



**COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES
TO CULTURAL-HERITAGE TOURISM**

An Exploratory Research Study

Prepared for the
Building Market-Readiness Capacity Working Group
Federal-Provincial-Territorial Cultural/Heritage and Tourism Initiative

By Apropos Planning
January 27, 2006

Federal-Provincial-Territorial Culture/Heritage and Tourism Initiative

Background

- The Federal-Provincial-Territorial Culture/Heritage and Tourism Initiative (FPTTI) was officially launched in November 2003 as a two-year pilot project that ended in October 2005.
- This partnership between all provincial and territorial ministries responsible for Culture and Heritage and the Department of Canadian Heritage is co-chaired by Manitoba and New Brunswick.
- Three working groups were created to implement this initiative:
 - The Aboriginal Cultures and Tourism Working Group (led first by Alberta and then Saskatchewan);
 - The Building Market-Readiness Capacity Working Group (led by Ontario); and
 - The Economic Benefits Distribution Research Working Group (led by British Columbia).

Products

- The Initiative's aim is to support partnering jurisdictions in ensuring their culture/heritage stakeholders are able to become active in tourism on their own terms.
- The products to date reflect input from each jurisdiction.
- These products were created to stimulate discussion and create opportunities for dialogue between culture, heritage and tourism counterparts.
- The FPTTI partners are responsible for disseminating the products and key messages within their jurisdictions as they deem appropriate.
- The FPT Culture/Heritage and Tourism Initiative Coordination Office is prepared to respond to requests. They can be contacted at FPTTI@pch.gc.ca

Benefits of the FPTTI

- Continued collaboration with tourism counterparts on culture/heritage-driven projects creates opportunities for increased information sharing and strategic partnerships. The FPTTI will continue to develop the tools and information that will enable FPT culture/heritage ministries to:
 - 1) Provide leadership on cultural and heritage aspects of tourism-related policy;
 - 2) assist the culture/heritage sector to build capacity in tourism; and,
 - 3) create and promote understanding that the promotion, retention, and support of Canada's cultures and the sustainability of tourism are mutually reinforcing.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study explores the phenomenon of collaboration between culture/heritage and tourism sectors. It was commissioned by the Building Market-Readiness Capacity Working Group through the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Cultural/Heritage and Tourism Initiative.

The goal of this study was to explore how successful small and medium-sized cultural/heritage tourism collaborations really work. Were there particular partnership models or winning strategies that could be documented and shared? Could the case be made for a collaborative approach that would benefit both culture/heritage and tourism? The study reviewed the experiences of a selected sample of small and medium collaborative projects across the country. The starting assumption was that there were tested templates of success.

In the end, we did not find any magic formulas for successful collaboration. However, we did find many interesting approaches, lessons, strategies and observations that stand to inform, to strengthen and sometimes to challenge the way we think about collaborative cultural-heritage tourism in Canada.

The combinations and permutations of culture/heritage and tourism partnerships—how they come about, the players involved and the environment in which they succeed—are as diverse as this country itself.

The key findings from the research and interviews carried out in the course of this study are:

1. There is no single model of collaboration for cultural-heritage tourism initiatives, but a variety of important features that tend to lead to success.
2. There is a wide range of circumstances under which collaborative partnerships have emerged, but most have involved some level of public support.
3. Collaborative approaches to cultural/heritage tourism are relatively new and there are a limited number of small and medium-sized projects that have a multi-year track record.
4. Collaborative cultural-heritage tourism does not occur just by magic or by good will; it requires a commitment of resources and effort over a number of years.
5. Leadership by individuals who are in key positions and who have an affinity for both sectors seems to be an important factor in the success of collaborative ventures.
6. Collaborative cultural/heritage tourism initiatives work best when the culture/heritage experiences are already at a high level of market-readiness, or when product development is integral to the project.

7. Collaborative projects seem to be more successful when they are quite focused and when they have unique anchor attractions/experiences around which all activities can be grouped and themed.
8. When collaboration succeeds, all partners benefit and are enthusiastic about the initiative.
9. The development of cultural-heritage tourism collaborations in Canada is often limited by inflexible funding programs which promote either purely cultural or purely tourism activity and which do not easily permit innovative partnerships
10. In several cases, new business models are emerging which integrate culture and tourism into a single new entity.

It is likely that the diversity of collaborative approaches across Canada reflects the relative novelty of cultural/heritage tourism in this country and the lack, for the most part, of public policy frameworks. While many multi-faceted collaborations are too new to measure and given the few reliable measurement tools for determining success, there is a general consensus that collaborative approaches are beneficial to all partners and should be nurtured.

The people interviewed report that there remain many barriers to collaborative cultural/heritage tourism projects. According to these, funding would be a key issue as it seems clear that these projects do require new resources over a long time frame, yet are possibly hindered by funding formulas lacking flexibility and by the chronic under-funding of the cultural and heritage sector.

Successful projects result from dynamic leadership, a strong and clear vision, unique products, a willingness to collaborate and an understanding that cultural/heritage tourism is a new activity that needs public investment to take root and grow. Some alternative hybrid models are emerging to bring culture/heritage and tourism together.

Collaborative cultural/heritage tourism is taking root all across Canada. There is an opportunity for increase public support for these efforts, which could go a long way to ensure their long-term success.

COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES TO CULTURAL/HERITAGE TOURISM

Table of Contents

Background.....	Page 6
Project Definition, Scope and Methodology.....	Page 6
Key Findings.....	Page 10
Barriers to Collaboration.....	Page 14
Benefits of Collaboration.....	Page 18
Conclusion.....	Page 20
Appendix A: Project Summaries.....	Page 21
Appendix B: Working Group Members.....	Page 60
Appendix C: People Interviewed.....	Page 61
Appendix D: Research Instruments.....	Page 63

COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES TO CULTURAL/HERITAGE TOURISM

1. BACKGROUND

In 2003, Canada's fourteen ministers responsible for culture and heritage launched the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Cultural/Heritage and Tourism Initiative. The goal of this Initiative is to increase appreciation of the culture/heritage sector's contributions to tourism and to advance cultural/heritage tourism in this country.

The Initiative has created three working groups to undertake specific projects. This study, which explores the phenomenon of collaboration between culture/heritage and tourism sectors, was commissioned by the Building Market-Readiness Capacity Working Group. The Working Group played a key role in the study, providing guidance and direction throughout the process.

The goal of this study was to explore how successful small and medium-sized cultural/heritage tourism collaborations really work. Were there particular partnership models or winning strategies that could be documented and shared? Could the case be made for a collaborative approach that would benefit both culture/heritage and tourism? The study reviewed the experiences of a selected sample of small and medium collaborative projects across the country.

This study is one of the first in Canada to seek to understand how collaboration really operates--not for the well-known blockbusters and mega-projects--but for the more modest organizations, which make up the vast majority of this country's culture and heritage experiences. Accordingly, this was an exploratory research exercise.

In the end, we did not find any magic formulas for successful collaboration. The combinations and permutations of culture/heritage and tourism partnerships are as diverse as this country itself. However, we did find many interesting approaches, lessons, strategies and observations that stand to inform, to strengthen and sometimes to challenge the way we think about collaborative culture-heritage tourism in Canada.

2. PROJECT DEFINITIONS, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

2.1. Definitions

The very first question the Working Group asked itself was "what do we mean by a collaborative cultural/heritage tourism project?" For the purposes of this study, we agreed on the following working definition:

A collaborative culture-heritage tourism project is defined as a multi-product/supplier partnership representing both the culture/heritage and the tourism sectors with the demonstrated ability to attract new and repeat visitors to a quality experience with mutually beneficial results.

2.2. Narrowing the Scope

There are literally thousands of cultural-heritage tourism experiences in Canada, including museums, historic sites, performing arts, visual arts and festivals. Virtually every one of these includes tourists among its audiences. Studying all of these projects to see if they were collaborative was far beyond the scope of what could be achieved with a study of this size and budget.

The study scope was narrowed in the following ways:

- The study deals only with small and medium-sized collaborations. Major national institutions and blockbuster events were excluded since their experiences would be less relevant to the majority of cultural/heritage organizations, and also since they have been the focus of previous studies on cultural-heritage tourism successes.
- The study emphasizes ongoing collaborations that have lasted for several years, ideally three years or more. It is hard to assess whether something works or not until it has stood the test of time. Also, creating a short-term collaboration is a different challenge than building an ongoing one.
- Given the real limitations of time and budget, it was agreed that we would limit the number of case studies. The original intent was to carry out 12-15 in-depth interviews, a number sufficient to reveal trends and themes. In the end, we reviewed more than 20 projects, however, some did not turn out to be fully relevant.

2.3. Qualitative, not Quantitative

Since this research was exploratory in nature, we used qualitative research techniques. As is common in a qualitative research study, we used a small sample size, which should not be taken to be representative of the cultural-heritage tourism offer in Canada. We used less-structured research instruments, open-ended questions and interviewer probes to elicit information on behaviours, attitudes and motivation towards collaboration. Our analysis is based primarily on the information provided through telephone interviews and the findings should not be taken as conclusive. Nevertheless, significant insights were gained from this exploratory research that can be taken into account in policy development and which could be the basis for more structured research in the future.

2.4. Methodology

This study was carried out between May and September 2005 by Apropos Planning using the following methodology.

The consultant prepared a preliminary set of draft selection criteria and a draft representation grid (see appendix) for discussion by the Working Group. The initial methodology was for the Working Group to recommend projects meeting all the criteria, and then to select 12 – 15 on the basis of representation of different areas (urban, rural etc.), different disciplines (visual arts, performing arts etc), different types (public/private, culture-initiated/tourism-initiated) and different parts of Canada.

However, the Working Group found the selection criteria to be too stringent and felt there would be an insufficient number of projects to study. It was agreed that the Working Group would bring forward the names of projects that either met the criteria or that had alternative indicators of success or innovation that made them worthy of consideration.

The consultant received over 40 project suggestions. These suggestions were reviewed against the preliminary criteria and assessed for potential relevance and interest. Some were eliminated at this point because they were brand-new and had no track record to study. Others were set aside as they did not seem to be collaborative—that is to have a strong partner in both the culture/heritage sectors and the tourism sectors. One simple screening exercise was to check websites to see if both culture/heritage and tourism partners were acknowledged in some way. It was surprising to see how few cultural/heritage tourism experiences presented themselves to the world as partnerships.

The consultant then proposed a list of over twenty projects that met most of the draft selection criteria and represented a good cross-section of different types of projects and a good regional diversity.

A research questionnaire was approved with the understanding that the interviews would be relatively unstructured and permit informants to express their own opinions. It was also agreed that some more cursory interviews would be conducted, so that a greater number of projects could be touched upon.

In the end, 23 projects were reviewed and are summarized in this study. In the majority of cases, a minimum of two interviews was carried out for each project, in order to solicit the different perspectives of culture and tourism.

2.5. Study Limitations

As the purpose of this study was to carry out qualitative research on collaboration, the consultants did not inventory cultural/heritage tourism projects in Canada, nor evaluate success. Projects were selected with the aim of exploring a fairly broad range of collaborative projects of different types, rather than as a representative sample.

The narrow focus of this study meant that many successful and important cultural/heritage tourism projects are not included either because they are major endeavours (not small and medium sized projects), because they were not developed as partnerships, or because the study scope limited the number of case studies. Care must be taken not to over-generalize the results.

2.6 Projects Studied

<p>Cultural Corridors</p> <p>Okanagan Cultural Corridor, BC</p> <p>Cultural Cascades, BC &USA</p> <p>Routes on the Red, MB</p> <p>Viking Trail, NL</p> <p>Themed/Sectoral Initiatives</p> <p>“Just the Ticket”, ON</p> <p>Nutcracker Neighbourhood, ON</p> <p>Le Mois de l’archéologie, QC</p> <p>Cultural Tourism Destinations</p> <p>Chemainus Murals, BC</p> <p>Edmonton, Festival City, AB</p> <p>Trois-Rivières, QC</p> <p>Pictou Heritage Quay, NS</p> <p>Trinity, NL</p>	<p>Heritage/Culture Centred</p> <p>Barkerville, BC</p> <p>Glenbow Museum, AB</p> <p>Wanuskewin, SK</p> <p>Buxton National Historic Site, ON</p> <p>Confederation Centre, PEI</p> <p>Tourism Centred</p> <p>Canadian Cultural Landscapes, QC</p> <p>Bienvenue Québec, QC</p> <p>Alternative Business Models</p> <p>Tunnels of Moose Jaw, SK</p> <p>Le Pays de la Sagouine, NB</p> <p>The Economuseum® Network QC, NB, NS, NL</p> <p>Institutional Models</p> <p>Québec’s Cultural Tourism Agreements</p>
--	---

3. KEY FINDINGS

Ten key findings emerged from this study. They resulted not only from the interviews but also from the process of defining the scope, selecting the projects, and discussing the issues with the Working Group.

