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World Heritage Sites in Canada

- Since 1976, [Parks Canada](#) is lead agency for implementation of World Heritage Convention in Canada.

- Fifteen sites designated in Canada
  - combination of national and provincial parks and historic settings
  - 9 natural and 6 cultural or mixed designated sites.
1. Nahanni National Park (1978)
2. L’Anse aux Meadows National Historic Site (1978)
3. Kluane/Wrangell-St. Elias/Glacier Bay/Tatshenshini-Alsek (1979, 1992, 1994) - a transboundary site between Canada and US.
4. Dinosaur Provincial Park (1979)
Click on a Heritage site for more information.

Policy in Canada: Protection, Conservation, and Presentation of the Cultural and Natural Heritage

- Canadian system of federal, provincial or territorial, and municipal governments shapes the way that heritage is protected in Canada.

- No single entity responsible for the management of all World Heritage Sites in Canada, let alone for heritage generally.

- Federal legislation and policy are complemented by those of the provinces, territories and municipalities.
Management of natural and cultural heritage is split between levels of government and among governmental organizations; policy regarding governing heritage is similarly diverse:

- not centrally planned
- encompasses a wide range of protected areas, mechanisms and approaches.
- Various partners engaged in protecting areas e.g. Parks Canada, Historic Places Initiative, ICOMOS Canada,…
- Includes all levels of government (and more than one department or ministry within the same government) non-governmental organizations, private citizens and corporations.
- Choice of mechanism for any particular heritage area is dependent upon jurisdiction, heritage resources, and planned use of the area.
Policy Development:
Tourism and Heritage Management Issues
Research

- Little research was evident on role of tourism and its relationship with World Heritage Sites, not only in Canada, but globally
  - impact assessments: economic, social, cultural, environmental
  - governance issues
  - management challenges and issues
  - planning processes/analytical frameworks

- MSVU organized The Halifax Initiative

Twelve researchers from Belgium, Lebanon, Hong Kong, USA and across Canada took part in the Halifax Initiative. A research workshop was organized and held in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, from July 28 -31, 2008 to bring this group together.

The purpose was to launch a collaborative and comparative research program focused on growing concerns and issues associated with the designation of UNESCO World Heritage status, including the complex relationships and interconnections between cultural heritage planning and management of World Heritage Sites as global tourism destinations.

The World Heritage Tourism Research Network (WHTRN)
The World Heritage Tourism Research Network (WHTRN)
### Proposed Framework for analyzing Tourism in World Heritage Sites

(Jansen-Verbeke, M. and McKercher R. 2009)

#### Key Issues in tourism in World Heritage Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Spatial Characteristics</th>
<th>Robustness</th>
<th>Tourist Appeal</th>
<th>Experiencescape</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranges from solitary and isolated to integrated into an urban landscape</td>
<td>Size of WHS – individual monument to multi-nationals scale</td>
<td>Fragility of tangible asset</td>
<td>Place on attraction’s hierarchy (primary vs. secondary)</td>
<td>Type of tourist attracted to site and, therefore, type of experience sought</td>
<td>Single overriding agency vs. multiple agencies vs. no dominant agency</td>
<td>Pursuit of WHS status for conservation or tourism goals?</td>
<td>Presented as is with little commodification vs. heavily commodified</td>
<td>Single stakeholder with a clear focus vs. multiple stakeholders with mixed foci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism location ranges from isolated to part of a contiguous destination area</td>
<td>Internal spatial structure of WHS (compact or dispersed, single or multiple nodes)</td>
<td>Risk that tourism pressure may compromise cultural values</td>
<td>Fame prior to designation (known well before or unknown)</td>
<td>Type and quality of interpretation and which story / stories to be told presentation</td>
<td>Ownership public, private or a mix of public and private ownership</td>
<td>Presence or absence of effective national legislation</td>
<td>WHS site management structure - public sector, public / private partnership or leased to private sector</td>
<td>Direct and pragmatic vs. indirect and ideologically driven stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access considerations (easy vs. difficult)</td>
<td>Presence or absence of iconic feature</td>
<td>Ability to manage impacts</td>
<td>Realistic assessment of tourism potential</td>
<td>Theming and desired message(s)</td>
<td>Level of government management of WHS devolved to (local of federal)</td>
<td>Presence or absence of formal conservation or management plan and its effectiveness</td>
<td>Power balance between stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to other WHS sites</td>
<td>Presence or absence of buffer zone around WHS</td>
<td>Possess necessary attributes for success</td>
<td>Tourist connectivity to the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue source for conservation (presence / absence; reliance on tourism to provide funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection with main tourism gateways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived role of tourism (primary use vs. ancillary use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HARDWARE**
- Location
- Spatial Characteristics
- Robustness

**SOFTWARE**
- Tourist Appeal
- Experiencescape

**ORGWARE**
- Organisation
- Policy
- Management

**Stakeholders**
- Single stakeholder with a clear focus vs. multiple stakeholders with mixed foci
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Hardware

- **Location**
  - Natural and cultural WHS
  - Difficult access, remote in the Andes, 2000m high, 5 hours from Cuzco main city
  - Isolated but various archaeological sites in the region

- **Spatial characteristics**
  - Sanctuary, protected area

- **Robustness**
  - No serious carrying capacity studies to date
  - Very fragile area (landslides, flooding)
Software

Tourist appeal
- Famous before designation (not so much at global stage)
- Tourism before designation (but not so developed)
- High profile site

Experiencescape
- Cultural tourism (Inca past, interest in natural species,
- Focus is on the experience of being there, to see the landscape and learn about the local culture
World Heritage since 1983

- Tourism development boom in the 1990s
- Fujimori decade (1990-2001)
- 1990s, international arrival increase - 12.9% per year
- 2000 - 360,000 visitors to Cusco
- 2008 – 1 million visitors to Cusco
Orgware

- **Organisation**
  - UGM, a single public overriding agency made of multiple agencies representatives (INC, INRENA, tourism government)
  - National protected area

- **Policy**
  - Highly centralised governance
  - For conservation or tourism development?

