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Project Summary

Purpose

This project set out to determine the value of the Charter for Sustainable Tourism Protected areas’ contribution in identifying sustainable tourism destinations. We can establish, through the project work undertaken that the “Charter” is a useful and important tool that delivers social, environmental and economic benefits and indeed can be described as a model of governance that delivers protected areas as sustainable tourism destinations. Further this report also shows that the Charter is able to deliver wider European and international policies.

Planning

Some preliminary work had been undertaken in a previous “Charter related” project. This project wanted to refine those data sets and review elements of the Charter themselves to ensure it was fit for purpose to deliver sustainable tourism destinations.

The project was managed by the EUROPARC Director with assistance from Paulo Castro of the Sustainable Tourism Working Group.

Three meetings of the working group took place, with an additional meeting was held in Regensburg Germany to address some detailed aspects of work package 3.

Each meeting consisted of interactive session to discuss and agree in detail all aspects of the project’s work packages with extensive use of email, skype and phone calls by EUROPARC staff to gain data and information from the working group and EUROPARC members.

Objectives

The project objectives were set as

- To generate a data-set to identify the economic and other values, derived by protected areas who gain Charter certification.
- To analyse the Charter methodology and assessment system for sustainable tourism destinations in order to recommend the contribution of Charter to sustainable tourism destinations.
- To analyse the Charter re-evaluation methodology to bring about alignment with sustainable tourism destinations assessment and other relevant criteria, e.g. CBD.
- To gather evidence from Charter parks, in addition to data obtained through the STEPPA project in order to demonstrate the economic value of the Charter for protected areas.

Outputs

On completion of the project the following outputs arising from the 4 work packages have been achieved.
Further research to develop the Charter “magic numbers”, a new survey to gather the data and communications of these “magic numbers” was delivered and compared with results obtained in 2008. A further detailed report of N2000 sites and protected habitats and species being managed specifically in Charter areas was also produced through Work package A1.

A set of proposed indicators for ‘sustainable tourism destinations’ have been developed by the Tourism Sustainability Group1 of DG Enterprise, this project tested these indicators as a framework for examining the role of the European Charter with developing EU policy. Work package A2 explores this comparison.

It was more difficult than anticipated to undertake a thorough analysis of Charter parks and the changes in re-evaluation over time. However, an indication of the value and benefit of the Charter to a protected area and to a territory with reference to the STEPPA2 project, TEEB and CBD This project accessed the data generated through the STEPPA project and interrogated the re-evaluated Charter parks in this project in order that improvements to the data generated through re-evaluation can be created. This project considered the current Charter re-evaluation system to review its methodology in order to ensure it could be used as a measure of the wider economic, socio-cultural and ecologic benefits, delivering ecosystem services gained over the 5 years of the Charter experience in these parks. One Charter Park had undertaken a full analysis of the economic benefits of the Charter specific to its area and a summary of its findings is included. Work package A3 will give this information.

The results of best practice of partnerships between business and protected areas and Charter areas were gathered. A comprehensive method to gather case studies was agreed by the working group, with a new set of case studies of best practice published. A brochure indicating best practice case studies in the Charter showing social economic and environmental benefits has been produced. This was undertaken in Work package A4

Communications, showing the range of dissemination of results and information about the project is contained in section Communications page 29.

Cooperation with other entities

The cooperation on this project with entities other than the working group was fairly extensive. The communications output in particular shows a huge range of organizations with whom we have had contact and liaison over the course of the project. Some notable exchange of ideas and information came with International Centre for Responsible Tourism School of Events, Tourism & Hospitality Leeds Metropolitan University, principally Xavier Font. This was important with regards to the

---

1 The Tourism Sustainability Group was set up by the European Commission in 2004 to provide input to the process for the sustainability of European tourism. EUROPARC is represented by Federico Minozzi, Policy Office EUROPARC Federation

2 STEPPA –Sustainable Tourism in Enterprises, Parks and Protected Areas. Knowledge networks for the competitiveness and sustainability of European Tourism DG Enterprise, European Commission.
result arising from the STEPPA project as well as his analysis of Charter methodology and how it would impact or not the project analysis of the re-evaluation of the Charter.

Further liaison with EUROPARC’s Sustainable Tourism Working Group was also extensive as we consulted with them frequently over all aspects of the projects outputs.

The Sustainable Tourism Working group are represented by:

Lasse Loven  Metsahallitus (Fi)  Stephania Petrosillo EUROPARC Italy (IT)
Richard Partington EUROPARC Consulting (UK),  Monica Herrera-Pavia Le Mercantour National Park (F)
Paulo Castro EUROPARC federation (P)  Hans Schiphorst SNP Netherlands (NL)
Mike Pugh Forest of Bowland (UK)  Barbara Engels BfN (D)
Josep Maria Prats Parc Natural de la Zona Volcànica de la Garrotxa, (S)  Ricardo Blanco Department of Tourism (S)

**Conclusions**

- This project has looked across a number of areas in measuring sustainable tourism activities and broadly shown that the European charter for Sustainable Tourism is a mature and responsive tool that delivers social, environmental and economic benefits and is a model of governance that delivers protected areas as sustainable tourism destinations.

- This project has highlighted the need to continually update and disseminate information to a wide audience. A brochure indicating Charter best practice case studies was produced illustrating the social, economic and environmental benefits. Additionally an 'infographic' was produced and launched at the EUROPARC 2012 Conference explaining what the Charter means based on the 'magic numbers' data set developed during this project.

- The project collected magic numbers (data set) for the whole European Charter area, by county/Charter areas and the data demonstrated that the number of species and habitats being managed in Charter areas was significant. This indicated for the first time the huge range of Natura 2000 sites and endangered species that are being managed under the Charter sustainable tourism principles.

- A comparison between the emerging idea for a set of EU Sustainable Tourism Indicators and the Principles of the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas was carried out and concluded that overall the EU principles espoused are much in line with principles of the EUROPARC Charter. EUROPARC was able to respond (April 2012) to an EU consultation and provide advice and comment which will positively influence any tourism initiatives from the Commission.