1 There is no single model of collaboration for cultural-heritage tourism initiatives.

Collaborations exist at all levels (by individuals, cultural or tourism organizations, communities, businesses, or governments) and function in many different ways, both formal and informal.

Collaborations range from provincial inter-departmental partnerships (for example, in Québec, the Ministries of Culture and Communications and Tourism jointly lead and fund several projects) to formal accords (e.g. the Viking Trail tourism accord has more than 40 signatories), to municipal-initiated projects (e.g. the Okanagan Cultural Corridor) to grassroots partnerships (e.g. Trinity, Newfoundland). There does not seem to be any standard approach to collaboration nor does one model appear to be superior to another.

2 There is a wide range of circumstances under which collaborative partnerships have emerged, but most have involved some level of public support.

Cultural/heritage tourism collaborations have been initiated for many different reasons in many different ways. Several were driven by economic necessity (for example, the Viking-themed tourism in Newfoundland grew out of the cod moratorium). Others came out of municipal planning exercises to brand and promote their community (e.g. Trois-Rivières, Chemainus, Edmonton). Some were initiated by cultural organization seeking to expand their reach (e.g. Wanuskewin, Glenbow, Rising Tide Theatre), while others were part of a deliberate tourism development strategy (e.g. "Just the Ticket", Nutcracker Neighbourhood, Routes on the Red). One project, the Economuseum® Network, began through a desire to preserve a traditional craft; others were strictly business propositions.

Although collaborations studied began in many different ways, and there did not seem to be a common pattern in how they were created, we did find that the majority of projects studied received some public funding and support.

3 Collaborative approaches to cultural/heritage tourism are relatively new and there are a limited a limited number of small and medium sized projects that have a multi-year track record.

Perhaps the biggest challenge for this study was finding projects that had been ongoing for several years. In many cases, the cultural/heritage experiences were well established, but the tourism partnership was new. Several other projects were in their infancy, in transition, or were ending because the special funding/support program was over. It is likely that this

lack of longevity is due to the fact that cultural/heritage tourism is a relatively new field, but it may be possible that the collaborative approaches are unstable. It is really too early to say.

Many new initiatives look promising, and should be monitored in the future. It is expected that if this study were repeated five years from now, the results might be somewhat different, especially in terms of assessing levels of success.

4 Collaborative cultural-heritage tourism does not occur just by magic or by good will; it requires a commitment of resources and effort over a number of years.

One common thread that emerged from the interviews was that partnerships take a lot of effort, above and beyond the normal workload of participants. The more successful collaborations tended to have full-time staff whose job was to promote cultural tourism or the partnership.

Collaborative projects also take an investment of new financial resources for such purposes as coordination, training, product development, packaging and above all for marketing. Generally, the collaborative partnership must be recognized as a new project, above and beyond the normal workings of either the cultural/heritage or tourism participant. To carry out this new project, partners must either find new resources or reallocate existing resources.

Finally, it is essential the commitment of resources be sustained over a period of several years. The tourism planning cycle is two to three years, so it takes a minimum of that time to begin to see returns, and longer to grow the targeted market to maturity. It seems clear that a much longer-term view is needed in terms of these projects than has previously been discussed.

5 Leadership by individuals who are in key positions and who have an affinity for both sectors seems to be an important factor in the success of collaborative ventures.

Leadership is a key factor in successful collaborations. Leadership can come from senior officials, or from dynamic individuals who have a vision and who champion a project against all odds. The importance of leadership became so clear in our interviews that we began probing with a new question: would this collaboration continue if this key person left.

An interesting finding was that the individuals who seemed to be the most effective were those with an instinctive affinity for both sectors: the Newfoundland innkeeper who had previously worked in theatre; the Québec municipal tourism official who loved art and ballet, or the British Columbia arts officer who has traveled widely, the businessman who appreciates crafts. A personal passion for both culture/heritage and tourism seems to be a key characteristic of effective leaders.

6 Collaborative cultural/heritage tourism initiatives work best when the culture/heritage experiences are already at a high level of market-readiness, or when product development is integral to the project.

Attracting visitors from outside one's local community, region, province or country requires a high quality cultural/heritage experience, one with the services and amenities expected by tourists. Collaborations with the tourism sector work best when the cultural/heritage offerings are already successful at a local level, rather than when they are trying to use tourism as a way to develop in the first place. Market-ready sites already have the capacity to collaborate with a tourism partner and to focus on cultural tourism as a new layer to their offer.

In short, cultural/heritage tourism collaborations rely on quality cultural/heritage experiences that are sustainable in their own rights.

Alternatively, if a cultural/heritage experience that is not yet market ready wishes to pursue a cultural/heritage tourism collaboration, it is important that the early stages of the partnership focus on product development before marketing. This is what is happening with Archéo-Québec. The Québec Ministries of Culture & Communications and Tourism have already supported three years of product development, aimed mainly at getting the archaeological visitor experience to local markets. They expect it may still be a few more years before they are ready to target out-of-province or international tourists. Projects that were less successful, such as the international BC/USA *Cultural Cascades* initiative, often began marketing before products were truly ready.

7 Collaborative projects seem to be more successful when are quite focused and when they have unique anchor attractions/experiences around which all activities can be grouped and themed.

The most successful collaborations have a clear focus. They have conducted market research, know what their products/experience are, keep things focused on a theme or on an anchor attraction, and know what the roles, expectations and obligations are of each partner. The better the project definition, the smoother it seemed to go.

For example, in western Newfoundland, all partners agreed that the Viking theme was their key competitive advantage and used this as a hook to market multifaceted experiences. They also signed a formal accord to clarify roles. In Ontario, the "Just the Ticket" project was narrowly focused, based on solid market research, focused only on theatre, and had clear rules for "buy-in".

Another factor that seems to lead to success is having a major attraction or experience as an anchor. It is often easier for tourism to collaborate with culture/heritage places when there is a clear anchor cultural/heritage experience that attracts visitors to an area. Sites like Barkerville, BC and Wanuskewin, SK found it relatively easy to build partnerships since they were already the key poles of attraction for visitors.

8 *When collaboration succeeds, all partners benefit and are enthusiastic about the initiative.*

The interviews made clear that when a collaborative cultural heritage project is successful, everyone shares in its benefits—though not always in the same way. In most sets of interviews with culture/heritage and tourism partners, there was a similar reaction from both sectors. Either both sides were positive and enthusiastic, both sides were somewhat happy with the situation, or there was a clear sense that it was not working. This suggests that looking at shared benefits and perceptions of success might be one way in the future to measure the success of collaborative cultural-heritage tourism projects.

9 *The development of cultural-heritage tourism collaborations in Canada is limited by funding programs lacking flexibility, by promoting either purely cultural or purely tourism activity; this would not easily permit innovative partnerships*

With the exception of some projects in Québec, one of the most common comments from informants was that it is extremely difficult for cultural/heritage tourism projects to qualify for funding. According to interviewees, these sorts of initiatives would not fit into traditional cultural/heritage funding mechanisms, but nor would they be favoured by mainstream tourism funding sources. Proponents of cultural/heritage tourism would find themselves either excluded from funding, or required to jump through hoops to get funding for one aspect here, and another aspect there. Often economic development agencies seemed to be more open to funding cultural/heritage tourism than the government departments responsible for these sectors.)

Private funding would seem to be another solution in theory, but is difficult in practice. Private sector investment in cultural and heritage tourism is limited by barriers such as governance structures, public funding criteria, difficulties in finding profit-sharing mechanisms and the question of who controls how monies are spent.

There is a clear need for either special funding for cultural/heritage tourism projects or more flexible funding criteria within existing programs. Several informants also mentioned the void of policy relating to cultural/heritage tourism.

10 *In several cases, new business models are emerging which integrate culture and tourism into a single new entity.*

One of the interesting findings of the study was that some of successful cultural/heritage tourism projects perceived as examples of collaborative approaches, turned out to operate on models other than collaboration and turned out to be examples of alternative business models. The International Economuseum® Network Society operates more than 40 sites

that are a hybrid between a living crafts studio, a museum, a boutique and a business. Le Pays de la Sagouine in New Brunswick is also a hybrid—a place that showcases literature and the performing arts, while acting squarely as a tourist attraction. The Tunnels of Moose Jaw is clearly a tourism business, built around an authentic heritage resource.

In Ontario, in Manitoba and in British Columbia—among other provinces—municipal cultural plans and community development plans are also looking at the role of cultural tourism, not as a separate activity but as part of the very fabric of urban planning and economic development.

These new business models have emerged for different reasons. However, in every case, there was a feeling that the traditionally separate realms of culture/heritage and tourism needed to do more than collaborate, they needed to co-exist. While not really the focus of this study, the emergence of new approaches and models is surely an interesting development.

4. BARRIERS TO COLLABORATION

There are many barriers to collaboration between the culture/heritage and tourism sectors. The most obvious barriers are lack of time, money, skilled people and resistance to change. These barriers are common to projects in any field.

In addition, there are barriers related to cultural/heritage tourism in general. These include the lack of understanding of the other sector and the use of different jargon (e.g. culture/heritage prefers the word "experience"; tourism uses the word "product"). These barriers, which were identified in the 2000 Canadian Tourism Commission's cultural tourism business strategy "Packaging the Potential", still exist to some degree, although they are less of a factor than a decade ago.

However, this study also identified a number of barriers specific to collaboration between culture/heritage and tourism.

• *Planning Cycles*

The travel trade for the long-haul market needs products and prices finalized 2-3 years in advance in order to market and sell packages. However, small and medium cultural/heritage organizations are rarely able to plan that far in advance because of lack of funding and the creative nature of their activity. Often it is unclear whether the cultural site will even be open in three years.

Even in the short-haul and niche markets, planning cycles can be a problem. The tourism industry needs final program, price and booking information at least six months to a year in advance in order to prepare packages and marketing materials. However, many cultural/heritage organization do not know until March or April what their final budgets will be or if they have received project grants.

The problem of planning cycles is especially acute for performing arts and festivals that tend to rely on "of the moment" performers. The problem is less severe for museums and historic sites but does still exist. For example, even if a museum knows what its special exhibit themes will be two

years from now, it may not know what the pricing will be or be in a position to know what special programs will be available. Overall, the lack of compatibility in terms of planning cycles is a major barrier to collaborative approaches.

Stable, long-term funding of cultural and heritage experiences can help overcome the planning cycle barrier. Also of help can be decisions to feature "anchor" programs, such as the Confederation Centre of the Art's "Anne of Green Gables" or Rising Tide Theatre's "New Founde Lande Pageant". This allows the tourism industry to sell a core experience in advance and then allow for last-minute additions of another night at the theatre. Branding can also be a solution: one doesn't need to know what play is being performed to book a package to the Stratford or Shaw festivals or to plan to take in a summer festival in Edmonton.

• ***Market-readiness of cultural/heritage experiences***

Sometimes culture/heritage experiences want to attract tourists before they are market-ready and sometimes leaders of collaborative projects are so keen to move forward that they include everyone possible, without considering whether the calibre of all participants is appropriate. However, including non-market-ready experiences can undermine the credibility and potential success of a collaborative project.

While insufficient funding or lack of funding available to cultural/heritage experiences is part of the problem, it is not the only reason for lack of market-readiness. Sometimes cultural/heritage experiences and even government decision-makers are not aware of what is needed by the tourism sector and so embark unprepared; at other times, the cultural-heritage experiences are not truly willing to adapt (or as some would say, compromise) their offering for the needs of tourists.

There needs to be realistic planning and assessment of whether each partner is truly ready, willing and able to take part in a cultural/heritage tourism collaboration. These sorts of collaborations are not for everyone. Alternatively, product development should be an integral part of what the collaboration is meant to accomplish and a longer time frame provided.

• ***Difficulty for profit-based and non-profit organizations to collaborate***

Collaboration between profit-making and non-profit organizations is often difficult, no matter what the field. Different values, different business structures, different governance models, different resources and different priorities tend to complicate relationships. The profit/non-profit gap is a fundamental barrier to cultural/heritage tourism as the majority of tourism organizations are profit-oriented whereas the majority of cultural/heritage organizations are non-profits.

Tourism businesses often cannot understand the situation of publicly owned or non-profit cultural/heritage organizations that cannot make simple decisions without reporting to boards, do not know from one year to the next what their budgets and offerings will be and have an inability to invest even small sums of money to draw future returns.

Conversely, many cultural/heritage stakeholders have little experience with business environments and have difficulty in understanding the financial necessities of businesses. Even within the cultural/heritage sector there is a split between profit/non-profit ventures and cultural business like commercial art galleries or publishing is often not recognized as a legitimate cultural activity.

Collaboration tends to work best when the cultural/heritage experience operates according to a business model. In some cases, the gap between profit and non-profit can be overcome by defining different roles for each side. For example, one side can provide money; another can provide staff time

• *Funding Criteria*

The people interviewed said that cultural/heritage tourism initiatives rarely qualify for funding from traditional cultural or tourism funding programs since they would not meet the criteria of either. Sometimes projects must apply to many different sources for funding of different aspects of their activities; at other times, they find they are simply not eligible for financial support.