- **Management**
  - Formal master plan of development
  - Supervisory role of UNESCO

- **Stakeholders**
  - Strong power *imbalance* between stakeholders
  - Conservation and tourism development are the main focus and takes over the social issues
Aguas Calientes - Landslides
Carrilluchayoc Bridge:

- Threat - World Heritage Site in danger
- Increase tourism
- Conservation issues
- Sense of place - sacredness
- Local socioeconomic isolation
The porters of the Inca trail

- 1970s, highland Quechua communities exploited
- « Ley de los porteadores 27607 » in 2001
- 2002 to 2005, Inka Porters’ Project linked to Tourism Concern
- Sanctions inspections and planning
- 6000 members porters Union
UNESCO
State of conservation report

1. The ineffectiveness of the Integrated Sanctuary Management Unit;
2. the uncontrolled growth of Machu Picchu Village accompanied by an ever increasing level of risks from landslides, fires, structural failure, health threats, and social crisis;
3. the absence of a public use plan and associated analysis of access and risks;
4. the difficulties in getting budgetary approval for maintenance work on the archaeological structures of the Sanctuary;
5. the lack of control of the western access to the property;
6. deep concern about the consequences of the construction of the Carrilluchayoc bridge and the access road in the buffer and core zone of the Sanctuary and the lack of due process and governance related to this issue [UNESCO 2007a:6-7].
Stakeholders power relation

- Cuzco City
- Regional Government
- Aquas Calientes
- National Government
- Machu Picchu World Heritage Site
- Carrilluchayoc Bridge
- Porters
- UGM
- UNESCO
- PeruRail
- Tourists

Power relations are indicated by arrows pointing towards Machu Picchu World Heritage Site.
Conclusion

- Not sure the framework addresses the international community as a stakeholder or the influence of UNESCO as a crucial actor in management and policy making?

- Towards developing comparability through the framework
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World Heritage Sites In India

• Ancient civilization
• Birthplace of several religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism)
• Has a significant Muslim population (2\textsuperscript{nd} largest in the world)
• Early Christian and Jewish settlements
• Varied landscapes
• All adds up to several WHS!
  – 27 in total; 5 natural, 22 cultural
  – 29 on the tentative list
• http://www.shubhyatra.com/guide/world-heritagesites-india.html
• http://indianjourney-krithi.blogspot.com/2009/01/world-heritage-sites-of-india.html
WHS in India

- The sites range from mountain railways to wildlife parks to historic buildings to religious sites to of course, the Taj Mahal!
Religion a key factor

• Of the 22 cultural sites, 17 are of religious significance
• A good number are ‘living’ sacred sites – i.e., places of current worship
• One ‘endangered’ site: Manas Wildlife Park
Key Issues

• Using the proposed model
  – Lack of studies on the impact numbers

• The assumption is that WHS designation leads to increased #s, but this is yet to be proven

• Many factors will affect #s – location (rural/urban), access, proximity to other sites, popularity prior to designation, etc

• Many of the cultural sites are in rural areas and not well known

There is a huge cluster of WHS in the Delhi-Agra area
  – Taj Mahal, Fatehpur Sikri, Humayun’s tomb, Red fort, Qutub Minar
Demand Side Issues

• Motivation to travel to WHS needs more examination
  – Governmental studies of international visitors indicate that
    • Most travel to urban areas and the ‘tourist corridor’ (Delhi-Agra-Rajasthan-Mumbai)
    • Many travel for business and spend only a short time there
    • Non-Resident Indians (NRIs) travel to meet family
Demand Side Issues

• Domestic travelers
  – Travel to meet family and friends (68%)
  – May only visits sites in that area
  – Many are from rural households and religious travel is the key reason for many rural tourists
  – WHS are not the key religious sites
  – Reasons for visiting heritage sites were classified into three groups: "heritage experience," "learning experience," and "recreational experience."

• One and two: Less valid for domestic tourists?
Sustainability, Impact, and Inclusion

• Sustainability:
  – Of the 32 sites on the endangered sites, almost all are in developing countries
  – 16 are cultural sites, 16 are natural
  – India has one

• Is sustainability the key issue?
  – Misuse, underuse probably more important
Impact and inclusion

• Proportion of tourists to local population a key factor
  – Some sites have huge influxes of tourists – especially international tourists
  – Impact on local culture a big issue
  – Infrastructure development has often been ‘top down’ and not beneficial to the local population
  – Inclusion not a priority in developing countries

• Nanda Devi National Park
To sum up...

• WHS in developing countries like India face a different set of problems
• Local issues have to be considered while developing management schemes
• More care needs to be taken in the assessment of a property for WHS designation
  – ‘hardware’ and ‘software’ have to be considered
  – ‘orgware’ is often the key problem