- This project has modernised and refined the existing Charter methodology reflecting the analysis and comparison between STEPPA, TEEB and CBD to ensure any Charter evaluation
The system was in line with sustainable tourism current thinking. The project has moved forward in the understanding of the importance of indicator-based management, but further work will need to be developed. It has shown that in the long term Charter can be beneficial only if it is simplified and the focus is truly with the continuous improvement of the parks with their partners – following the idea of adaptive planning. The development of revision of the Charter has begun with this project recommending 12 new 'key issues' to replace the old 'principles' bringing the Charter system up to date with minimum criteria set for each key issue.
Project activities

Background

The EUROPARC Federation
EUROPARC represents the protected areas of Europe, with over 430 members in 36 countries. Our members manage the green jewels of Europe's land, sea, mountains, forests, rivers and cultural heritage. Nature knows no boundaries and we therefore facilitate international co-operation in all aspects of protected area management to further improve and conserve our shared natural inheritance. We endeavour to exchange expertise, experience and best practice as well as to collaborate with others to ensure the value and meaning of protected areas is at the heart of Europe.

European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas

Local Agenda 21
The wider need for sustainable development was highlighted by the creation of the Agenda 21 programme at the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development at Rio de Janeiro in 1992. In 1993 EUROPARC published the groundbreaking report “loving them to death”, which called for sustainable tourism in Europe’s protected areas. Further in 1995, EUROPARC took the initiative to set up the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas. The European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas is a practical management tool that enables protected areas to develop tourism sustainably. The core element of the Charter is working in partnership with all relevant stakeholders to develop a common sustainable tourism strategy and an action plan on the basis of a thorough situation analysis. The aim of all Charter projects and activities is the protection of the natural and cultural heritage and the continuous improvement of tourism in the protected area in terms of the environment, local population and businesses as well as visitors. The European Charter Network, at the time of starting this study, counts 88 protected areas from eight European countries involving over 200 local tourism businesses as Charter partners, local and regional government authorities.

“Charter” and CBD: CharterNet project
Strengthening and further development of the European Charter and the Charter Network was the aim of this EUROPARC project “European CharterNet”. The project took the potential of the Charter Network through specific activities and communication methods and achieved added-value for the European Network. The Sustainable Tourism Destinations project looked at the results of the CharterNet project and how they can be embedded in Charter evaluation assessments.

TEEB - The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity
At the meeting of the environment ministers of the G8 countries and the five major newly industrialising countries that took place in Potsdam in March 2007, the German government proposed a study on ‘The economic significance of the global loss of biological diversity’ as part of
the so-called 'Potsdam Initiative' for biodiversity stating: 'In a global study we will initiate the process of analysing the global economic benefit of biological diversity, the costs of the loss of biodiversity and the failure to take protective measures versus the costs of effective conservation.'

The German Federal Ministry for the Environment and the European Commission, with the support of several other partners, has jointly initiated preparatory work for this global study, which is named 'The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity (TEEB). TEEB states – “The aim of the TEEB D1 Report is to highlight the relevance of our work to mainstream policy making. We show that the failure of markets to adequately consider the value of ecosystem services is of concern not only to environment, development and climate change ministries but also to finance, economics and business ministries. Evidence presented here shows pro-conservation choices to be a matter of economic common sense in the vast majority of cases. At the heart of this complex problem is a straightforward and well-recognised issue in standard microeconomics. The lack of market prices for ecosystem services and biodiversity means that the benefits we derive from these goods (often public in nature) are usually neglected or undervalued in decision-making. This in turn leads to actions that not only result in biodiversity loss, but also impact on human well-being.” (TEEB – The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity for National and International Policy Makers – Summary: Responding to the Value of Nature 2009).

It will be increasingly important that the ecosystem services being identified and the economic values derived will have a particular bearing on sustainable tourism in protected areas as much of the natural capital of protected areas is of immediate economic benefit to the tourism industry. EUROPARC has established both sustainable tourism and an economic and ecosystems working groups to examine the results of TEEB as they become available and the work of protected areas. This project will have access to any recommendations provided.

“Charter” and STEPPA
STEPPA is an acronym for Sustainable Tourism in Enterprises, Parks and Protected Areas. The project is funded by DG Enterprise in response to the call for project relating to ‘Knowledge Networks for the competitiveness and sustainability of European tourism’. The project will promote and strengthen the cooperation between the different experiences and certification initiatives for small and micro tourism enterprises working with (Charter) protected areas (PAs), through the sharing, leveling and enhancement of their sustainability practices and criteria, and strengthen their competitiveness through the development of working partnerships between these initiatives and specialized research and support centers for tourism sustainability.

STEPPA will build on the current stage of development of the Charter and its Part II approach, by promoting the transfer of knowledge and experiences between countries/parks which are already implementing formal Charter partnerships with businesses (Spain and UK), countries/parks in the process of defining their approaches (Germany and Italy), and countries considering the implementation of the Charter for the first time in their territories (Latvia and Slovakia). The project will test, pilot and produce the definition of common standards and criteria for Part II partnerships for replication across the European Charter network, as well as aim to demonstrate the benefits of such approaches for businesses and parks, as particularly sensitive tourism destinations with their special values, needs and challenges.
**Project team & project working group**

The project team consisted of staff from the EUROPARC Federation with voluntary contributions from the Sustainable Tourism Working Group.

The project working group members were selected from experienced Charter parks that had already undergone a re-evaluation process.

- Carmen Cabrera, Sierra Nevada National Nature Park, Junta of Andalucia, Spain
- Marianne Dispa, Parc Regional Naturel Scarpe Escault, France
- Martin Carey, Mourne Mountains, Northern Ireland UK
- Matti Tapaninen, Syote National Park, Finland
- Patrizia Rossi, Parco Alpi Marittime, Italy
- Paulo Castro, EUROPARC Federation Sustainable Tourism Working Group
- Richard Partington, EUROPARC Consulting
- Carol Ritchie, EUROPARC Federation
- Barbara Engels, BfN

**The project team also consisted of EUROPARC Federation staff**

In 2011-12 this consisted of:

- Alexandra Crineau (intern)
- Regina Schoefer (administration)
- Morwenna Parkyn (communications).