Ministries responsible for culture and heritage tend to have stringent funding guidelines that would not favour tourism. Rarely is marketing, packaging or promotion seen as a legitimate cultural activity. By contrast, tourism authorities will rarely invest in product development.

These people suggest that there is a need for more flexible funding approaches that reward, rather than hinder, innovative cultural/heritage tourism projects and which promote collaboration. The solution may be either create new funding programs that specifically support cultural-heritage tourism or make existing funding programs more flexible.

• *Narrow Definitions of Authenticity*

While authenticity is an essential characteristic of cultural/heritage experiences, there is much debate everywhere about what makes something 'authentic'. Differing definitions of authenticity can hinder collaboration and block the development of innovative cultural/heritage tourism products and experiences.

Several interviews revealed that there are conflicts about the issue of authenticity not only between culture/heritage and tourism (e.g. concerns from the heritage sector that some edu-tainment presentations are not totally accurate) but also within the culture and heritage community. There are differing definitions of authenticity among proponents of built heritage (which places a high value on the authenticity and integrity of historic structures), heritage interpretation (which places a high value on communicating authentic content and meaning even if replicas and other means must be used) and culture (which values creative expression and interpretation as a way to express authentic truths and experiences, even if some of the literal details may not be right).

For example, a site like Le Pays de la Sagouine (where stories and characters of Acadian author Antonine Maillet are presented) or the Random Passage film set (the site of filming of Bernice Morgan's novel) may not be considered by some heritage experts as legitimate cultural/heritage experiences (and qualify for cultural/heritage funding) as they are not historic places. Yet, they showcase Canadian talent and creativity and may well convey an authentic sense of time, place, culture and human experience that is compelling.

There is no easy way to overcome the barrier of differing values and differing definitions of authenticity but it is worth noting that more than one informant cited it as a problem. This

challenges some traditional thinking about how the criteria of authenticity is defined and may indicate that some new policies are needed for cultural/heritage tourism.

• ***Regional Boundaries***

A much more practical barrier to cultural/heritage tourism collaboration is that the administrative boundaries for tourism regions and destination marketing organizations do not necessarily match the locations of cultural/heritage experiences. As a result, thematically related or complementary experiences that would benefit from being packaged and marketed together, are not always able to do so.

Flexible thinking and cooperation between different areas can go a long way towards overcoming this barrier.

• ***Competitive Copycats***

One unexpected barrier to cultural/heritage tourism projects is that successful projects attract imitators. This can dilute the originator's success and its uniqueness as a product.

For example, Chemainus in British Columbia was among the first cities in Canada to develop a mural project; now there are murals all over the country and this makes Chemainus less of a must-see. Similarly, the success of Rising Tide Theatre in Trinity, Newfoundland has led to regional theatre companies all over the province. While this may be good for artists, it is not necessarily good for cultural heritage tourism as competing destinations offering similar experiences may disperse the existing market to the point where economic viability becomes an issue.

While it is important to share success stories—and a critical mass of complementary experiences does help generate tourism—it is also important to not simply repeat what others are doing, but to focus on unique products and approaches. This will expand the cultural-heritage tourism product base, provide more choices for visitors, and make sure that there different experiences complement one another, rather than compete directly. Sometimes this requires an investment in new product development and a willingness of public agency funders and the private sector to take risks with supporting new ideas.

• ***Success is Hard to Track and Measure***

It is difficult to measure the success of cultural-heritage tourism collaborations. Few people have found ways to measure success other than sales of packages, yet this is not necessarily the only or best indicator. In fact, many artistic or cultural organizations actively resist sales as a measure of success, as they care more about cultural excellence or quality experiences. It should be noted that many smaller cultural/heritage experiences are presented free of charge and do not count attendance.

Is success just in terms of number of packages sold and increased visitation, or is it in less tangible areas such as increased awareness, or more employment for actors? What happens if one side, such as an accommodation partner, sees an increase in revenues, but another side, such as a museum, has made an investment in the product but sees only limited returns? If a long-standing

collaboration sees a decrease in visitation, how can one know if it would have been better or worse without the partnership?

It is important to recognize that not all projects will be financially self-sustaining but may have other spin-off benefits—creating jobs, increasing skills, enhancing identity, fostering appreciation of culture and heritage or building awareness of a region. When tracking success, it will be important to look at multiple indicators.

This difficulty in measuring the success of collaborative approaches is a major barrier that will likely continue to persist. There are no easy solutions.

5. BENEFITS OF COLLABORATION

Given all the barriers and the challenges of collaboration, is it worth pursuing? The answer by all informants—even those that do not have fully successful project—is yes. There are significant benefits to a collaborative approach to cultural/heritage tourism. Some of the key benefits follow.

- *Collaboration gives each partner access to new skill sets and new ideas.*

This was mentioned by many as one of the key advantages of a collaborative approach. Many felt that more creative solutions emerged when different sectors cross-fertilized. They also appreciated the diversity of talent and expertise that a collaborative partnership gave them access to.

- *Pooling of funds allows creation of marketing campaigns of a quality, reach and impact that could never be achieved by any single player.*

Joint marketing was probably the most common-cited benefit of a collaborative approach between culture/heritage and tourism. For example, by contributing to a shared marketing effort “Just the Ticket” was able to advertise in “Food and Drink” magazine, a high quality publication with the same market characteristics as theatre. No single player could have afforded that.

- *A critical mass of experiences packaged together brings in more visitors, for a longer time.*

Outside major urban areas, clustering and packaging is a critical factor in attracting tourists. For example, in the Okanagan Cultural Corridor and Routes on the Red, many smaller experiences packaged together have become a tourist draw that exceeds any single partner’s capacity. The advantage of cultural/heritage collaboration with tourism (as opposed to just a collaboration between different cultural experiences) is its ability to offer the variety of experiences and services that tourists want. It is known that most tourists are not interested only in culture—they want culture/nature, culture/adventure, culture/spas, culture/culinary etc.

• Collaboration between cultural-heritage and tourism tends to create better networking overall. In fact, it seems to promote partnerships among/between heritage/culture organizations that used to see themselves as competitors.

Taking part in a multi-faceted, multi-supplier cultural/heritage tourism project tended to promote a culture of cooperation, networking and relationship-building that extended beyond the parameters of the particular project. What was particularly interesting were comments by different organizations, often somewhat similar in orientation and geographically close to each other, that original project had given rise to several spin-off relationships. For example, there was increased sharing of collections and expertise.

• Collaboration frees heritage and culture organizations from some of tasks at which they are not expert (e.g. packaging, marketing) and lets them concentrate on core activities.

Many cultural/heritage organizations were pressured to attract tourist audiences but did not know how to do so. A collaborative approach meant that they did not have to hire new "tourism" experts, learn new marketing skills or take on new work tasks; they could focus on their own activities and count on their tourism partners to help.

• The results of a collaborative initiative tend to build awareness of a region and its culture/heritage over the long term

A cultural/heritage tourism campaign often results in increased awareness, even if people do not necessarily "buy" a package. This can have long-term benefits. For tourism partners, it may result in a visit at another date that will have economic benefits. For culture and heritage partners, it may not only result in later visits, but may also increase awareness and understanding of Canada's culture and heritage.

• Bringing in more visitors through tourism tends to strengthen the culture and heritage sectors overall.

While tourism is not the panacea that it is sometimes believed to be, an effective collaborative project can bring in more visitors—both mainstream tourists and niche cultural visitors—to cultural/heritage experiences. With more visitors come more revenue, more jobs, more creative opportunities, and more recognition. And while it is true that excessive tourism can destroy unique places and experiences, it is equally true that cultural/heritage tourism can support the preservation and presentation of heritage and culture. What is more, it can create an intangible benefit—increased public awareness and understanding of culture and heritage.

6. CONCLUSION

All over Canada, small and medium cultural/heritage organizations are joining together with tourism stakeholders in collaborative projects. These projects have evolved at many different levels (from grassroots to federal) and in many different ways (from informal alliances to formal institutional agreements). The finding of this research study is that there seems to be no single successful model for collaboration.

It is likely that the diversity of collaborative approaches across Canada reflects the relative novelty of cultural/heritage tourism in this country and lack, for the most part, of public policy frameworks. While success of these multi-faceted collaborations is hard to measure, there is a general consensus that collaborative approaches are beneficial to all partners and should be nurtured.

There remain many barriers to collaborative cultural/heritage tourism projects. According to the people interviewed, funding is a key issue as it is clear that these projects do require new resources over a long time frame, yet are hindered by funding formulas lacking flexibility and by the chronic under-funding of the cultural and heritage sector.

Successful projects result from dynamic leadership, a strong and clear vision, unique products, a willingness to collaborate and an understanding that cultural/heritage tourism is a new activity that needs public investment to take root and grow. Some alternative hybrid models are emerging to bring culture/heritage and tourism together.

Collaborative cultural/heritage tourism is taking root all across Canada. There is an opportunity for increase public support for these efforts, which could go a long way to ensure their long-term success.

APPENDIX A: PROJECT SUMMARIES

Cultural Corridors

- A.1 Okanagan Cultural Corridor, BC
- A.2 Cultural Cascades, BC & USA
- A.3 Routes on the Red, MB
- A.4 Viking Trail, NL

Themed/Sectoral Initiatives

- A.5 "Just the Ticket", ON
- A.6 Nutcracker Neighbourhood, ON
- A.7 Le Mois de l'archéologie, QC

Cultural Tourism Destinations

- A.8 Chemainus Murals, BC
- A.9 Edmonton, Festival City, AB
- A.10 Trois-Rivières, City of History and Culture, QC
- A.11 Pictou, Heritage Quay, NS
- A.12 Trinity, NL

Heritage-Culture Centered

- A.13 Barkerville, BC
- A.14 Glenbow Museum, AB
- A.15 Wanuskewin, SK
- A.16 Buxton National Historic Site, ON
- A.17 Confederation Centre of the Arts, PEI

Tourism-Centred

- A.18 Canadian Cultural Landscapes, QC
- A.19 Bienvenue Québec, QC

Alternative Business Models

- A.20 Tunnels of Moose Jaw, SK
- A.21 Le Pays de la Sagouine, NB
- A.22 The Economuseums® Network, QC, NB, NS, NF

Institutional Models

- A.23 Québec's Cultural Tourism Agreements

A.1. OKANAGAN CULTURAL CORRIDOR, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Description

The Okanagan Cultural Corridor (OCC) is one of Canada's largest cultural corridors, covering three geographic regions and more than 200 art galleries, art studios, museums, heritage sites, agriculture sites, performing arts, wineries, festivals and events, aboriginal experiences. Its mandate is to identify, develop, package and promote authentic and sustainable, market-ready, four-season cultural tourism experiences. Project provides a website and print guide and encompasses both self-guided itineraries and guided excursions. The heart of the corridor is the city of Kelowna's Cultural District.

Collaborative Approach

The OCC is run by a board of directors with 4 – 6 members from museums, arts, tourism and municipal councils. It meets as needed and is advised by a larger regional advisory committee that meets four times a year. The Corridor has full-time staff. It is funded primarily by Tourism British Columbia and the various Destination Marketing Organizations. Attractions pay to be in the guide. The partners communicate through a newsletter and website. The OCC staff act as a broker and facilitate contacts.

Background

- Project began in 1995 when the City of Kelowna created its first arts development office. The Arts and Cultural Development Officer, Steven Thorne, saw potential for cultural tourism and played key leadership role.
- Began with planning process to develop the arts in Kelowna; led to "Kelowna Initiative"—a major investment by the City of Kelowna in cultural development in form of grants, bricks and mortar investments, public arts funding, programming, festivals.
- Thorne also had idea of taking all the cultural attractions of Okanagan and packaging them together, similar to other areas he had seen on travels.
- In 2000, OCC was launched as a cultural development and tourism initiative with funding from BC Ministry of Community Development and Tourism BC as a pilot project in cultural tourism marketing. Began with inventory and situation analysis and then marketing and strategic plans. Have also held packaging workshops and other activities.
- Focus has been tourism marketing.
- Printed first guide in 2003, second edition this year.

Observations

- OCC experience reveals the long time frames are needed for cultural/heritage tourism collaborations to develop. The OCC itself is now five years old, and the initial planning work started a decade ago.
- This initiative is based on a lot of solid research and planning.
- The OCC has used a broad definition of culture (agri-tourism, First Nations culture, natural and built culture) to make collaboration easier.
- The main draw in the Okanagan is the wine industry and so the culture/heritage tourism efforts have aligned themselves with the wineries and to some extent ride on their coat-tails.
- Corridor benefits from anchor of a significant artistic nucleus in Kelowna itself.

