity of both public and private actors. Major gaps may include: (a) the reciprocal mistrust and lack of understanding of each other's interests and needs across the public and private sectors; (b) the absence of locally available information on, and experience with, arranging sustainable partnerships; and (c) the underlying legal,

political, and institutional obstacles to forming effective public-private relationships. These gaps may lead to lengthy negotiations and increased transaction costs making such partnership projects less attractive to potential interest parties.

The *challenge for solutions* is to tackle these bottlenecks and lay the groundwork for more effective collaboration at the local level. Local governments must implement the necessary sector reforms and develop integrated strategies for multistakeholder participation. We can specify four sets of strategic dilemmas to be addressed: (1) Trust building (2) Effective structure building (3) Policy development (remove legal and political bottlenecks which hinder PPP development at the local level and, if necessary, carry out policy or legislative reform) (4) Capacity building for local governments, local business and community organizations aimed at overcoming misunderstanding and mistrust between public and private actors, and building the minimum capacities to design and negotiate effectively sustainable partnerships.

Next in the *SUT-Governance* project, we will merge our experiential and research findings to examine how successful partnerships perform, to identify the conditions in which they work best, and to determine the factors that define their long-term success.

Reference

- Aspen Institute (1997). *Voices from the Filed*, Washington: Aspen Institute.
- Bennet, R. and G. Krebs (1991). *Local Economic Development: Public-private partnerships initiatives in Britain and Germany*, Belhaven Press: London.
- Benson, H. J. (1975). 'Inter-organizational networks as a political economy'. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 20(3):229-49.
- Boo, E. 1990. *Ecotourism: The Potentials and Pitfalls*, Volumes 1 and 2. Washington, DC: Word Wildlife Fund.
- Carrol, P. and P. Steane (2000). 'Public-private partnerships – sectoral perspectives', in Osborne, St. *Public-Private Partnerships: Theory and practice in international perspectives*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 9-36.
- Colman, W.G. (1989). *State and Local Government and Public-Private Partnerships: A Policy Issues Handbook*, Greenwood Press: New York.
- Ceballos-Lascurain, H. 1993. *Ecotourism as a World-wide Phenomenon*. In *TES*.
- Cooper, Ch., et al. 1993. *Tourism: Principles and Practices*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Davis, D. (ed.) (no date). *Public-Private Partnerships: Improving Urban Life*, Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science, New York, Vol. 36, No. 2.
- DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W. (1988) 'The iron cage revisited', in G. Milofsky (ed.) *Community organizations*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp 77-99.
- Doswell, R. 1997. *Tourism: How Effective Management Makes the Difference*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Doxey, G. V. (1976). 'When enough's enough: the natives are restless in Old Niagara', *Heritage Canada*, 2(2):26-7.
- ECLEI 1999. Local Agenda 21 Model Communities Program: <http://www.iclei.org/la21/la21uptdt.htm>.

Falconer, P. and Ross, K. (1998) 'Public-private partnerships and the "new" labor government in Britain', in L. Montanheiro, B. Haigh, D. Morris and N. Nrovatin (eds.) *Public and Private Sector Partnerships: Fostering Enterprise*, Sheffield: Sheffield Hallam University Press, pp 133-48.

Fox, M. (1977). The social impact of tourism: A challenge to researchers and planners', in B. R. Finney and A. Watson (eds.) *A New King Sugar: Tourism in the Pacific*, Santa Cruz: Center for South Pacific Studies, University of California, pp 27-48.

Gee, Ch., et al. (1997). *The Travel Industry*. Third edition. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Green, H. and Hunter, C. (1992). 'The environmental impact assessment of tourism development', in P. Johnson and B. Thomas (eds.) *Perspectives on Tourism Policy*, London: Mansell, pp. 29-48.

Gunn, Cl. (1994). *Tourism Planning: Basic Concepts, Cases*. Third Edition. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.

Hall, P. (1970). 'A horizon of hotels', 15:445.

Harding, A. (1990). 'Public-private partnerships in urban regeneration policy', in M. Cambell (ed.) *Local economic policy*, London: Cassell.

Hall, M. and J. Jenkins (1995). *Tourism and Public Policy*, Routledge: London and New York.

Harrison, L. and W. Husbands (1996). *Practicing Responsible Tourism: International Case Studies in Tourism Planning, Policy and Development*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Sons.

Hastings, A. (1996). Unraveling the process of partnership in urban regeneration policy', *Urban Studies* 33:253-68.

Hawkings, D., et. al, (eds.) (1995). *The Ecology Sourcebook for Planners and Developers*. North Bennington, VT, USA: The Ecotourism Society.

Hetherington, A. (1991). *Tourism Planning: An Integrated and Sustainable Development Approach*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Huxham, G. and Vangen, S. (1996). 'Managing inter-organizational relationships', in L. Montanheiro, et al (eds.) *Public and Private Partnerships: Fostering enterprise*, Sheffield: Sheffield Hallman University Press, pp. 183-94.