In 2012 this was:

- Dea Mijakovic (intern)
- Heike Blankenstein (administration)
- Julia Schönhärl (communications)

EUROPARC was also supported by Paulo Castro of the Sustainable Tourism Working Group, to give expert advice and information (not necessary as he is already mentioned above).

**Work Packages**

In order to complete the aims and objectives of the project four work packages were created. These focused on differing aspects of analysis of the contribution of the Charter to Sustainable Tourism Destination.


- The Sustainable Tourism Working Group of EUROPARC generated a definition of the magic numbers the Charter. The data set generated by the “charternet” project were revised and amended and checked by the charter network in terms of the ability to acquire the necessary data.
- EUROPARC, over the 3 year period of the project contacted every Charter park and to acquire this data.
The data, once collated, was analysed and used in communication material, such as website, newsletters, with an infographic produced.

**Work package A2: Sustainable Tourism Destination**

The project focused on the indicator system for ‘sustainable tourism destinations’ produced by the Tourism Sustainability Group of DG Enterprise.

The report produced will also lend weight to the Charter verification process since it shows the relationship of charter indicators and those proposed by the European Commission. The levels of compatibility of the Sustainable Tourism Destinations indicators with the Charter in order has been shown and will provide the opportunity for the Charter to become a methodology recognised at a Commission level for the designation of a sustainable tourism destination.

Therefore to complete this work the following was be undertaken:

- A desk study of the methodology of the sustainable tourism destination process and indicators and the Charter conducted through EUROPARC Consulting. This considered the common factors between the principles, methodologies and indicators of the two procedures.
- Recommendation for application into Charter guidelines following the results of the desk study was produced.
- A positive analysis of these methodologies would be used in EUROPARC lobbying work to work toward the formal recognition of the Charter as a recommended methodology in becoming a sustainable tourism destination.
- If additional monies can be acquired then a pilot test of the common set of monitoring indicators to be used for both sustainable tourism destinations and Charter parks could be undertaken.

**Workpackage A3: Undertake an analysis of the Charter re-evaluation methodology**

The project revised the current Charter indicators in pilot regions and could with a few selected Charter Parks who have already been re-evaluated.

Utilizing the experience of the 5 parks in the study, an analysis of the protected area at initial certification and five years later at re-evaluation could be undertaken. The economic study of one re-evaluated park was submitted.

This involved:

- The EUROPARC Sustainable Tourism Working Group in defining the most relevant aspects to be monitored in a re-evaluation of a Charter park and a revision of the re-evaluation methodology.
- Work with the parks to agree the monitoring and process of capturing the change in data over the 5 years.
- Analysis and report with recommendations to influence future Charter re-evaluation

Based on the finding of work package A2 to assess the viability of the inclusion of sustainable tourism destination indicators in the Charter process.
Workpackage A4: Identify and communicate best practice in the Charter Park network

The Sustainable Tourism Working Group of EUROPARC identified and defined the indicators of best practice in public use, tourism business, nature conservation and governance. This involved a desk review of all verifier’s reports to identify best practices across the network and collation of best practice case studies. A case studies brochure has been produced and will be communicated widely, both internally to the Charter network and externally to all stakeholders and relevant bodies.
Project Results


**Project Objective:** To generate a data-set to identify the economic and other values derived by protected areas who gain Charter certification.

**Project Objective:** To gather evidence from Charter parks, in addition to data obtained through the STEPPA* project in order to demonstrate the economic value of the Charter for protected areas.

A review of the current Charter data set took place, followed by a of current Charter parks. This was concluded by a comparison with the 2008 figures obtained through the Charternet project and the production of an infographic showing the current “magic numbers”.

The Charter indicators describe numerically some of the key ecological, economic and social outputs of the Charter performance over a 5 year period, as well as the socio-geographic dimensions of the effective local or regional Charter area. Indicators, in Charter vocabulary are called, “Magic Numbers” and were first generated in the BfN funded “CharterNet” project.

In order to demonstrate the added economic value of the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in more depth further research about the magic numbers data set was undertaken by the project working group. They were reviewed, updated and modified and a comprehensive survey of all current Charter parks was completed, with a 61% response rate to the questionnaire.

The analysis of the magic numbers themselves and the results obtained from the 2012 survey of Charter parks is contained in the appendix European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in protected areas (Charter): The value of the “Charter” in identifying sustainable tourism destinations. Analysis of Charter “Magic Numbers”.

Further a comparison with the dataset obtained through the 2008 “CharterNet” project and the current project was also done by Lasse Loven of the Sustainable Tourism Working Group with input from EUROPARC staff. This work has also been submitted to the IUCN Parks journal.

The project reported on the magic numbers for the whole European Charter area and by each county with Charter parks. These have been produced and disseminated to the Charter network.

One unexpected bonus document that came out of the survey is that the data provided of species and habitats being managed in Charter areas were significant. This indicated for the first time the huge range of Natura 2000 sites and endangered species that are being managed under sustainable tourism principles. Since the volume of material produced was substantial, it is appended separately to the “magic numbers” report in the appendix “European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in protected areas (Charter): The value of the “Charter” in identifying sustainable tourism destinations - work package 1 report number of endangered species + habitats in Charter parks”.

In the latest survey in 2012 due to the increased number of Charter Network itself (N=87 at the starting period of the research) the number of responding parks has also increased (n=53. The limited

---

*National Park Sierra Maria los Vélez*
summaries and especially the average numbers per park below give an interesting view about the major development tracks generated by the Charter performance.