- Some challenges in the early years were that culture did not like tourism lingo, tourism did not necessarily recognize value of culture, and city officials could not see difference between OCC initiative and more general DMO marketing. Also had a problem with tourism district boundaries, as DMO was responsible for more than just the Okanagan. There was some inter-community rivalry, but this has been overcome.
- Have experienced challenges trying to work with smaller producers, such as artists working in studios who do not necessarily want to commit to standard open hours.
- Was intended as marketing effort primarily, but do find that product development is a big need. Indeed, the need for product development and sensitivity to cultural sector needs is exactly why a body like OCC is necessary.
- Although hard to measure success, feeling is that there are more visitors and project is successful.
- Still needs funding for capacity building (e.g. signage).
- Definite benefits in better networking among cultural and heritage community who are now in constant touch with one another.

Contacts

Sandra Kochan
Coordinator, Okanagan Cultural Corridor

Wayne Wilson
Executive Director, Kelowna Museums Society

A.2. CULTURAL CASCADES, BRITISH COLUMBIA AND USA

Description

An American-Canadian cooperative partnership of five cities—Vancouver, Seattle, Tacoma, Portland and Eugene in a strategic alliance with the Amtrak railway company—formed to highlight the array of cultural experiences and easy travel between these points via Amtrak's Cascades routes.

Project provides a website which provides information about what is offered by city, by date and by theme. Themes are: On View, On Stage, On Fire, On the Table and On Board.

Collaborative Approach

- Partners include the Destination Marketing Organizations from Vancouver, Seattle, Portland, Tacoma and Eugene and Amtrak.
- Canadian cultural partners are the Vancouver Alliance for Arts and Culture and the Coastal Jazz and Blues Society.
- The tourism representatives from the Destination Marketing Organizations (DMO) and Amtrak meet about three times a year. The cultural groups from the host city are invited. This is a relatively small budget initiative. Each DMO was supposed to give \$7000, Vancouver has only given \$5000 but has invested more time.

Background

- Began four or five years ago when Seattle, Washington and Portland, Oregon realized they offered a similar product. They decided that it would be worthwhile to work together to showcase the area.
- They took the lead and contacted Vancouver Tourism, which in turn involved the cultural partners.
- Although the website appears impressive, this project has not really got off the ground. It is not necessarily unsuccessful, but has not been fully implemented. Not clear if it will continue.

Key Observations

- Tourism stakeholders have found it difficult to engage the arts and culture sector. Arts and culture community are more interested in marketing to their own community and has very little money or human resources to commit to marketing outside their own community. Have not even wanted to give a lot of time to maintain the listings in the website or provide information on what they are doing.
- For Tourism Vancouver, an organization with limited money, it is hard to get a budget for a niche project like this that does not benefit all its members. Niche projects are not a high priority.
- For all the Destination Marketing Organizations, it was hard to get them to see the value of group marketing and niche marketing—they wanted to be included, but still do their own thing.
- Several culture/heritage products were not market-ready and work experience with the tourism industry was limited.

Contacts

Peter Udzenija, formerly with Consumer Marketing and Product Development, Tourism Vancouver or Walter Judas, Tourism Vancouver

A.3. ROUTES ON THE RED, MANITOBA

Description

- Organization developing Red River Corridor as a tourism destination offers twenty culturally and heritage themed self-guided tours of the Red River area of Manitoba plus related themed travel packages

Collaborative Approach

- A non-profit organization that receives financial support from the federal (through the Western Economic Diversification Agency), provincial and municipal governments.
- Managed by a board of 30 members with representatives from municipalities, heritage attractions, Travel Manitoba, Province of Manitoba, City of Winnipeg, Canadian Heritage, First Nations.
- Also an advisory board of experts.
- Marketing is carried out and financed by the Routes on the Red (not by participating attractions)
- Also provides free business counseling, product development advice, packaging workshops etc.

Background

- Began in 1999. Impetus was declining visitation at Lower Fort Garry National Historic Site.
- Leadership came from provincial government and from Western Economic Diversification Canada and was supported by strong lobbying efforts from the tourism industry.
- The goal was and is to get tourists to discover Manitoba beyond Winnipeg.

Observations

- While most of the tours and packages have a strong culture/heritage focus, the organization as a whole has broader mandate related to economic development and resource protection.
- Did begin with research and business plan.
- Has taken advantage of programs such as the Canadian Tourism Commission's product club and the Canadian Heritage Rivers System.
- Level of success is unclear. There is no monitoring or tracking yet.
- Focus has been on packages and linkages not product development.
- Multi-jurisdictional area is a challenge for marketing.
- Routes on Red staff facilitate linkages. They actively bring together accommodation, food, activities etc. to form packages. It would not happen otherwise.
- Has been difficult to get tourism and culture/heritage to work together. Different views on how to market. Tourism side more interested in simply listing activities; culture/heritage wanted a thematic approach.
- Sense that different museum and heritage sites were operating as 'islands' and not working together with tourism or with each other. Still a problem to some extent as everyone is very busy.
- Project would not exist without public funding which enables there to be staff.-

Contacts

Lorna Hendrickson,
Executive Director, Rivers West – Red River Corridor Inc.

Wayne Copet
Product and Market Development, Travel Manitoba

Jim August, Chair, River West Organization

A.4. VIKING TRAIL, NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Description

The Viking Trail is themed highway in Newfoundland and Labrador. It is anchored by two UNESCO world heritage sites: Gros Morne National Park and L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Site and includes many other cultural and heritage experiences as well as over a hundred tourism suppliers.

Collaborative Approach

The Viking Trail Tourism Association (VTTA) is a destination marketing organization with a specific focus on marketing its region as a heritage destination. It has over 100 members.

Unlike most DMOs, the VTTA has been involved in more than linkages and marketing. It operates a heritage experience, a living historical village of Norstead and also initiated a signage project.

Background

- The development of a Viking themed tourism industry in Newfoundland and Labrador was driven largely by the collapse of the cod industry, which created a huge need for an alternative form of economic development.
- Community planning sessions identified the “Viking” tourism theme as the one with the greatest potential.
- Viking Trail Tourism Association (VTTA) was formed in 1988 as a destination marketing organization.
- It took on a much more significant role in 1994 with the signing of the Viking Trail Tourism Accord by more than 50 public and private sector partners.
- Has involved community-based tourism development.
- The Viking Trail accord led to a \$40 Million dollar investment in tourism infrastructure by governments and \$10 Million by the private sector to ready the region for the celebrations in 2000 of the Millennium of the Norse landing at L'Anse aux Meadows.
- Today, the VTTA continues to act as a marketing organization but it also delivers heritage experiences at Norstead, a replica of a Viking port of trade.

Observations

- The Viking Trail Tourism Association has been in existence for more than 15 years now.
- In the past, there were conflicts and communications difficulties between the culture/heritage and tourism sectors—and between federal/provincial officials and local communities— but today the partnership is working relatively well. It has taken years to build trust and to find the best ways of working together.
- Generally, in the partnership today the cultural/heritage organizations provide time, staff, expertise and the experience for visitors; the tourism organizations focus on marketing, packaging etc.
- The major cultural/heritage experiences in the area are owned by Parks Canada. Not only does this provide anchor experiences are high-quality, authentic and market-ready, it also facilitates communications between the sectors as there is one major player with four key sites (Gros Morne, L'Anse aux Meadows, L'Anse L'Amour, and Red Bay. It has taken some time for Parks Canada,

with a national mandate and modus operandi, to learn how best to work with local communities, but over time there has been a positive adaptation.

- In the past, the VTTA identified a need for more animation and programming related to the Viking Theme and initiated major programming initiatives such as the Viking encampment at L'Anse aux Meadows. In 2000, the VTTA established a new heritage attraction, Norstead, intended to complement the experience and story provided at L'Anse aux Meadows. The future of Norstead has been a difficult question for the VTTA . It was recently transferred to a newly incorporated board (Norstead Village Inc) and it is hoped this will lead to more stability.
- The emphasis on the Viking theme has been a catalyst for new tourism products such as themed Viking dinners and watercraft cruises.
- There has been an increase in cultural and heritage activity overall, due to the Viking Trail initiative. For example, the Grenfell Historic Properties in St. Anthony have been developed and there are theatre and music festivals in Gros Morne National Park.
- The extraordinary levels of public funding for the Viking Trail are due to two exceptional circumstances, which are unlikely to occur elsewhere—namely the economic devastation of the cod moratorium and an important anniversary—the Viking millennium.
- It is interesting to note that even with the advantages of a well-established tourism association clearly focused on heritage tourism, huge levels of public funding to create tourism infrastructure, the draw of two world heritage sites and a significant number of other federal, provincial and local heritage and cultural experiences and a supportive provincial department of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, maintaining tourism numbers in a remote area with a low population is still a struggle.

Contacts

Bob Hicks, Chair of Viking Trail Tourism Association

Barb Genge, Tuckamore Lodge

Loretta Decker, L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Site

Ken Kennedy, Parks Canada

A.5. "JUST THE TICKET", ONTARIO

Description

A themed theatre-tourism alliance featuring vacation packages combining live performances with fine dining, elegant accommodations and breathtaking landscapes. In 2005, 14 theatres participated. Slogan is "Get away to Ontario Theatre Country".

Collaborative Approach

Partnership is between the Ontario Tourism Marketing Partnership Corporation (OTMPC) and the Association of Summer Theatres 'Round Ontario (ASTRO) who represent the participating theatres.

Participants must meet program criteria and pay \$2500 to take part. Fee is usually shared between theatre and local accommodation partners. OTMPC provides a tourism consultant who coordinates the program. Partners met once a year.

Collaborative tactics include a getaway guide, an insertion of guide into leading consumer magazines, familiarization tours, website (main Ontario travel website), newspaper inserts, training,

Background

- Launched by Ontario Tourism Marketing partnership in 2002 as a three-year pilot
- Initiated as strategic response to market research and OTMPC drive to create new products
- Renewed this year due to success in pilot phase.

Observations

- This has been a very successful program for both tourism and cultural partners and resulted in \$815,000 worth of packages, 4000 room-nights.
- A great deal of advance research and planning went into the program before it was launched.
- Had clear focus, clear criteria for participation, quality controls. Buy-in in the form of a financial contribution was required from the partners. This ensured that products taking part were market-ready.
- In partnership with Theatre Ontario staff and ASTRO volunteers, an OTMPC consultant was hired to collect all the information and program details, liaise with the partners, coordinate the marketing etc. Could not have been done without this professional help.
- It helped that there was a critical mass of theatre product and some major partners involved—such as the Stratford and Shaw Festivals. Also that Ontario as a whole and Toronto in particular already had a strong brand image for theatre.
- A key advantage for this partnership was that the theatre community was already organized into an effective association. Mechanisms for communication among the theatres already existed, there were already standards in place to determine "professional" levels, and there was already a high level of trust in the association.
- For the theatres, the key advantage has been in marketing. On the web, the program is part of the main travel Ontario website. A very high quality getaway guide was produced and placed as an insert in a high-quality consumer magazine (Food & Drink). This turned out to be a very good match...targeted the right audience for theatre. Individual theatres could never have achieved this

type of marketing. For a \$2500 investment from each participant, 300,000 copies of a prestige publication.

- The only downside has been that in some cases, the accommodation partners do not want to pay their share of the membership fee. This has made it necessary for some theatres to pull out.
- Overall however seems to be a clear success.
- Now there are questions whether to expand to include other cultural products; the tourism partners are interested but the theatre partners want to keep the focus.
- Success factors included being careful who was allowed in, packaging as short getaways and making sure that everyone understood roles.

Contacts

Nancy Fallis, Ontario Ministry of Tourism

Jane Gardner, Blyth Festival

A.6. NUTCRACKER NEIGHBOURHOOD, ONTARIO

Description

This was a Toronto winter tourism package centred on the St. Lawrence Market neighbourhood in downtown Toronto: the “original” Toronto. It combined the historic elements of the neighbourhood with walking and food tours, shopping, dining, and seasonal performing arts, anchored by the National Ballet’s *The Nutcracker*.

Collaborative Approach

This program was planned and put together by the Ontario Tourism Marketing Partnership Corporation (OTMPC). Partners included the National Ballet of Canada, Tourism Toronto, St. James Cathedral Archives and Museum, the St. Lawrence Market, a local business improvement area, and hotels and restaurants.

Background

- Project was initiated by the OTMPC as a product development initiative highlighting new reasons to visit Ontario.
- OTMPC hired a consultant to bring the partners together and form packages.

Observations

- This program was an interesting and innovative program that combined culture, food, history, business and tourism to create an urban winter tourism weekend getaway.
- A number of different packages were offered.
- There was a lack of market-readiness by some of the products. Some, such as the Church had limited marketing dollars. The Ballet and the St. Lawrence Market contributed significant in-kind contributions in advertising and promotional activity.
- While the package was coming together, it would likely have required some additional outside funding (corporate or government) not just seed money to both develop the product and the marketing to the point where it could be self-sustaining.
- This program has been continued with City of Toronto staff support, in a slightly different form. Financing required for developmental work has not been readily available.
- The OTMPC has changed its focus from product development to a more marketing-focused return on investment.