ICLEI (1999). 'Sustainable tourism: A Local authority perspective', www.

Inskeep, E. 1991. *Tourism Planning: An Integrated and Sustainable Development Approach*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

ISSC-UNESCO/MOST (1997). 'Partnerships' – A new solution to urban challenges? Social science perspectives on Habitat II Agenda'. Symposium, Paris, 24-25 November, www.

Irish National Economic and Social Council, "Opportunities, Challenges, and Capacity for Choice", <http://www.irlgov.ie/taoiseach/publication/nesc/NESC%20105.pdf>

Jacobs, B. (1998). 'Bureaupolitics and public/private partnerships in economic development in the British West Midlands', in N. Waltzer and B. Jacobs (eds.) *Public-Private Partnerships for Local Economic Development*, Westport, GT:Praeger.

Jessop, B. (1999). 'The Dynamics of Partnership and Governance'. In: G. Stoker, ed. *The New Politics of Local Governance in Britain*. Oxford University Press.

Johnson, P. and B. Thomas (ed.) (1992). *Perspectives of Tourism Policy*, London: Mansell

- Jones, R. (1998). The European Union as a promoter of public-private partnerships', in L. Montañeiro, et al (eds.) *Public and Private Partnerships: Fostering enterprise*, Sheffield: Sheffield Hallman University Press, pp. 183-94.
- Kadt, E. (ed.) (1979). *Tourism: Passport to Development?* A Joint World Bank – UNESCO publication. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kay, J. A. (1993). *Foundations of Corporate Success: How Business Strategies Add Value*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kooiman, J. (1993). *Modern Governance*, London: Sage.
- Kickert, W. (1997). 'Public governance in the Netherlands: An alternative to Anglo-American "managerialism"', *Public Administration* 75(4):731-52.
- Kotler, D. et.al. (1993). *Marketing Places*. New York: The Free Press.
- Law, C.M. (1993). *Urban Tourism: Attracting Visitors to large Cities*, London: Mansell.
- Lea, J. (1988). *Tourism and Development in the Third World*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Leach, S. Stewart, J. and Walsh, K. (1994). *The Changing Organization and Management of Local Government*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Lindberg, K., et al. (eds.) (1998). *Ecotourism : A Guide for Planners and Managers*. Volume II. North Bennington, VT USA: The Ecotourism Society.
- Lopez de Avila, A. (1995). First World Conference on Sustainable Tourism, *One Europe Magazine*, OEM 2.
- Matheison, A. and Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism: Economic, Physical, and Social Impacts*, London: Longman.
- May, V. (1991). 'Tourism, Environment and Development Values, Sustainability and Stewardship'. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 13 No. 2.
- McIntosh, R. and Ch. Goeldner (1994). *Tourism: Principles, Practices and Philosophies*. Seventh edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- McQuid, R. (2000). 'The theory of partnerships: Why have partnerships?' in Osborne, St., *Public-Private Partnerships: Theory and practice in international perspectives*, London and New York: Rutledge.
- McQuid, R. W. and B. Christy (1999). "European economic development partnerships – the case of the Eastern Scotland European Partnership", in L. Montañeiro, et al (eds.) *Public and Private Partnerships: Fostering enterprise*, Sheffield: Sheffield Hallman University Press, pp. 355-66.
- Mertes, J. and J. Hall. (1995). *Park, Recreation. Open Space and Greenway Guidelines*. Washington, DC: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Middleton, V. (1994). *Marketing in Travel and Tourism*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Montanari, A. and A. Williams (eds.) (1995). *European Tourism: Regions, spaces and restructuring*, Wiley: Chechester.
- MOST 1999. 'Governance: What's in it?' Newsletter No. 8, www.
- MUNICIA, 2001. *Local Actors and their role*
http://www.municipia.org/web/uk/frame_uk.htm
- Murphy, P. (1985). *Tourism: A Community Approach*. London: Routledge.
- National Environmental Plan Austria (NUP) (1998). *Tourism, Recreation and Leisure*: <http://www.cedar.univie.ac.at/nup/nup-english/nup345.html#2>
- Oakley, P. (1991). *Projects with People*, Geneva: ILO.