In order to compare the results between the two surveys, (2008 and 2012) it is important to take into account certain differences in formation of the questions and the sample size of the target audience. Survey held in 2008 and 2012 are not completely comparable due to the changes in questions introduced. To better understand the differences in “magic number” indicators shown in 2008 and 2012, Table 10 shows the equivalent of questions, their differences and how comparable these actually are. (C= comparable, PC= partially comparable, NC=not comparable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of “Magic Number” indicator survey questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of local organisations participating in Charter forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coverage of the Charter area in hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- where percentage of Natura 2000 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amount of protected biodiversity values in Charter area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Natura 2000 sites, in hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-EU Habitat Directive sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-EU Bird Directive species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of annual visitors using the Charter park services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of school class visits annually in the Charter park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of inhabitants on the 1,5 hours regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Area Representing Percentage of Total Population in Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Population Living Within the Charter Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Environmental Investments in Charter Park Basing on the Action Plan During Last 3 Years (€),</th>
<th>8. Total Investment in Euros, Considered in the Action Plan Over the 5 Year Term</th>
<th>The 2008 Number Refers to the Past 3 Year Period, While the 2012 Number Takes into Account Past and/or Future Estimate of the Total Investment in a 5 Year Action Plan by Park Governing Authorities and/or Private Sector in the Delivery of the Charter for Sustainable Tourism Action Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Number of Businesses Co-operating with the Charter Park of Which Charter Partner Certified</th>
<th></th>
<th>In the 2012 Survey This Question Was Not Asked Due to the Existing and Updating Table with Information of Charter Business on the Charter Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Number of Charter Park Products (Rough Estimate)</th>
<th>9. Local Products Supported by the Charter Area</th>
<th>Local Products Supported by the CA in 2012 Were Categorized as; Food Production or Craft Productions That Take Place Within the Charter Areas Support Can Be in the Form of Financial Through Grants, Use of Facilities or Staff Assistance. Promotion Can Be Use of Park Label, Marketing or Special Events Such as Farmers Markets Etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Economic Impact of Charter Park Tourism in Regions (Method under Development, See Chapter “Tools for Monitoring Economic Impacts …”)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, an “infographic”, “What does the Charter mean in numbers?” was produced and launched at the EUROPARC conference 2012. It will be widely disseminated at the completion of the project. The full version is contained in the appendix.
This is the first and most comprehensive study undertaken specifically of a Charter area and provides a model for possible comparison between other Charter areas. Although the depth of such a study could not have been possible within his project. The main belief of the author is that this investment in the tourism industry and the subsequent economic benefit derived, in La Garrotxa would not have happened were it not for the fact of the Charter.

**Work package A2: Sustainable Tourism Destination**

**Project Objective:** To analyse the Charter methodology and assessment system for sustainable tourism destinations in order to recommend the contribution of Charter to sustainable tourism destinations.

The report “A comparison between EU Sustainable Tourism Indicators and the Principles of the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas “ has been produced. It is contained in appendix.

In summary, the appended report concludes that, in general the issues of most of the EU proposed indicators are well addressed by the Charter Principles and questions referring to them. Taking the EU indicators as key issues for sustainable tourism which have to be addressed, the Charter with its Principles takes the same approach. The applicant area is required to show evidence of action and to provide information covering all the Principles. With the detailed questionnaire and evaluation, the situation for each of the issues is thoroughly investigated. The Charter requires
assessments, surveys and monitoring and the Charter areas have to define indicators to measure the success of their action plan. However, in comparison with the EU measurements the Charter does not ask for standardized data in most of the cases. The questions leave it open how to illustrate evidence of action in the various issues. The table below shows overall the indicators as proposed by the EU DG Enterprise and how they are covered by current Charter principle and/or by Charter part 2 partnerships in Charter areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU indicators</th>
<th>Charter coverage</th>
<th>EU measurements</th>
<th>Connection to Charter II.</th>
<th>Additional aspects in EU measurements</th>
<th>Additional aspects in Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tourism Volume and Value</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tourism Enterprises Performance</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community/Social Impact</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quantity and Quality of Employment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender equality</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Equality – accessibility</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reducing Transport Impact</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Climate change</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sustainable tourism management practices in tourism enterprises</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Solid waste management</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sewage treatment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Water management</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Energy use</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Landscape and Biodiversity Protection</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lights &amp; Noise Management</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Inclusive Management Practices</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Development Control</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Tourism Supply Chain</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Protecting and enhancing local cultural identity and assets</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional destination-specific indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Bathing water</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Destination specific capacity indicator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the course of the project the EU Commission (DG Enterprise) indicated it would be launching a consultation exercise on its sustainable tourism policies, including new indicators and a
“Sustainable and Responsible Tourism Charter”. Although EUROPARC responded to this consultation the final results for the European Commission have not been published therefore the project working group concluded that no further additions or conclusions can be made to the original analysis of the sustainable tourism indicators at this time.

**Workpackage A3: Undertake an analysis of the Charter re-evaluation methodology**

**Project Objective**: To analyse the Charter re-evaluation methodology to bring about alignment with sustainable tourism destinations assessment and other relevant criteria, e.g. CBD

The initial premis of the analysis and review of the Charter re-evaluation methodology was that it should give an indication of the change over time of indicators used in the process which could then give some indication of the Charter would bring in the economic values of that protected area or region. ThIs proved to be too complex an analysis in the time frame and resources of the project however one comprehensive analysis of Parc Natural de la Zona Volcànica de la Garrotxa, (S), was made available to the project and a summary of their findings is reproduced here.

The report *“Estimating the economic impact of the European Charter Sustainable Tourism on tourism Garrotxa during the period 2001-2010. Definition of a system of indicators the annual update of the impact”* indicated clearly the economic value of sustainable tourism through the operation of the Charter.

---

*Estimating the economic impact of the European Charter Sustainable Tourism on tourism Garrotxa during the period between 2001-2010. Definition of a system of indicators the annual update of the impact* Consell Comarcal de la Garrotxa and Turisme Garrotxa and ALS (Advanced Leisure Services)
Since 2001, the Region of Garrotxa has been a pioneer in the application area of the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism (ECST), the year in which the Natural Park of the Volcanic Area Garrotxa achieved accreditation by Europarc Federation, the implementation of CETS marked the scope of the Charter throughout the Region, and to consolidate the letter as a strategic development and management model as tourism in the region.