Contact

Lori Waldbrook, OTMPC

A.7. LE MOIS DE L'ARCHÉOLOGIE, QUÉBEC

Description

A month-long program in August all across the province of Québec offering public visits to over 50 archaeological sites and over 60 activities such as archaeological digs and expert lectures. The goal is to position archaeology as a tourism experience.

Collaborative Approach

- The Réseau Archéo-Québec is a province-wide network, which brings together museums, interpretive centres, municipalities, government entities and educational institutions interested in presenting archaeology to the general public.
- The Réseau is funded jointly by two Québec departments: the ministère de la Culture et des Communications and the ministère du Tourisme du Québec; it also benefits from the financial support of several other programs and sponsors.
- Archéo-Québec has three staff, supported by a team of experts, who work with all the member sites and coordinate all the programs. They organize regional round tables to ensure the development of a selection of archaeology-based tourism experiences in the targeted regions, then produce a brochure, a website, attend trade shows and organize familiarization tours etc. The Mois de l'archéologie ("Archaeology Month") is incorporated in Québec's list of tourism products.

Background

- This non-profit organization was created in 1999, following heartfelt calls for support from managers of several different regional sites who wished to group together to make archaeology more publicly accessible.
- From 2000 to 2004, as a first joint initiative, the organization offered, weekly events called "Archéo! Dimanches ("Let's dig on Sundays"), which offered activities every Sunday during the summer.
- In 2005, the format was enhanced and revamped as The Mois de l'archéologie ("the"Archaeology Month", with all activities concentrated in August.
- Idea of using archaeology as a new tourism product came from the Ministry of Culture and Communications; the idea was easily accepted by tourism officials, who were looking for new authentic tourism products.
- The two ministries signed a first agreement re: Archéo-Québec in 2001 and a second three-year agreement began last year.

Observations

- Even after five years of operation, this partnership is still in the product development stage (in other terms, in the stage of developing archaeological experiences as ingredients of cultural tourism) and also in the capacity-building stage; it is not yet ready for out-of-province markets. It is however successful at the provincial level.
- There is a great deal of interest in archaeological tourism as it is relatively new and undeveloped in Canada; authenticity is its drawing card, especially given the active involvement of key research players: the archaeologists themselves.
- However, only a small number of the interpretive sites and museums that have archaeological collections are really market-ready.

- Archéo-Québec works closely with both the culture and tourism ministries. Relies on the tourism ministry for such things as market research, information on trade shows, access to visiting journalists etc.
- Archéo-Québec concentrates on making the linkages and connections.
- Archaeology-based tourism, as a new product line, would likely never develop without this sort of investment/partnership.

Contacts

Pierre Desrosiers, Ministère de la Culture et des Communications

Nadine Cloutier, Réseau Archéo-Québec

Marie-France Fusey, Tourisme Québec

A.8. CHEMAINUS MURALS, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Description

A groundbreaking community development project of 36 historic murals in an open art gallery made Chemainus, BC a cultural tourism destination.

Collaborative Approach

- The partnership is an informal one between the Chemainus Festival of Murals Society and the Chemainus Chamber of Commerce.
- The Murals Society is a non-profit with a mandate to encourage artistic interpretation of history and promotion of arts, culture and tourism. Society maintains the murals, commissions new ones, publishes book and map.
- Chamber of Commerce does most of the outside promotion and works with the local and provincial DMOs.
- The municipality owns the murals and takes care of licensing and copyright issues.
- All three share common goals and in fact many of the same individuals are involved in both the Murals Society and the Chamber of Commerce as volunteers.

Background

- Project began in 1982 when local mill closed and town's economy was devastated.
- Idea of local Mayor (Graham Bruce) and dynamic visionary businessman (Karl Schutz). Started with 5 murals, now over 36.
- Keep producing murals every year to bring visitors in.

Observations

- Chemainus is a small town—only 4500 people —yet it attracts over 400,000 visitors annually
- This was a community based, economic development project and a tourism project at the same time.
- Creation of murals has fostered creation of over 200 new businesses, majority being tourist oriented such as bed and breakfasts, gift shops.
- Visitation has begun to decline somewhat so Chemainus has now built a major new theatre, gallery complex and launched a Theatre Festival.
- Key to success has been vision and collaborative spirit—everyone working together for shared objective—lot's of volunteer involvement.

Contacts

Lynda Kinney

Treasurer, Murals Society and Chamber of Commerce, Chemainus

Johanna Reymerink, Secretary

Chemainus Festival of Murals Society

A.9. EDMONTON, FESTIVAL CITY, ALBERTA

Description

“Edmonton Festival City, Live All Year” is a collaboration of Edmonton’s cultural and tourism industries designed to tap the tourism potential of the city’s festivals.

Collaborative Approach

The Festival City Partnership brings together The Edmonton Arts Council, the Edmonton Festivals Consortium, The Edmonton Capital Region Tourism Partnership, fine art institutions and Edmonton Tourism. Group meets quarterly.

The key players are Edmonton Tourism, which administers and funds the Festival City project with advice from the partnership, and the Edmonton Arts Council, which funds the festivals.

There are interchanges on many levels between the partners. For example, the Director of Edmonton tourism sits on the board of the Edmonton Arts Council. This is a municipal project: both Edmonton Tourism and the Edmonton Arts Council are primarily funded by the city.

Background

- This project began in 2002 and was a joint, grassroots initiative of both the cultural and tourism communities.
- Discussion about how to draw tourists to Edmonton, which had no dominant image, product or brand. Wanted to show Edmonton as a city rich in arts and culture.
- Came up with idea of using city’s 30 festivals as a product—treating them as a group. Advantage of Festivals was that it did not compete with other attractions (West Edmonton Mall etc.) as tourists who come for a festival will usually do more.
- Arts Council and Edmonton Tourism together held series of consultation sessions to talk about festival ideas (with hotels, restaurants, festival organizers, other attractions).
- Came up with concept of Edmonton Festival City—highlighting of long light summer nights, outdoors, informal ambience, open to all—not highbrow culture, but local talent
- Edmonton tourism developed logo, website and marketing. Also have a Festivals Road Show—a variety show featuring components of the different festivals to provide an evening of entertainment.

Observations

- Project has been well received and is successful.
- Festival City logo is used by many partners such as restaurants. Airport took logo and used as part of airport redevelopment—organized kiosks by festival themes
- There is a culture of cooperation in Edmonton; a mindset that by working together everyone benefits. This existing culture and openness of all participants has made the partnership proceed very easily.
- Concept would not be successful if festivals were not well funded and thriving. There needs to be an established cultural product for cultural tourism to succeed. In this case, festivals are well funded by the city through the Arts Council. This allows them to keep their artistic integrity and to do things that may not be good for business but are good for the arts (e.g. free tickets to students and seniors).

- Edmonton Tourism plays the key role in the strategic planning, funding and administering the project. Brings everyone together for advice, and consults stakeholders, but can run the project on day-to-day basis.
- There have been some barriers—relating to the planning cycle and the types of artistic programming offered. Festivals want to be more spontaneous, creative and take more risks than tourism, the latter wanting a predictable, consistent product. However, with a high level of trust and good communications, these barriers are overcome.
- Project is growing; new support from Alberta Tourism, starting some direct mail marketing “Festival in a Box”, encouraging conventions to go with festival theme.
- A factor of success may be the excellent relationship between the Director of Marketing and Communications at Edmonton Tourism and the Executive Director of the Edmonton Arts Council. It is also a positive factor that the tourism marketing director has an arts background.

Contacts

John Mahon

Executive Director, Edmonton Arts Council

Jennifer Christenson

Director, Marketing and Communications, Edmonton Tourism

A.10. TROIS-RIVIÈRES, CITY OF HISTORY AND CULTURE, QUÉBEC

Description

The city of Trois-Rivières in the province of Québec has made a commitment to cultural tourism as a key economic development strategy and has branded itself as Ville d'histoire et de culture (City of History and Culture).

The city has made a major investment in cultural infrastructure as well as the support, promotion and marketing of culture and heritage. It has promoted linkages between cultural/heritage attractions by such means as a "Cultural Getaway Passport" (a museum pass) and has taken part in regional cultural tourism initiatives such as coordinated exhibitions where up to 20 different institutions explore a single theme.

Collaborative Approach

The partnership is between 2 municipal agencies, the Tourism Office and the Cultural Development Corporation. In addition to this, a municipal task force on arts and culture under the immediate authority of the municipal council discusses cultural tourism partnership projects. As well, regular communications between the two offices (tourism and cultural development) ensures that common projects and files move ahead smoothly.

Concerted efforts result in new synergies between the 2 sectors. For example, in order to reflect the importance it gives to culture and heritage, four of the 13 seats on the board of the Office of Tourism are filled by 4 cultural representatives. As well, the tourism office encourages membership from cultural and heritage organizations and will reduce membership fees to encourage them to join, thus recognizing that their contributions go beyond monetary benefits.

Background

- In the 1980s, Trois-Rivières was in economic doldrums due to loss of industry jobs. Municipal leaders were seeking ways to revive economy.
- Surveyed the city's assets and realized how many of those resources and strengths related to culture and heritage. They decided to brand the city as a historic and cultural destination for tourists.
- Organized two offices—one for tourism, one for cultural development—with strong links between them.
- In the 1990s, Trois-Rivières invested in cultural infrastructure and urban renewal—highlighting its heritage buildings, improving public spaces and strengthening cultural facilities.
- In recent years, the City has made significant investments in culture, including building the Québec Museum of Folk Culture, preserving an old prison as an attraction and a major renovation of the Maison de la Culture.
- It has also promoted a wide range of cultural activities from visual arts (e.g. Prints and Stamp Biennials) to performing arts (e.g. Cirque Eloise et the Dance Festival) to festivals (e.g. the International Poetry Festival)—many of which already existed in Trois-Rivières but have been enhanced and strongly supported.

Observations

- Leadership for cultural tourism in Trois-Rivières came from senior municipal leaders and the project continues to receive political support from city council. This political support is key and encourages cooperation and communication at all levels. It is telling that the strategic priority given to cultural tourism has been consistent for over a decade, rather than changing with every municipal election or budget. A consistent direction on a long-term basis results in a climate that makes collaborative cultural/heritage tourism thrive.
- Key individuals leading both the tourism and cultural development offices have a natural affinity for both sectors, good working relationships, and are committed to the same goals. As a result, collaborative approaches come naturally. It is undoubtedly an asset that these key senior employees have been with the city for a long time so they do not constantly have to start over.
- Trois-Rivières did not suddenly decide to make culture and heritage a focus without proper planning and analysis. The city realized that authentic cultural and heritage resources already existed, were well located geographically for tourism markets (half-way between Montreal and Québec) and that this was a niche where Trois-Rivières was competitive.
- Trois-Rivières has taken a very broad and dynamic view of history and culture, including such diverse offerings as prison tours by former convicts and an international poetry festival that has garnered tourism honours. This sort of thinking encourages creativity.
- Even in a city strongly committed towards cultural tourism development, such as is the case with Trois-Rivières, it is a long-term effort. Trois-Rivières still largely targets the Québec market. In 2002, the Office of Tourism began to reach out to some American and Ontario market segments in a gradual approach that takes into account need to develop English-language services. However, the city is taking a long-term view and is not trying to do everything at once.

Contact

Marilie Laferté

Executive Director, Office du tourisme de Trois-Rivières

A.11. PICTOU - HECTOR HERITAGE QUAY, NOVA SCOTIA

Description

Hector Heritage Quay is a waterfront development with a marina, replica of a historic settlers ship, and interpretive centre that was developed jointly by the Pictou Waterfront Development Corporation, in partnership with a tourist association, municipal government and heritage groups. The site is now operated by the municipality with support from the Ship Hector Foundation.

Collaborative Approach

- There was a partnership between tourism, the municipal government and a heritage organization when the project was being developed, but it is not longer really in effect. However, to some extent, the municipal government is working with a heritage group to run this site as a tourist attraction.

Background

- About 20 years ago, the Pictou County Tourist Association did a study on potential opportunities for local tourism and the Hector (the ship bringing the first permanent Scottish settlers directly from Scotland to Nova Scotia) was considered the best opportunity.
- Tourism took the lead initially, and the project evolved in partnership with local government, the tourist association and the Ship Hector Foundation.
- The local waterfront development corporation raised funds and developed the site; funding came from ACOA, the provincial government, Ship Hector Foundation, private businesses and individuals.
- Project is no longer run collaboratively; but is now administered by town of Pictou. The Ship Hector Foundation raises revenues from the store, admissions and membership that support the maintenance of the ship.

Observations

- This may not be a successful collaboration now, but the collaborative approach was useful during development stage for combining of different skills and wider networks.
- As a replica and exhibition centre, the Hector finds it hard to qualify for cultural funding, which is usually earmarked for museums.
- Site does bring in 20,000 visitors a year, which is more than most local museums do.
- Note that the Museum of Nova Scotia is developing a site in Pictou on a complementary theme and there is potential for more collaboration.