- OECD (1997). OECD Conference on Partnerships in Tourism, www.
- Osborne, St. (2000). *Public-Private Partnerships: Theory and practice in international perspectives*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Osborne, S. (1997). 'Managing coordination of social services in the mixed economy of welfare: Completion, cooperation, and common cause?' *British Journal of management* 9:317-28.
- Page, Stephen (1995). *Urban Tourism*, Rutledge, London.
- Paraskevas, C. and U. Muldur (1997). Society -The Endless Frontier: A European vision of research and innovation policies for the 21st century. EUR 17655; ISBN 92-828-1186-7, Catalogue no: CG-NA-17-655-EN-C.
- Pearce, D. (1989). *Tourism Development*. Second edition, Longman: London.
- Pearce, D. (1996). *Tourism Development*. Third edition. Harlow, Essex, UK: Longman Scientific & Technical.
- Pearce, Ph. Et. al. (1996). *Tourism Community relationships*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Podziba, S. (1998). *Social Capital Formation, Public Building and Public Mediation: the Chelsea Charter Consensus Process*, Dayton, OH:Kettering Foundation.
- Priestley, G.K., J.A. Edwards and H. Coccossis (eds.) (1996). *Sustainable Tourism? European Experience*, CAB International.
- Rapaport, D. Ed. no date. *Creating Environmentally Sound Resorts*. Suva, Fiji: Greenpeace Pacific.
- Rogers, A. (1993). *The Earth Summit: F Planetary Reckoning*. Los Angeles: Global View Press.
- Sellgren, J. (1990). 'Local economic development partnerships – an assessment of local authority economic development initiatives', *Local Government Studies* July/August: 57-58.
- Shaw, G. and Williams, A. (1994). *Critical Issues in Tourism: A Geographical Perspective*, Blackwell: Oxford.
- Shaw, G. and Williams, A. (1992). 'Tourism, development and the environment: the eternal triangle', in C.P. Cooper and A. Lockwood (eds.) *Progress in Tourism, Recreation, and Hospitality Management*, Volume 4, London: Belhaven, pp 45-59.
- Smith, St. (1995). *Tourism Analysis: A Handbook*. Second edition. Harlow, Essex, UK.
- Smith, V. and W. Eadington, ed. (1992). *Tourism Alternatives: Potentials and Problems in the Development of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Stratton, C. (1989). Quated in OECD, *Mechanisms for Job Creation*, Paris:OECD, p. 81.
- The Ecotourism Society (1993). *Ecotourism Guidelines for Nature Tour Operators*. North Bennington, VT, USA.
- Taylor, M. (1997) *The best of both worlds: The voluntary sector and the Government*, York:YPS.
- The Ecotourism Society (1995). *Marine Ecotourism Information Package*. North Bennington, VT, USA.
- UNCHs Habitat 2000. "Good Urban Governance: A Normative Framework – Summary" HS/C/PC.1/CRP.6, 26 February.

UN ESA (1997). Success Stories – The Calvia Declaration on Tourism and sustainable development in the Mediterranean:
<http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/success/tour8.htm>.

UN ESA, (1999). Decision of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development: <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/tourism/tour2.htm>.

UN General Assembly, Seventh Session 1999. Addendum 1 to the Report on Tourism and Economic Development (*EICN.1711999/5/Add.1.*)

UN CSD, General Assembly, Seventh Session 1999. *Tourism and Sustainable Development*. Sustainable Tourism: A Local Authority Perspective. Background Paper No.3.

UN Development Program, Public Private Partnerships for the Urban Environment (PPPUE), <http://www.undp.org/ppp/about/what.htm>.

UNESCO (1995). 'Towards the city of solidarity and citizenship'. Meeting of experts. Paris 11-12 October, www.

Van der Berg, L., van der Borg J, and van der Meer, J (1995). *Urban Tourism: performance and strategies in eight European countries*, Avebury: England.

Waltzer, N. and B. Jacobs (eds.) (1998). *Public-Private Partnerships for Local Economic Development*, Wesport, GT:Praeger.

The World Bank (1999). "The World Bank Stakeholder Participation Handbook", <http://www.worldbank.org>.

World Tourism Organization (1998). *Guide for Local Authorities on Developing Sustainable Tourism*, ISBN 92-844-0280-8.

World Tourism Organization (1993). *Seminar on Tourism Development and the Responsibility of the State*. Budapest, Hungary.

World Tourism Organization (1994). *Notional and Regional Tourism Planning: Methodologies and Case Studies*, London and New York: Routledge.

World Tourism Organization and European Tourism Action Group (1996). *Joint Seminar on Tourism and Environmental Protection*. Heidelberg, Germany.

World Tourism Organization and United Nations Environment Programme (1992). *Guidelines: Development of National Parks and Protected Areas for Tourism*. Madrid.

World Tourism Organization and World Health Organization (1991). *Regional Conference for Africa and the Mediterranean and Food Safety and Tourism*. Tunis, Tunisia.

World Tourism Organization Publications (available from WTO in Madrid).

World Tourism Organization (1996). *Towards New Forms of Public-Private Sector Partnership: The Changing Role, Structure and Activities of National Tourism Administrations*. Madrid.

World Tourism Organization (1997). *The Social Impacts of Tourism*. World Tourism Leaders' Meeting. Manila, Philippines. Madrid.

World Travel Organization and United Nations Environmental Program (1992). *Guidelines: Development of National Parks and Protected Area for Tourism*. Madrid.

World Travel Organization, United Nations Environment Programme and Foundation for Environmental Education in Europe (1996). *Awards for Improving the Coastal Environment: The Example of the Blue Flag*.

World Travel Organization, World Travel and Tourism Council, The Earth Council (1995). *Agenda 27 for the Travel and Tourism Industry: Towards Environmentally Sustainable Development*.