In recent years, many countries and regions have estimated the economic impact of tourism activities using different systems that used different definitions and estimation methodologies. In most cases, the diversity of approaches has prevented the implementation of rigorous comparisons among them, which has difficulty extracting conclusions about the economic impact of tourism activities and their relationship with other economy. Hence the vague and misleading perception that the public generally has significant effects on the resulting direct and induced tourism, and therefore the low recognition policies and priorities which in practical terms has helped this sector very asymmetric in relation to his remarkable contribution to the economy.

The expenditure by tourists directly impacts a broad set of industries and also has an impact on many areas of activity. Knowing what is in fact the economic impact of tourism is very difficult, if not impossible, especially at local level. Tourism is a very large, difficult to define and specify, that is related to many other activities, which greatly complicates its quantification. Indeed, an analysis of the economic impact of tourism, will provide estimates of these tangible economic interdependence and a greater understanding of the role and importance of tourism in the economy of a region. Understanding the economic impact of tourism is an essential task in the planning of a territory or region and proposals for economic development. But it is a necessary aspect to control the marketing and management decisions by companies. The company therefore should know the relative importance of tourism in the region, including its contribution to economic activity in the area and creating jobs.

European Charter for Sustainable Tourism (ECST)

Volcanic Zone Natural Park Garrotxa obtained in 2001 as the first natural area of Spain EUROPARC accreditation of the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism. The Charter, which was renewed in 2006 for the second time, was accompanied by an action plan, which required an investment of € 9,414,450 effective in the period 2001-2005 and € 3,783,484 in the 2006-2010 period.

Of this total amount of € 13,197,937 is estimated may be attributed to investment in construction, improving public spaces and the creation and improvement of facilities for tourist use the amount of € 3,651,312, approximately 28% of the total investment.

Based on the above data, it is estimated that the direct impact from investments to boost tourism in the Garrotxa in the period 2001-2010 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agents d’inversió vinculats amb l’activitat turística</th>
<th>Import de la inversió estimada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carta Europea de Turisme Sostenible (CETS)</td>
<td>3.651.312,00€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parc Natural Zona Volcànica de la Garrotxa (PNZVG)</td>
<td>1.871.293,51€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consorci de l’Alta Garrotxa (CAG)</td>
<td>1.167.195,97€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajuntaments</td>
<td>18.095.450,47€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inversions segones residències</td>
<td>34.491.047,15€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inversions privades: creació de l’oferta turística</td>
<td>38.508.333,00€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inversions privades: millora de l’oferta turística</td>
<td>1.525.429,09€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AGENTS</td>
<td>99.330.116,19€</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The money supply generated by tourism in the municipalities of Garrotxa during the period between 2001-2010 was 700 million euros.

In terms of employment were generated, the sum of the period between 2001 and 2010, a total of 8,500 jobs, 70% of them by the direct effect of tourism, 22% for the indirect effect of tourism and 8% due to the effect of tourism given these ten years the tourism tax generated revenues of 160 million euros.

The economic activity generated by tourism in La Garrotxa contributes to regional GDP between 7%-9%.

This is a clear evolution in the sector in the period analyzed, a sector that generates direct employment, and contributes to job creation in other related sectors, notably the commercial sector.

The main reason that the flow of tourists to the region are nature and landscape attribute own land on which there are active policies for conservation, which in turn support the enhancement to ensure increased tourism.

This is the first and most comprehensive study undertaken specifically of a Charter area and provides a model for possible comparison between other Charter areas. Although the depth of such a study could not have been possible within his project. The main belief of the author is that this investment in the tourism industry and the subsequent economic benefit derived, in La Garrotxa would not have happened were it not for the fact of the Charter.

**Charter and comparison to other European and International Policies**

In order to ensure the Charter methodology was aligned to other relevant policies and strategies such as TEEB and CBD, as well as take forward recommendations from the STEPPA project, a desktop comparative study was undertaken.

**Charter and STEPPA**

With reference to the analysis of the Charter re-evaluation methodology, although the STEPPA project was primarily assessing new methodologies for Charter park 2 i.e. partnerships with businesses, it was an useful reference point since Charter park 2 indicators would need to be reflected in Charter park evaluations and re-evaluation.

**Update criteria and standard.** It is necessary for all Charter Part 2, approved certification programmes to review criteria to make them relevant to the current understanding of sustainability, while keeping the links with conservation and PA’s objectives. This should include a number of aspects, including socio economic sustainability and climate change related criteria that should be introduced within the context of the award’s aims.

Further the STEPPA report also indicated that:
Therefore STEPPA provided to this project working group the basis of the analysis of the Charter re-evaluation. This included the recommendation from STEPPA, of change that should take place in Charter 2 methodologies. Such a similar change should be considered for the Charter Park award itself to ensure the Charter systems for the park and businesses were consistent. This was therefore reflected in work package 3 where the project working group reviewed the criteria of the re-evaluation to consider the relevance of socio-economic sustainability, climate change and other aspects that may need to be added or revised since the original Charter system was created.

The recommendations from STEPPA however also indicated that economic factors were not often the driving reason for a business participating in sustainable tourism. Therefore qualitative evaluation in both Charter part two and therefore also Charter re-evaluation were also needed in order to determine the Charter park’s role in promotion and supporting such work through their Charter activities.

**Charter and TEEB**

The project working group undertook an analysis of the re-evaluation methodology of the Charter. This resulted in two documents, a conceptual framework of “building blocks” explaining how the principles translate into the key issues of the Charter, and a new “Key Issues” of the Charter framework. Both documents are contained in the appendix.