Contacts

Jodie Noiles, Marketing Director and Special Events Coordinator, Pictou Recreation, Tourism and Culture

Karla Marshall, Ship Hector Foundation

A.12. TRINITY, NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Description

The tiny town of Trinity, Newfoundland is a cultural/heritage tourism destination with professional theatre, museums, historic sites, walking tours, an interpretive centre and a film set that have been the catalyst for tourism development. Trinity boasts several fine inns, restaurants, shops, services and tour operators.

Collaborative Approach

Most of the collaboration in Trinity itself is informal, based on people knowing one another as neighbours and communicating regularly. There is a formal destination tourism marketing organization, the Discovery Trail Tourism Association, which promotes the Trinity-Bonavista area, but it takes a wider approach and is not necessarily focused on cultural tourism. There have also been cooperative efforts of businesses in the area to develop the Trinity Bight website.

There is collaboration between the Rising Tide Theatre and the Trinity Historical Society and provincial historic sites to stage the New Founde Lande pageant—which visits several historic buildings. There is also collaboration between the Department of Tourism, Culture and Recreation and the Trinity Historical Society to access historic sites. People can buy a pass to all the sites; revenues are shared.

Local tourism providers—inns, restaurants and shops, build on and complement the formal culture/heritage experiences with their own offerings. For example, most of the accommodation is provided in heritage buildings or in newer buildings designed to reflect the area's distinct architectural style. Several inns host cultural events such as musical performances and book readings. Some sell works of art and craft by Newfoundland artists.

Background

- Trinity has a large number of historically significant buildings. Starting in 1964, a group of concerned citizens formed the Trinity Historical Society to preserve the older homes and collect artefacts. The town of Trinity instituted heritage regulations that have preserved the architectural heritage of the community; this has been the foundation upon which the subsequent cultural tourism industry has grown.
- In 1993, Rising Tide theatre, a professional theatre company from St. John's, moved its base to Trinity and mounted an inspiring production about Newfoundland's history—called the New Founde Lande (the Trinity Pageant). The Pageant is an outdoor spectacle that is part theatre, part walking tour. This unique and original production was an immediate success.
- The next year, Rising Tide theatre mounted a summer long theatre festival, *Summer in the Bight*. Most of the productions are about Newfoundland life, history and culture. Rising Tide is now housed in a new theatre facility, built in 2000.
- The theatre attracted thousands of visitors, which in turn sparked a great deal of tourism development: new inns, new restaurants, new shops, new tours etc.
- Today, there is the theatre, six historic attractions, walking tours, music, local crafts and many cultural events ranging from musical performances to writers' readings.
- Some 20,000 visitors a year come to Trinity and motor coach loads of visitors come from St. John's to see the pageant. Trinity is now recognized as a leading cultural-heritage destination. Both

the Rising Tide Theatre and the town have been recipients of awards and funding for more tourism development.

- The Trinity area includes several other cultural and heritage offerings including the Random Passage Film set and national historic sites in Bonavista.

Observations

- Trinity is a tiny town with a population of only about 150 year-round residents; the Trinity Bight area includes 12 small communities. Everyone knows one another and sees each other regularly; there is little need for formal partnerships.
- The preservation of the authentic heritage character of the community has been key both to its development as a cultural tourism destination. The theatre would not have moved to Trinity were it not for the unique cultural landscape here.
- It is unlikely that Trinity's cultural tourism would have developed to the extent it has were it not one key leader/visionary—Donna Butt of Rising Tide theatre. It is the decision of the Theatre to move to Trinity and to mount the New Founde Lande pageant that has been the catalyst for the real business of tourism. She reports that it took a lot of vision, perseverance and determination to succeed.
- Initially there was some skepticism from the community about the cultural vision of Trinity, but now there is a high level of community cooperation and support.
- There has been excellent collaboration in Trinity between theatre and heritage, with the New Founde Lande pageant, touring and even going inside of historic buildings. As well the local hospitality industry have supported the cultural experience by ensuring that accommodations, food services and shopping are all in keeping with the cultural and heritage appeal of Trinity.
- At the Random Passage film set there were some tensions between heritage and culture over questions of authenticity, but these have since been resolved. Effective communications between the heritage, culture, tourism and government were key to resolving the problem.
- It is interesting to note that lack of formal partnerships might occasionally be an asset. For example, ACOA recently gave grants to three separate projects: Rising Tide Theatre, Cape Random Trust and the town of Trinity. Had they been one project, would they have had access to same levels of funding?
- The Rising Tide Theatre is supported by Provincial Arts Council and Canada Council, occasionally ACOA, but finds it hard to find funding for tourism end; see need for cultural tourism policy.
- The tourism businesses have seen the appeal of heritage and culture and are developing in ways that support it with traditional architecture, local crafts, hosting cultural events etc.
- There are still challenges; from tourism point of view, never know the theatre schedule in advance, hard to market. Tourism wants longer season and theatre is trying to accommodate, however, few people, risk of burn out.
- A challenge has been that many other communities are now emulating Trinity and offering summer theatre; this creates competition, need for more marketing etc.
- Interestingly enough, another positive economic impact of cultural tourism has been an influx of outside summer residents.
- Even though Trinity as a cultural tourism destination is well established and the theatre has been thriving for over a decade, some question whether it has a strong enough business model to survive in when Donna Butt, the driving force behind the theatre company, eventually decides to move on. Long-term sustainability is still a question.

Contacts

Donna Butt, Rising Tide Theatre

Jim Miller, Trinity Historical Society Inc.

Jason Card, Cape Random Trust

John Fisher, Discovery Trail Tourism Association

A.13. BARKERVILLE, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Description

Barkerville is a major historic site and tourist attraction in the Cariboo district of BC. Until last year it was operated by the provincial government. It is now operated by a non-profit corporation, the Barkerville Heritage Trust.

Collaborative Approach

There is no formal partnership between Barkerville and the tourism industry. Instead, collaboration occurs within the Trust board. The Board includes representatives from District of Wells, Tourism BC, City of Prince George/Fraser-Fort George Regional District, Friends of Barkerville, Cariboo Chilcotin Coast Tourism, District of 100 Mile House/Williams Lake, City of Quesnel/Cariboo Regional District, School Dist #28/University of Northern BC, BC Museums Society/Heritage Society of BC. Overall, the Trust Board has a good balance between tourism and culture.

The Trust partners with local and provincial tourism associations on marketing campaigns (a 50/50 cost split) and trade shows. The DMO and Barkerville also cooperate on training and packaging. The Trust also does many stand-alone marketing campaigns where there is no cost-sharing.

Background

- Barkerville was established as a provincial heritage site in 1958.
- In 1992, BC government announced plans to privatize heritage sites and called for tenders; however no interest from the private sector in Barkerville as it was too big and remote.
- A local task force created to look at future of site.
- In 2004, the Barkerville Heritage Trust was established.
- This is the first year under the new system; seems very positive so far. Attendance is up 5%.

Observations

- When Barkerville was run by the province, collaborations were difficult. Marketing was done at the provincial level and Barkerville did not have its own marketing budget. Also, the government fiscal year was different than everyone else's (April 1 instead of January 1) so the site was running out of money just when the season was starting.
- There is a sense that the new arrangement is far better on the marketing side. With Tourism BC and regional DMO on the board, there is greater marketing expertise and attention to this area.
- There are no real barriers to cooperation between Barkerville and DMOs as they share goals of economic development and sustainability while preserving the authenticity of the site.
- The Heritage Trust keeps a balance between authenticity and entertainment that seems to be working. Has an authenticity committee.
- Site is experimenting with programs and services to make them more attractive to tourists e.g. drop off programs for children so parents can tour on their own; places to relax and have a coffee.
- Tourism groups find that working with a major site like Barkerville is easier than with a small heritage operator as Barkerville has knowledgeable staff who understand tourism.
- Longstanding positive relationships between Barkerville and local and provincial DMOs are important and a key to successful transition to new system.
- The situation is new; time will tell.

Contacts

Mark Nichiporuk, Executive Director, Cariboo-Chilcotin-Coast Association & Board of the Heritage Trust

Robin Sharpe, Manager of Public Programs and Communications, Barkerville

A.14. GLENBOW MUSEUM, ALBERTA

Description

The Glenbow Museum—a downtown Calgary museum—offers a four-season leisure tourism package called “Calgary Urban Adventure” for the weekend getaway market. Packages include accommodation and meals plus passes to the Glenbow Museum and the Calgary Tower.

Collaborative Approach

Partnership is between Glenbow Museum, Travel Alberta, Calgary Tower and Calgary Downtown Association. Fifty percent of the funding comes from Travel Alberta; the other fifty percent is shared. The work is also shared: Travel Alberta provides advice, market information, tactics; Glenbow Museum provides coordination/marketing; the Downtown Association handles the money and vouchers.

Background

- Partnership started in 2003. It was initiated by the Glenbow, which saw an opportunity to market to an audience segment looking for urban, weekend getaways.

Observations

- This type of cultural tourism partnership is a developmental model for the Museum.
- Uses a template formula that makes it easier to continue over the years than trying to do a separate marketing/packaging plan for every changing exhibition.
- Leadership came from Museum. Other partners saw the Museum’s role as a project champion and a bona fide cultural/heritage anchor as essential. Quality product made Glenbow an attractive partner.
- From business point of view, keys were low participation fee and turnkey approach.
- Downtown Association did not pitch this to all its members but met individually with those that seemed to have the best fit (i.e. high end hotel); the role of the Downtown Association in facilitating access to these businesses, choosing the right ones and in providing financial administration services was very helpful. For them, it was a way to get people downtown on weekends.
- Travel Alberta role is important: Travel Alberta Strategic Tourism Market Plan revealed audience segment looking for this type of product. Travel Alberta funding is enticement for everyone to join in.
- Travel Alberta would not have funded unless project was well thought out with focused target market, proven tactics, a good product and at least two partners.
- Even a relatively small partnership like this takes time; Museum management supported time away from other tasks to persevere through planning phases.
- High levels of respect between partners; good relationships make a difference.
- Now that template is established, it is relatively simple to maintain.
- Glenbow is working on several other partnerships (e.g. including a non-traditional partnership with a parking supplier) and is joining with others to push for a cultural corridor between Calgary and Edmonton.

Contacts

Brent Buechler, Glenbow Museum

Brook Carpenter, Travel Alberta

Jackie Flegel, Calgary Downtown Association

A.15. WANUSKEWIN HERITAGE PARK, SASKATCHEWAN

Description

Wanuskewin Heritage Park operates a self-sustaining, non-profit Aboriginal historic and tourist site, managed by First Nations and non-First Nations people, working in collaboration with many partners, including Tourism Saskatoon.

Collaborative Approach

There is no formal partnership between Wanuskewin and Tourism Saskatoon, but they work together closely. In fact, the Chair of Tourism Saskatoon is the CEO of Wanuskewin. Tourism Saskatoon has always had a representative from Wanuskewin on their board, or, if not on a committee. Wanuskewin and Tourism Saskatoon cooperate in many ways. For example, Tourism Saskatoon offers training and workshops. Wanuskewin takes part in various tourism trade shows and events such as local familiarization tours coordinated by Tourism Saskatoon.

It should be noted that Wanuskewin has other tourism partners. For example, it offers a joint pass with the Saskatchewan zoo. Tourism certification for the heritage site is carried out by Tourism Saskatchewan.

Background

- The development of Wanuskewin was started by the Meewasin Valley Authority in the 1980s as an archaeological resource and then eventually a site for interpretation and tourism.
- Initial steering committee for the site's development included people from Tourism Saskatoon and Saskatoon Economic Development.
- Tourism objective was recognized early on—tourism and Aboriginal awareness have always been part of the mandate.

Observations

- The heritage-tourism partnership is informal and does not need to be formalized because both sides are intrinsically interested in working together: Wanuskewin is a flagship attraction so Tourism Saskatoon has an interest in contributing to their success; Wanuskewin has always had tourism as an objective.
- As this is an Aboriginal site and serves five First Nations linguistic groups and has a First Nations Advisory Committee as a separate board, there was a steep learning curve for tourism people. Communications was originally a problem, but now good.
- On the Cultural Side, there was not a lot of expertise among the First Nations communities about how to develop a cultural/heritage site and this was a barrier in the early days.
- There continue to be some issues between heritage and tourism; for example, Wanuskewin could generate more revenues through convention banquets, but the First Nations partners have not allowed a liquor license due to cultural opposition. The two sides work through these issues and generally give priority to the cultural values.
- Training and service standards have also been issues, but by cooperating together and through joint training programs, these issues have been overcome.
- The credibility of the Wanuskewin board is important to the tourism community. At present, the board is seen to be credible and well-balanced so their decisions are respected.

- Wanuskewin has found that Tourism Saskatoon has provided good programs and services; appreciates the innovative ideas by tourism people.
- Wanuskewin has slightly more difficulty with the provincial tourism people, rather than the municipal tourism ones—probably because the communications are not as good.
- As a private, non-profit organization, Wanuskewin runs like a business more than government-owned sites tend to. Wanuskewin is lean and so is always looking for collaborative approaches and partnerships to make money go further. The fact that they already work on a business model, makes partnership with tourism easier.