A redefinition of the Principles of the Charter was proposed as:
The project working group agreed that 12 new “Key Issues” which would replace the old “principles” bringing the Charter system up to date with current thinking on aspects of sustainable tourism. It also included the analysis and comparison between STEPPA, TEEB and CBD to ensure any Charter evaluation system was in line with the recommendations and principles espoused. It was also agreed how minimum criteria for each of those key issues should be set; if not in exact numbers than in description of what does minimum criteria include.
One example in the table below, shows how a new “Key Issue” relates to the “old “Principle of the, how this aspect would then be evaluated through the re-evaluation return provided by the park and then what a verifier would be looking for in a re-evaluation situation. The numbering system refers to the questions that appear on the evaluation forms completed by parks and verifiers. This is a first proposal produced as a result of this project. Clearly a remodelling of the application forms, with definitions of terms and indicators and minimum criteria as well as training in the new system for Charter officers and verifiers will be required in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Charter principle</th>
<th>New proposed Key Issue with question associated with original Charter application</th>
<th>Question asked in park Re-evaluation</th>
<th>Questions asked to verifier in Re-evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Principle</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Re-evaluation – Park</td>
<td>Verifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KEY ISSUE 4 SUSTAINABLE TOURISM AND REDUCING CARBON FOOTPRINTS</td>
<td>3.3 Action to control development (including tourism) which would adversely affect the quality of landscapes, air and water; use non-renewable energy; and create unnecessary waste and noise.</td>
<td>3.3 Action to control development (including tourism) which would adversely affect the quality of landscapes, air and water; use non-renewable energy; and create unnecessary waste and noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Action to reduce tourism activities which adversely affect the quality of landscapes, air and water; use non-renewable energy; and create unnecessary waste and noise.</td>
<td>10.3 Promoting use of public transport, cycling and walking as an alternative to private cars.</td>
<td>3.4 Action to reduce tourism activities which adversely affect the quality of landscapes, air and water; use non-renewable energy; and create unnecessary waste and noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.4 Controlling the siting and style of any new tourism development within the planning control of the Charter areas</td>
<td>10.4 Controlling the siting and style of any new tourism development within the planning control of the Charter areas</td>
<td>10.2 Promoting use of public transport, cycling and walking as an alternative to private cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Action to control development (including tourism) which would adversely affect the quality of landscapes, air and water; use non-renewable energy; and create unnecessary waste and noise.</td>
<td>10.4 Controlling the siting and style of any new tourism development within the planning control of the Charter areas</td>
<td>10.4 Controlling the siting and style of any new tourism development within the planning control of the Charter areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRINCIPLE 3 – PROTECTING NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE
PRINCIPLE 10 – MANAGING VISITOR FLOWS
With such changes it was felt Charter evaluation leading to re-evaluation would be able to provide a stronger analysis of change indicators over time. The current system does provide a description of change but is less quantitative. The parks involved in the working group of this project as experienced parks having been through evaluation, agreed to the changes to the revaluation methodology however a wider consultation in the Charter network is envisaged before they are fully adopted.

**Charter and TEEB**

The project working group was not aware of any methodologies having been developed through TEEB in order to determine their value in assessing the economic benefit of the Charter. The TEEB remains at a policy level instrument for now.

In *Nature and its Role in the Transition to a Green Economy*, Ten Brink P., Mazza L., Badura T., Kettunen M. and Withana S. (2012) the following key principles of a green economy are described;

---

**In February 2012, stakeholders gathered at the UNEP Governing Council to draft key principles of a green economy.** These became the focus of a wide international consultation and have resulted in a set of principles which an increasing number of organisations are signing up to. The nine principles are considered necessary to help develop a collective understanding and vision of what a green economy needs to deliver and are also a reminder of the wider objectives that a transition to a green economy needs to embrace. The principles are:

1. The Sustainable Principle (a green, fair and inclusive economy delivers sustainable development);
2. The Justice Principle (it delivers equity);
3. The Dignity Principle (it creates genuine prosperity and wellbeing for all);
4. The Healthy Planet Principle (it invests in natural systems and rehabilitates those that are degraded);
5. The Inclusion Principle (it is inclusive and participatory in decision-making);
6. The Good Governance and Accountability Principle (it is accountable);
7. The Resilience Principle (it builds economic, social and environmental resilience);
8. The Efficiency and Sufficiency Principle (it delivers sustainable consumption and production);

---

The project working group in its check and review felt that the current principles and the key issues proposed, of the Charter were very much in line with these agreed by UNEP.

The group is therefore confident that at policy level the Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas is a suitable delivery mechanism to contribute towards a transition towards a Green Economy, through delivering sustainable development and protected are management. Tourism is a significant industry in Europe with over 40 percent of European travelers surveyed in 2000 included a visit to a national park (Eagles and Hillel, 2008). (cited in ten Brink P., Mazza L., Badura T., Kettunen M. and Withana S. (2012) *Nature and Its Role in the Transition to a Green Economy*.)
However a further check of TEEB key principle and messages was compared with those of the Charter in the report *Nature and its Role in the Transition to a Green Economy*. Ten Brink P., Mazza L., Badura T., Kettunen M. and Withana S. (2012). In it the following two key messages were closely related to Charter principles.

“any form of tourism development, management or activity which ensures the long-term protection and preservation of natural, cultural and social resources and contributes in a positive and equitable manner to the economic development and well-being of individuals living, working, or staying in protected areas”.

The working group felt given this statement from TEEB, that the aims, principles and methodology enable the Charter, to play a role, within the tourism sector toward a green economy as described in the TEEB report, *Nature and its Role in the Transition to a Green Economy*.

“Good governance is critical to the transition to the green economy and an integral part of the above six approaches. Components of good governance inter alia include: institutions and their roles; processes and participation; transparency and disclosure; and monitoring and enforcement”.

The principle of partnership and participation by all actors in a region to take forward sustainable tourism is embedded in the Charter and therefore is well placed to be recognized a delivery mechanism of this key message of TEEB in achieving a green economy.

Further the TEEB report goes on to add:

“Investments in nature today – whether restoration or protected area management – can save money and promote economic growth in the long term”

The TEEB report itself quote the example of Finland, of which working group member Syote represents, where in Finland, the total annual revenue linked to visitor spending in national parks and key recreation areas (total of 45 areas) has been estimated as 87 million EUR/year, generating 10 EUR return for every 1 EUR of public investment (Huhtala et al.2010).

The magic numbers produced in work package 1, showing the amount of investment being made by public and private sector in sustainable tourism as well as the number of habitats and species being managed under sustainable tourism principles, have shown that the Charter is a stimuli to local investment that works to protect nature.

The project working group took into consideration these aspects and points in their analysis of the Charter principles and key issues and recommended further dialogue with TEEB to highlight the role the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in protected areas could have as a useful tool for the tourism sector and protected areas to contribute to a Green economy.
Charter and CBD

The Guidelines on Biodiversity and Tourism Development⁴ were adopted by the Conference of the Parties of the CBD at its seventh meeting (decision VII/14). Since their adoption, the Guidelines on Biodiversity and Tourism Development and the Users’ Manual on the CBD Guidelines on Biodiversity and Tourism Development⁵ have been produced. The Charternet project funding by BfN undertook to ensure Charter principles were in compliance with CBD guidelines. The results of that project were incorporated by the project working group’s review and analysis of the Charter re-evaluation as part of this current project.

However during the project working groups deliberations, the 11th CBD meeting took place in Hyderabad, India where the Charter itself was cited as a delivery mechanism to implementation the CBD Guidelines in accordance with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. This reaffirms the Charter’s alignment with this important international convention. In the paper Tourism and biodiversity: review of the implementation of the guidelines on biodiversity and tourism development. UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/52/Rev.1 2 October 2012.

The Application of the Guidelines on Biodiversity and Tourism Development AND its relevance to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets

The following examples and case studies illustrate the implementation of the CBD Guidelines in accordance with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets

Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascapes.

- Another successful cross-border example is the “European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas (ECST)” - a contract awarded by the EUROPARC Federation for European national parks, biosphere reserves and nature parks. ECST is a practical management tool that was developed in consultation with all relevant stakeholders for future tourism development of protected areas. Around 89 reserve areas (as of October 2011) are awarded in Europe with the "European Charter"¹. A Network among the European regions helps to exchange experiences regarding the Charter implementation. So far, 387 local tourism businesses in 23 Charter Areas within this Network committed themselves to work towards an environmental management within their businesses and developing activities promoting and respecting the protected areas. The brochure “Joining forces – How the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas”¹ presents further related successful examples from various European countries. The recent EU-funded project “PARKS and BENEFITS” aims at ensuring sustainable regional development in eight large protected areas in six countries around the Baltic Sea including Germany. The project’s main instrument was the applicability of ECST in the Baltic Sea Region and its joint implementation in national, regional and nature parks and a biosphere reserve. Two German protected areas: the Müritz National Park and the Biosphere Reserve South-East Rügen have been awarded the European Charter in 2011.

WWF MedPO in capacity building for the CBD PoWPA recommends and indeed are now implementing the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism for Protected Areas in the region. “Promoting regional cooperation in the Western Balkans through improved management of natural resources” WWF MedPO Dinaric Arc Parks- Team meeting – Andrea Štefan WWF Belgrade, 04 June 2012.Sub-Regional Workshop for CEE and Central Asia on Capacity Building for Implementation of the CBD PoWPA.

**Workpackage A4: Identify and communicate best practice in the Charter Park network.**

**Project Objective:** To gather evidence from Charter parks, in addition to data obtained through the STEPPA* project in order to demonstrate the economic value of the Charter for protected areas.

The indicators of best practice in public use, tourism business, nature conservation and governance were identified and defined. The project determined and agreed the criteria upon which case studies would be selected.

A desk review of all verifier’s reports to identify best practices across the network and collate best practice case studies took place and were collected into a single document for an easier review. The selected 89 were then further reviewed by the study group and a section of 10-15 was made which after contacting the relevant parks was finalised with 10 case studies.

Results of the selection process are in the Appendix - Identify and communicate best practice in the Charter Park network.

The case studies /best practise publication was produced translated in four languages, however for now it will be only in digital form as the project did not foresee printing costs.

In the appendix -e-brochure “Learning from Case Studies in Charter for Sustainable Tourism park around Europe”.

---

*Promoting regional cooperation in the Western Balkans through improved management of natural resources” WWF MedPO Dinaric Arc Parks- Team meeting – Andrea Štefan WWF Belgrade, 04 June 2012.Sub-Regional Workshop for CEE and Central Asia on Capacity Building for Implementation of the CBD PoWPA*
Communications undertaken by EUROPARC and project partners throughout the project was extensive as the communication report in the annexe shows.
Recommendations and Future Outlook

Following almost 3 years of analysis and gathering of data, evidence and discussion amongst a wide group of actors in the field of protected areas and sustainable tourism, the project working group have the following recommendations.

**Magic Numbers**

Having now gathered the “magic numbers” of the current Charter parks, that this data will be widely disseminated throughout the tourism and protected areas fields of work, to stimulate further discussion and to show the value of the Charter in real terms.

It is further recommended that any amendments proposed to Charter application processes and especially forms, begin to gather, as appropriate some of this data at this early stage. This will give a baseline for each park to enable analysis at a re-evaluation stage for example.

It is also important that investment is made by EUROPARC to make a full survey of the magic numbers data set at least every 5 years to enable changes progress and the value of the Charter to be monitored.

Further that the data gathered regarding N2000 sites within Charter areas, and the habitats and species being managed by Charter partners be further analysed, compiled and published in the future as a separate report and communications, when monies are identified.

The model presented by la Garrtoxa as a means of measuring the economic value of the Charter to a region be presented to the wider Charter network.

**Indicators**

The report produced, “A comparison between EU Sustainable Tourism Indicators and the Principles of the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas” as part of this project has been discussed in Dec 2012, with the European Commission DG Enterprise. EUROPARC has already proposed that it be presented at a conference to be organised by D G Enterprise in February 2013.

The report and subsequent input by EUROPARC to the TSG group, and response to the consultation exercise on a propose Charter for Sustainable and Responsible Tourism by European Commission DG Enterprise. EUROPARC will be following these developments closely as they emerge form the European Commission.

**Review of re-evaluation**

The initial premise of the analysis and review of the Charter re-evaluation methodology was that it should give an indication of the change over time of indicators used in the process which could then give some indication of the Charter would bring in the economic values of that protected area or region.