Contacts

Todd Brandt
President/CEO, Tourism Saskatoon

Sheila Gamble
CEO Wanuskewin Heritage Park

A.16. BUXTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE AND MUSEUM, ONTARIO

Description

Buxton National Historic Site and Museum, a site related to the Underground Railroad and black settlement in Ontario, was part of two themed collaborative projects, neither of which is continuing at present.

Collaborative Approach

- Buxton National Historic Site and Museum was part of two collaborative projects developed by the Ontario Tourism Marketing Partnership, namely the African Canadian Heritage Tour and Journeys of Discovery. Both were themed tourism circuits of related sites and offered tourism packages.
- These were funded for three years (2002, 2003, 2004) but are now defunct as they did not become financially self-sustaining.
- Buxton is no longer part of collaborative cultural/heritage tourism project though it does provide on-line bookings of tours and accommodation.

Observations

- These initiatives were seen as positive by Buxton National Historic Site.
- They were conceived as product development initiatives.
- The question is whether a three-year investment is sufficient?

Contact

Shannon Prince Curator, Buxton National Historic Site

A.17. CONFEDERATION CENTRE FOR THE ARTS, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Description

The Confederation Centre for the Arts combines a performing arts centre, a visual arts gallery and a heritage memorial. Also offers a restaurant and gift shop.

Collaborative Approach

- No single formal partnership but many strong informal relationships.
- The Chief Executive Officer of the Confederation Centre is co-chair of the standing provincial Tourism Advisory Committee. The CEO is also the chair of the mayor of Charlottetown's Task Force on Arts and Culture.
- There is a new Destination Marketing Organization in Charlottetown and the Confederation Centre has been assigned a permanent position on the board.
- Package with Confederation Bridge and hotels; 3-way split for radio and newspaper ads. This accomplishes everyone's goals: people use bridge, heads in beds and bodies in seats.
- Annually go out to key tourism areas and invite frontline personnel (i.e. taxi drivers, front desk workers, gas station attendants) to free previews of shows.
- Share co-operative advertising with provincial DMO; otherwise would be unaffordable for the Centre.
- Sit on committees for the Tourism Industry Association of PEI.
- The Centre's publicist works very closely with the provincial Department of Tourism on media contacts.

Background

- The Centre was established in 1964 to commemorate the Fathers of Confederation and the Charlottetown Conference.
- "Anne of Green Gables, the Musical" was an immediate hit and quickly became tourist attraction. Good synergy with Island sites relating to L.M. Montgomery and Green Gables.
- There is also synergy on the Confederation theme with Province House National Historic Site and Founders Hall.
- Confederation Centre ties into the two main cultural themes for the island.

Observations

- Confederation Centre is a major attraction rather than a SME.
- Collaborative approaches work well due to good will all round. Problems are minor e.g. sometimes programming is not confirmed in time to meet deadlines for tourism guides and other cooperative tourism initiatives; tourism tries to accommodate them because they are a flagship.
- Tourism understand Centre goals: knows they are not only about tourism, they are about cultural excellence.

Contact

Brenda Gallant, Director of Marketing
Confederation Centre for the Arts

A.18. CANADIAN CULTURAL LANDSCAPES, QUÉBEC

Description

Canadian Cultural Landscapes (CCL) is a receptive tour operator that specializes in cultural tourism and has worked collaboratively with a number of cultural and education institutions to offer niche high-quality cultural tourism experiences. It targets niche cultural market segments and then cooperates with Québec historic sites and museums to provide special programs for these clients.

Collaborative Approach

There is no formal, ongoing collaboration between Canadian Cultural Landscapes and cultural/heritage or academic organizations but, by specializing in cultural tourism and providing a high quality service, this tour company has built privileged relationships with several heritage sites and cultural institutions. Specialized niche cultural tourism operators like CCL serve as bridges between the sectors.

Background

- Company has been in business since 1986. Based in Québec City and has always focused on history and culture.
- CCL offers specialized travel programs for cultural/heritage groups like Smithsonian Journeys, the National Trust for Historic Preservation and American university alumni programs from Stanford, Yale and Harvard Business School.

Observations

- CCL is a niche tour operator, specializing in cultural and learning travel. By specializing in one area, it is able to build relationships and partnerships.
- Building relationships with local cultural/organizations allows CCL to offer special programs for its groups...for example, lunch with a museum director, a tour with a curator, or a behind-the-scenes visit. CCL is careful not to ask for special favours unless it has an appropriate group.
- Conversely, they have been consulted by museums about adapting exhibitions for the needs of specific markets—such as visiting student groups.
- By offering a high-quality tour experience, CCL has gained the respect and trust of foreign educational organizations (e.g. Alumni from Stanford University) that send groups interested in learning travel to Canada.
- Important aspect is that the company owners have strong academic backgrounds in history and culture—therefore the company has credibility in both the educational and cultural/heritage sectors. Owners have a natural affinity for both culture and tourism.
- CCL noticed that more and more mainstream tourism companies are offering cultural and learning travel offerings. This reflects that the cultural tourism is thriving; but does mean that cultural tourism experts like them are facing more competition all the time.

Contact

David Mendel
President, Canadian Cultural Landscapes

A.19. BIENVENUE QUÉBEC, QUÉBEC

Description

Organized by the Québec Bus Owners Association (APAQ), Bienvenue Québec is a major tourism event featuring both a major exhibit/trade show and a marketplace. For the 2002, 2003 and 2004 editions, it focused specifically on the theme of cultural tourism. It was the first time in Canada and in North America that a major tourism trade event would feature cultural tourism in such a prominent way.

This enormously successful initiative enabled more than 100 cultural organizations in 2004 (museums, exhibition centres, interpretation centres, and festivals) to take part in the Marquee of Culture area of the trade show in order to raise their profile among more than 800 group travel organizers from Québec and 100 North American operators and wholesalers.

Even though APAQ does not anymore focus on a specific cultural tourism theme for its Bienvenue Québec event, organizations involved in cultural tourism still participate.

Collaborative Approach

For the three years when cultural tourism was featured at Bienvenue Québec, the major partners making the event possible were APAQ, the Ministère de la Culture et des Communications (MCC) and Tourisme Québec (TQ). The role of APAQ was to deliver the organizational and administrative dimensions of the theme, while the MCC articulated the substance of the theme and implemented it.

The Canadian Tourism Commission, the Department of Canadian Heritage, the Villes et villages d'art et du patrimoine network (Université Laval) and SN tourisme culturel (a private cultural tourism operator) also collaborated to the initiative in 2002 by providing a training session for cultural suppliers and an orientation session for tourism buyers; a video and a report were also produced to share the results across Canada.

The first year, the activity was financed 100% by MCC but the two remaining years, it was financed jointly by MCC and TQ.

Background

- Bienvenue Québec is a well-established tourism marketplace and trade show that was in its 14th year when APAQ chose to focus on cultural tourism.
- The idea for a cultural tourism emphasis came from APAQ, in response to interest from previous tradeshow participants.
- APAQ approached MCC and TQ for support and funding. The project was received enthusiastically and a working team created.
- They chose the theme "Québec: A Unique Cultural Experience".

Observations

- Evaluations done by the promoter, APAQ, revealed that the initiative was an overwhelming success.

- The Cultural tourism theme earned APAQ the Tourism Industry Association of Canada's 2003 Innovator of the Year award.
- 96% of tour operators found the theme relevant and 88% discovered new cultural experiences.
- The training and orientation components were considered useful by both buyers and sellers.
- Building culture into associated activities like FAM tours was also well appreciated by all.
- This activity met the objectives of multiple agencies: for MCC, it met the goal of highlighting cultural attractions; for Tourism Québec it was a way to present new product and stimulate demand, for the CTC it was an opportunity to partner in a project directly related to several recommendations of the cultural tourism business strategy Packaging the Potential.
- Directives to cooperate on cultural tourism came from very high levels at MCC and TQ so the project was an easy sell.
- Collaboration also came from cultural associations, such as the Société des Musées québécois which played a crucial role in representing more than 300 museums.
- A complete report: "An Innovative Networking Event: Cultural Tourism at the Bienvenue Québec – 2002 Marketplace" is available in three separate documents: an Overview, the full Report and the Orientation Sessions.
- Now that the theme of Bienvenue Québec is no longer specifically focused on cultural tourism, the MCC, for reasons pertaining to its mandate, no longer provides direct funding and support to APAQ, even though many cultural and heritage organizations still participate. The MCC does provide ongoing operational funding, including funds for marketing. Cultural and heritage organizations can choose to participate in whichever marketing initiatives they prefer.

Contacts

Claire Drolet, Association des propriétaires d'autobus du Québec (Québec Bus Owners Association)

Richard Saint-Pierre, Ministère de la Culture et des Communications

A.20. TUNNELS OF MOOSE JAW, SASKATCHEWAN

Description

A cultural tourism attraction that is run as a business to attract visitors to an authentic heritage resource.

Collaborative Approach

This is not really an example of collaboration between culture/heritage and tourism. Instead it is an alternative business model for cultural/heritage tourism development.

The Tunnels of Moose Jaw does work with the local and provincial DMOs but no more than others. It partners with local attractions such as the Casino Moose Jaw and Temple Gardens Mineral Spa for shared advertising, packages and market intelligence.

Background

- A local non-profit organization, Tunnels of Little Chicago, was formed in 1997 to try to promote Moose Jaw's historic tunnels as a tourist attraction. While it achieved some success, it had limited resources for further development.
- In 1999, a cultural entrepreneur saw the potential to expand the operation as a business. Got a management contract to develop and operate the site; the Tunnels of Moose Jaw does pay a percentage of profits to the original non-profit.
- The new profit-oriented business—Tunnels of Moose Jaw run by Historical Xperiences Inc—invested capital and developed a much larger attraction with actors, special effects, multimedia, choice of tours etc.
- In 2000, the Tunnels of Moose Jaw was launched and was successful in year one.

Observations

- This is obviously a successful attraction. Generates profits and attracts about 120,000 visitors a year.
- Historical Xperiences Inc. has gone on to open a new attraction "Storyeum" in Vancouver and is planning to expand in the near future.
- Has won awards for business excellence and tourism excellence locally, provincially and nationally.
- Tunnels of Moose Jaw is member of local and provincial DMO and takes part in their campaigns but finds that they are too watered down as the DMO has to market all their members—rather than just focus on one niche.
- Tunnels does partner with other business—Casino and Spa—for joint marketing and packages. They contribute funds to joint marketing and share profits proportionally. This is easy as all are businesses.
- Noted that some of the government owned competition either do not charge admission or charge very little; also notes that they have different goals as compared to private business.

Contact

Jeff Grajczyk,
General Manager, Tunnels of Moose Jaw

A.21. LE PAYS DE LA SAGOINE, NEW BRUNSWICK

Description

- A cultural theme park type attraction bringing to life the characters of author Antonine Maillet's works and which presents Acadian culture and history through the performing arts.
- It was specifically developed as both a cultural experience and a tourist attraction, and is somewhat of a hybrid creation.

Collaborative Approach

- This is not a collaborative approach, but a new business model where a cultural creation is the basis of a tourist attraction, and the author/creator remains directly involved.

Background

- Le Pays de la Sagouine has been operating since 1992.
- It features a village setting, theatre, restaurant, boutique and other amenities.
- The main offer is cultural performances featuring the characters of Antonine Maillet's "La Sagouine" book and performances.
- However, there is also a great deal of music, theatre, crafts, food and culture of Acadia in general.
- Last year a blockbuster production on the history of Acadia "L'Odyssée 1604-2004", Le Grand Dérangement.

Observations

- The site attracts some 80,000 visitors a year, making it one of the most popular heritage attractions in New Brunswick.
- There is an interesting collaboration with author Antonine Maillet; the site has an agreement with Ms. Maillet whereby she writes scenarios for the animation and performances. She also receives compensation in return for the rights to use her literary characters.
- Even though the site is entirely artificial and not historically accurate, it has a lot of cultural resonance and appeal.
- The site creates employment for many actors, singers and musicians.
- The site has received support from both tourism organizations (such as Tourism New Brunswick), cultural organizations (e.g. Canadian Heritage) and economic development agencies (e.g. ACOA, i.e. the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency).

Contact

Marie-France Doucet
Assistant General Manager
Le Pays de la Sagouine

A.22. THE ECONOMUSEUM® NETWORK, QUÉBEC, NEW BRUNSWICK, NOVA SCOTIA, NEWFOUNDL AND LABRADOR, ONTARIO

Description

An ECONOMUSEUM® is a craft-based enterprise that produces and interprets traditional crafts and makes them available to visitors. Each ECONOMUSEUM® is an artisan-owned and operated workshop that provides demonstrations, exhibitions, and documentation to explain the craft in question and to preserve traditional processes and know-how. Operations are financed by sales of the crafts produced. The slogan for the Network is 'heritage that earns its keep'.