Preliminary analysis of this indicated that although some change over time can be measured, it was perhaps more qualitative, and that for each evaluation the Charter area may present a differing action plan that was being assessed by the verifier, so there was no absolute continuity in assessment. The working group recommended that key indicators of sustainable practices be adopted in the evaluation systems of the Charter which can be better measured over time. These are reflected in the key issues identified by the working group.

The recommendation from the working groups follows the more detailed analysis of the re-evaluation system, and that is, following a consultation with the Charter network, to adopt the new
principles and key issues of the Charter for both revaluation and initial Charter assessment. Also that more detailed minimum standards and indicators are prepared.

New communications materials, applications forms associated with the proposed changes should be drafted by EUROPARC.

The working group also indicated that training for verifiers and Charter officers be initiated as soon as practically possible to be able to adopt and apply the new proposals.

Further to the excellent progress made in the recognition of the value, importance and contribution the Charter makes in international strategy and policy such asCBD, TEEB, the working groups encouraged EUROPARC to communicate further the findings of this report and to engage further with other interested bodies such as, PanParks, WWF, Rainforest alliance, WCPA task force on Tourism and Protected areas and UNEP.

Fundamentally though the working group stressed the need to maintain standards, better dissemination of development and networking for the existing and future Charter areas of the EUROPARC Federation.

Case studies

The working groups recommended that the case study brochure be widely disseminated.

Communications

Communication about the Bfn Sustainable Tourism Destinations project undertaken by EUROPARC and partners during the project.

External publications

1. Die Europäische Charta für nachhaltigen Tourismus in Schutzgebieten
   http://www.bfn.de/0323_charta.html
   March 2011

2. Presentation European Charter Parks Trends, steps, cooperation, problems, by Lasse Lovén, Metsähallitus Natural Heritage Services, Finland
   7 Oct 2011

3. Report on the EUROPARC Sustainable Tourism Working Group meeting on 29.2.-1.3.2012 held in Forest of Bowland AONB in Great Britain, by Lasse Lovén
   http://tinyurl.com/c7ev2cv
   1 March 2012

4. European Charter parks – a growing network for sustainable tourism development in protected areas.
   Agnese Balandina, Lasse Lovén, Olaf Ostermann and Richard Partington (ed Carol Ritchie)
   IUCN Park Magazine to be published Dec 2012.
# Internal publications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECST - Charter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Approximately how many recipients</th>
<th>Weblink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2011</td>
<td>Charter leaflet (DE, EN, FR)</td>
<td>leaflet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>European Charter News Email N°4</td>
<td>Charter News</td>
<td>ca. 500</td>
<td><a href="http://www.european-charter.org/download/173">www.european-charter.org/download/173</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPF - Federation</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Approximately how many recipients</th>
<th>Weblink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published August 2012</td>
<td>Annual report 2011, p 12/13 (in EN, DE, FR)</td>
<td>report Website and print</td>
<td>Approx. 430 members, other partner NGOs; wider public thru website report.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.europarc.org/library/europarc-publication">http://www.europarc.org/library/europarc-publication</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July, 17, 2012</td>
<td>Work Package 1 Report Appendix 3 Number Of Endangered Species + Habitats In Charter Parks</td>
<td>WP report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 31, 2011</td>
<td>Assessment of Magic Number by Carol Ritchie</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>Assessment survey on Magic Numbers in English, French, Spanish and Italian</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 9, 2011</td>
<td>The Europarc Federation shared a link via Nacionalni Park Djerdap. 9 August 2011</td>
<td>Facebook note</td>
<td><a href="http://www.facebook.com/EUROPARC">http://www.facebook.com/EUROPARC</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussing sustainable tourism in protected areas in Serbia - European Charter for Sustainable Tourism <a href="http://www.european-charter.org">www.european-charter.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13, 2011</td>
<td>Reminder Assessment of Magic Numbers in Charter Areas</td>
<td>Email + attachments Magic Numbers assessment in English, French, Spanish and Italian.</td>
<td>All charter park members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>E-News May 2011</td>
<td>E-News</td>
<td>2200 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2011</td>
<td>Sustainable tourism Working group is on its way by Lasse Loven and Paulo Castro</td>
<td>press release</td>
<td>2200 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>E-News march 2011</td>
<td>E-News</td>
<td>2200 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2011</td>
<td>EUROPARC E-News February 2011</td>
<td>E-news</td>
<td>2200 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://tinyurl.com/cjftst9">http://tinyurl.com/cjftst9</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The value of the Charter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Details / Further Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2011</td>
<td>Completion of the desk study comparison of Charter and Sustainable Tourism Destination indicators and recommendations</td>
<td>Desk study</td>
<td>Europe’s protected areas and their staff, particularly Charter protected areas; Other businesses or organisations working in or around protected areas; European, national and local governments and politicians, relevant EU institutions and schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 29, 2010</td>
<td>Report Sustainable Tourism indicators v5</td>
<td>A report by EUROPARC Consulting Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Various - ongoing</td>
<td>E-Mails</td>
<td>between project partners, to EUROPARC members and to other distribution lists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Introducing the EUROPARC Federation Presentation – power point presentation, Dec 2010 until to date (council presentation)</td>
<td>Other documentation – power point presentation</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Events/seminars/conferences**

1. Sustainable Tourism Destination Meeting - Final meeting in Regensburg, September 27/28, 2012 – Internal


8. UNESCO: Management Effectiveness and Quality Criteria in European Protected Areas - Sharing experiences and promoting good management
   Link: [http://whc.unesco.org/pg_friendly_email.cfm?criteria=cooperation&cid=2788&index=241](http://whc.unesco.org/pg_friendly_email.cfm?criteria=cooperation&cid=2788&index=241)
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3. “What does the Charter mean in numbers?” infographic

4. “A comparison between EU Sustainable Tourism Indicators and the Principles of the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas “

5. “Building Blocks of the Charter”

6. “Key Issues “

7. “Identify and communicate best practice in the Charter Park network”

8. E-brochure “Learning from Case Studies in Charter for Sustainable Tourism park around Europe”

9. Communication report