The International Economuseum® Network Society was created in 1992. The Network has three regional affiliates in Québec, Ontario and Atlantic Canada. The Network and its affiliates are all non-profit corporations. There are over 40 member enterprises in Québec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland & Labrador.

Collaborative Approach

This is not really a collaborative approach between culture/heritage and tourism but an innovative, alternative business model for cultural/heritage tourism. However, it should be noted that the Economuseum® Network is recognized in Québec both as a tourism product (promoted by the Ministère du Tourisme) and as a cultural product (recognized by the Ministère de la Culture et des Communications). Its website offers links to provincial and local DMOs (Destination Marketing Organizations) and prospective visitors can book accommodations online.

The International Economuseum® Network Society has separate affiliate organizations in Québec, Atlantic Canada and Ontario. Each is a private, not-for-profit corporation with an interest in preserving the intangible heritage of traditional crafts and crafts techniques by establishing crafts enterprises that offer cultural projects, activities, displays accessible to visitors, local residents and tourists alike.

The Network manages the overall concept and management structure, establishes quality standards, provides joint services (such as the website and publications), encourages the expansion of the network, carries out international outreach, and liaises with governments, partners and sponsors.

The regional affiliates (Québec, Ontario, Atlantic) develop the Network in their areas, ensure quality standards, encourage entrepreneurship and networking, do regional marketing and support craft sales.

The Network has received financial support from the Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions Agency, Canadian Heritage and ACOA (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency). In the course of its expansion into the Atlantic Provinces, the network took advantage of several federal and provincial partnerships programs, including the CTC Product Clubs program, to establish bridges with the tourism industry.

Background

- The concept of Economuseum® is an original idea of Cyril Simard of Québec city.

- Concerned that a traditional papermaking workshop not disappear upon the death of its owner, Cyril Simard came up with idea of a combination crafts workshop/museum.
- The first Economuseum® workshop opened in 1988. The Network was launched in 1992, and today it is recognized by UNESCO as a legitimate way to preserve intangible heritage.
- The forty Economuseum® enterprises showcase crafts ranging from soap-making to glass-blowing.
- Each individual Economuseum® is self-sustaining/profit-making—financed by sales of the products.

Observations

- The success of Economuseum® businesses is due to the creativity, vision and work of a single artisan.
- The initiative has sparked interest from several tourism international markets in search of authentic experiences to offer tourists in their discovery of Canadian regional destinations.
- Key to its success has been a very clear definition of what an Economuseum® is, and rigorous eligibility criteria and museum standards.
- Must be based on authentic technique, know-how and high-quality craft.
- The criteria for eligibility are demanding (e.g. already in business for three years, annual revenues of at least \$75,000 and ensure that the artisan truly has the commitment to communicate his knowledge to the public and that his/her products are already developed, stable and successful as crafts enterprises before they can undertake a career in the Economuseum® Network.
- All Economuseum® businesses must offer standard features: a reception area, a workshop/studio, traditional and contemporary collections, interpretation/displays, a documentation centre and a boutique.
- The Network carries out a feasibility study and prepares a business plan to help determine whether an artisan is eligible to acquire the Economuseum® status.
- The fact that Economuseum® workshops are a proven model also helps them get financing.
- Success seems to be due to the diversity of the crafts presented, the original and authentic nature of the products and the fact that they are linked to places and traditions.
- While an Economuseum® can range in size, it is generally focused on a single craft; they do not try to do everything or be everything.
- Economuseum® enterprises have a high level of heritage credibility due to the fact that Cyril Simard has a PhD, has done extensive research on the field, and has worked with academics and UNESCO. Mr. Simard held Laval University's UNESCO Chair in Cultural Heritage and received the Prix du Québec Gérard-Morisset in 2005.
- Received 550,000 visits in Québec and some 200,000 in Atlantic Canada. For the most part, no admission fee is charged. The projects are financed by sales.
- Economuseum® businesses have won tourism awards and heritage honours.

Contact

Cyril Simard
CEO, International Economuseum® Network Society

A.23. QUÉBEC'S CULTURAL TOURISM AGREEMENTS

Description

The province of Québec has encouraged the development of cultural tourism by providing mechanisms for the Ministère de la Culture et des Communications (MCC) to fund local and regional tourism ventures (e.g. Special agreements in cultural tourism) and for the Ministère du Tourisme (TQ) to fund cultural ventures and for both departments to jointly fund and support cultural tourism projects province-wide (e.g. Archéo-Québec and Bienvenue Québec). The two departments collaborate to make cultural tourism projects possible. Most of the projects take the form of three-year funding agreements.

Many of these are underway now but still in their early phases so final results are not clear.

Collaborative Approaches

There is a wide-range of partnerships in place all over the province. Some examples are:

- An Agreement between the Regional Tourist Association of Saguenay-Lac Saint-Jean and the Ministère de la Culture et des Communications (2003-2006) which has resulted in 15 cultural projects receiving \$75,000 each to invest in product development.
- The project on the development and marketing of tourism products in Québec's Museums is financed by three partners: MCC, TQ and Economic Development Canada at a total cost of \$885,000. The contribution of MCC is \$195,000 for three years. The project aims to develop and implement a promotion and marketing plan for Quebec's museums. The project began in 2004 and will continue to 2007.
- An agreement between the MCC, the Eastern Townships Tourism Association, the local heritage committee and cultural and tourism officers from 9 local governments to support and stimulate the development, diversification and structuring of the tourism offer in the Eastern Townships, including the creation of a cultural tourism corridor. (2004-2007). MCC contributed \$75,000.
- The Cultural Tourism Professional Development Program: a joint training program developed and delivered by MCC and TQ. So far, government employees from both departments have received this specialized training. It is expected that the program will then be offered to cultural and tourism organizations in different regions.

Observations

- Québec has always invested more in culture/heritage than most other provinces in Canada, and has seen culture as part of the overall drawing card for tourism; so in many ways, Québec was already at an advantage.
- However, over the last few years there has been a significant increase in the number of formal and institutional linkages between culture and tourism.
- The Government of Québec has clearly made a commitment to the development of cultural/heritage tourism. This strong leadership has made a difference and there is increased collaboration between culture and tourism not only in the provincial government but also in the regions.

- Facilitating funding of collaborative projects has been a key both in fostering collaborative projects and in breaking down traditional barriers between the sectors.
- The long-term nature of projects—normally three year agreements that can be renewed—and the formal mechanisms for approval and funding—appear to foster carefully-planned and realistically-phased projects.
- Some results are being seen already, for example one of the products in the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area, L'Odyssée des Bâisseurs, won an award for best new tourism attraction at Bienvenue Québec.
- While the final results of Québec's efforts remain to be seen, this institutionalization of cultural/heritage tourism appears to be very promising.

Contact:

Richard Saint-Pierre

Ministère de la Culture et des Communications

APPENDIX B: WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

Building Market-Readiness Capacity Working Group

CHAIR: Christopher Rosati, Ontario Ministry of Culture

Claude Boucher, Ministère de la Culture et des Communications du Québec

Émilie Comeau, New Brunswick Tourism and Parks

Danielle Delisle, Ministère de la Culture et des Communications du Québec

Larissa Deneau, Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation

Gary Dickson, Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Tourism

Barb Dillon, Northwest Territories Industry, Tourism and Investment

Marie-France Ferland, Ministère de la Culture et des Communications du Québec

Juanita Keel-Ryan, Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Tourism Culture and Recreation

Bill Hodgins, Alberta Economic Development

Ernest Labrègue, until recently with the Canadian Tourism Commission

Isabelle Lemieux, Ministère de la Culture et des Communications du Québec

David McInnes, Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Tourism

Hélène Michaud, Ministère de la Culture et des Communications du Québec

Jill Richardson, Tourism PEI

Eva Salter, Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Tourism and Recreation

Lilian Tankard, Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Tourism

Patrick Tobin, Canadian Heritage

Karen Williams, Nova Scotia Tourism, Culture and Heritage

APPENDIX C: PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Apropos Planning thanks the following people who provided us with information for this study.

Jim August Chair, River West	Nancy Fallis, Ontario Ministry of Tourism	Sandra Kochan Okanagan Cultural Corridor
Todd Brandt Tourism Saskatoon	John Fisher Discovery Trail Tourism Association	Marilie Laferté , Office du tourisme de Trois- Rivières
Brent Buechler Glenbow Museum	Jackie Flegel, Calgary Downtown Association	John Mahon Edmonton Arts Council
Donna Butt Rising Tide Theatre	Marie-France Fusey Tourisme Québec	Karla Marshall, Ship Hector Foundation
Brook Carpenter Travel Alberta	Brenda Gallant Confederation Centre of the Arts	David Mendel Canadian Cultural Landscapes
Jennifer Christenson Edmonton Tourism	Sheila Gamble Wanuskewin Heritage park	Jim Miller, Trinity Historical Society
Nadine Cloutier Réseau Archéo-Québec	Jane Gardner Blyth Festival	Mark Nichiporuk, Caribou-Chilkotin Coast Association
Jason Card Cape Random Trust	Barb Genge Tuckamore Lodge	Jodie Noiles Pictou Recreation and Culture
Wayne Copet Travel Manitoba	Jeff Grajczyk Tunnels of Moose Jaw	Shannon Prince Buxton National Historic Site and Museum
Loretta Decker L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Site	Lorna Hendrickson Rivers West-Red River Corridor Inc.	Johanna Reymerink, Chemainus Festival of Murals Society
Pierre Desrosiers Ministère de la Culture et des Communications	Bob Hicks Viking Trail Tourism Association	Robin Sharpe, Manager of Public Programs and Communications, Barkerville
Claire Drolet Association des propriétaires d'autobus du Québec	Ken Kennedy Gros Morne National Park	Cyril Simard Economuseum® Network
Marie-France Doucet Assistant General Manager, Pays de la Sagouine	Lynda Kinney Chamber of Commerce, Chemainus	

Richard Saint-Pierre
Ministère de la Culture et des
Communications

Peter Udzenija
Tourism Vancouver

Jim Valentine
Slingshot Marketing Group

Wayne Wilson
Director, Kelowna Museums
Society

APPENDIX D: RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Part 1: Selection Guidelines

(These criteria were suggested to Working Group but were taken as general guidelines, not as firm criteria)

1. Initiative involves at least one major tourism partner as well as a major culture/heritage partner. Projects that are unilaterally culture/heritage- or tourism- driven will not be considered.
 2. Initiative is multi-faceted--greater in scope than a single product being marketed to tourists.
 3. Initiative has a successful track record for a minimum of 3 years.
 4. Initiative is rated favourably in a recognized tourism publication, guidebook or rating system and is widely recognized as being successful.
 5. Initiative is profitable to its partners and shows a pattern of increased revenues over the past 3 years
 6. Total attendance has increased significantly over past 3 years or has performed better than other products in its region.
 8. Initiative involves one or more small/medium enterprises, including at least one private sector enterprise.
 9. Initiative stands out for collaborative approach compared to other products of its type.
- Projects that meet all the above criteria will be slotted into the following framework to ensure broad-based representation.

Part 2: Proposed Representation Framework

	City	Small Town/Village	Rural/Remote	Mixed
Performing Arts				
Visual Arts and Crafts				
Museum or Cultural Centre				
Historic Site or Village				
Festival				
Tourism				
Organizational				
Mixed				

QUESTIONNAIRE: COLLABORATIVE CULTURAL HERITAGE TOURISM STUDY

PROJECT:

PERSON INTERVIEWED (Name, Organization & Phone Number)

1. Do you think this project is a good example of a successful collaboration between culture and tourism. Why? Why not?
2. Tell us about your cultural heritage tourism project. Who are the partners? On the culture/heritage side? On the tourism side? What role does each play? How is it organized?
3. How did this project get started? Who took the lead? Tourism or Culture/Heritage? Government or local?
4. What were your goals in setting up this collaboration? Have you attained these goals? (Probe: were you inspired by any other project you'd seen or heard of)
5. What barriers did you have to overcome to make this partnership work? How did you do so? (Barriers might include: different jargon, different funding situations? Different priorities? Different planning cycles? Difficulty in getting together? Not knowing the other sector?)
6. How do you work together now? Is partnership formal with a board and regular meetings or informal? How often do you get together? How do you keep communications flowing? How do you work together on different aspects such as product development and marketing? Do you mainly focus on joint marketing or do you do other things together? (*e.g.* Do you do any joint training of staff?)
7. What does each side contribute? How is the project funded? (probe: who pays for what parts; are profits shared?) Do you provide any reduced rates to visitors who take in more than one component of the program?
8. What were the key advantages of working collaboratively over going it alone? What are the strengths? What are the challenges? How does your project differ from other cultural/heritage tourism projects in your region or province that have not taken this collaborative approach?
9. How do you define success and how are you measuring your success?
10. Have you changed what you do or how you work because of the collaboration? In what way?
11. (for cultural sector only) What have been the benefits for the cultural sector and your institutions? (for tourism sector) What have been the benefits for the tourism sector?
12. Where do you see this going in the future?
13. Can you give me the names and phone numbers/e-mails of others involved in this project?

