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Abstract

Globalization age led to creation of new markets and to unveil new scenarios. This contingency highlighted the existence of a broader range of tourist offerings; a factor which, frequently, has undermined the most traditionally established destinations. The model of new destinations must not ignore the peculiarities of territories on they insist creating a unique amalgam and differentiating it from other neighboring or similar destinations. Due to this proliferation of factors that destabilize the governance of tourism management models in the public and private sector, it is necessary to start an analysis of government indicators that consider peculiar aspects of destination management in the era of globalization. For these reasons we conducted an analysis of the business-economic literature about the themes of tourism and governance in tourist destinations and we selected a set of indicators to describe, assess and control extended, slow and sustainable destinations. In this work, we want to illustrate a heuristic approach to build glocal destination based on the pillars of extended, slow and sustainable tourism. From the results of the literature analysis it will be possible to create a framework to build a tourist strategy in glocal destination management, useful to implementation of territorial tourism strategies for both institutional, public and private actors. The use of the key factors of the model could favor the insertion of new tourist routes respecting the cornerstones of the tourism ecosystem of sustainability.
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1. Introduction

Creating innovation in the destination experience offers new opportunities to develop an holistic model between the destination marketing, management theory, and practice (Gardiner & Scott, 2018). So public and private entities are playing a new proactive role in this scientific area to influence positive outcomes. Moreover the convergence of organic, incremental innovation and government development can lead to sustainable mass tourism with new models and plans. Innovation framework is often a central part of the core strategy for a regulation tourism market access. It appears difficult using such existing frameworks to model efficient turist strategy in glocal destination management because such methods require more generalisation and flexibility. In this paper we propose an innovative framework with the idea to create ‘route-map indicators’ for researchers and professionals. The issue of the glocal destination management is relevant to both demand and supply-side perspectives of tourist destination marketing. This paper aims to identify the trajectories of tourism development for the actors within the changing international markets; in order to identify these trajectories, from a preliminary analysis of the literature, interesting managerial research question emerged that could deliver to the theoretical development of tourism management results useful for scientific progress: can the concept of sustainability be represented by managerial indicators that allow to generate information to define new governance model? To be able to answer it, we need necessary to conduct a more structured examination of the literature. We applied an inductive methodology to identify the keywords helpful to define a framework; this instrument could be capable to highlight indicators to potential stakeholders in order to measure their ability to adapt their tourism governance models to the most current and therefore long-lasting ones.

2. Background

Since the 1990s, great changes have taken place in the economic and social field. They also influenced the tourism sector (Fernando & Long, 2012; Martini, 2017), forcing it to open up to globalization and, therefore, to compete at global level (Musaro, 2013). In fact, globalization has led to the creation of new and competitive
markets, characterized by the presence of large multinationals, with strong bargaining power. This scenario, with greater safety and economy of transport services, unveiled a much wider tourist offer; in many situations, these new conditions undermined the destinations that established their reputation over time. At the same time, the different behaviors of consumers changed their way of living, their dreams and their expectations, distorting key elements of tourist demand, such as the period and length of stay. While the digital revolution changed the approach used by tourism organizations to sell and communicate their products and services, the web has certainly become the most effective tool to acquire information, to quickly identify the alternatives and to choose the destination where to spend holidays (Di Vittorio, 2011). The tourism sector moved towards an offer system whose competitive capacity depended on the territorial resources and on the strategic and management program of systems (Martini, 2017). This approach is particularly important: in fact destinations have to combine tourist services (for example: transport, and entertainment) with their own potential attractive factors (natural beauty, geographical location, heritage cultural and folklore) (Goffi, 2010). On the other hand, operators must be able to match the territorial resources with the expectations of tourists, transforming them in "a multiplier of the configurable strategic opportunities for the tourism products offered" (Della Corte, 2013).

Therefore, the tourism products became the result of a complex system with different actors, contributing to formulating a wide and differentiated offer and taking into account the characteristics of the tourist destination and the market demands (Valeri & Fadlon, 2018). The final product, if it is well formulated and conceived, coincides with the territory and local resources: the latter are attractive factors that can capture the touristic demand.

In the tourism sector, the product is complex because it represents the result of interactions between supply and demand, the segmentation, the number and types of stakeholders and, finally, the decision-making activities (Bordas, 2012). To unify the components previously listed with the territory a systemic approach could be a useful tool to incorporate new interpretative models that support tourism production processes (Eugene, Judith, & Michael, 2009; Wang & Tong, 2009).

Concerning the development of local tourism contexts, that are defined as a "tourist systems", they can be used as an analysis tool both for tourism production and for management. The transition from industrial eco-systems to the globalized market led territories to acquire more value, becoming a fundamental component of what today must be conceived as a “tourism system”. The territory has now passed the ancient definition of geographical area in which production is determined: it has become a container of resources, skills, and knowledge capable of enhancing natural and cultural attractions, making it competitive in the globalized market (Barucci, Becheri, & SVIMEZ, 2006). The "destination management" theory can be a useful tool for achieving the aforementioned objective. In "destination management" the territory plays a predominant role, being defined as “the set of components of equipment (natural, artistic, structural, urban planning, infrastructural) and systemic structures (companies, organizations social, individuals, institutional bodies) confined to a defined physical space” (Golinelli, 2002). The creation of value for the most representative stakeholders it is a useful strategy for the pursuit of this goal (Cetin, Cetin, Sevik, & Sevik, 2016); it is a process that consists in achieving a set of heterogeneous and, very often, contradictory objectives. The vocation of the territory, more commonly defined as “genius loci”, is understood as “the potential for development that emerges in a given interval of time, from the natural, social, cultural and economic inclination of the territory” (Mintzberg, 1989). Over time, this can be influenced by various social factors such as the interactions between the territorial components or the presence of customs, laws, and behaviors that can determine the increase or the depletion of the social capital (Paniccia & Leoni, 2015).

The integration between the territory, actors and their activities become strategic and characterizing. According to this approach operators can be variously composed, broad, and cohesive. They can be producers of goods, services, and information, both in the public and private sectors.

The transformations described so far have focused on the identification of a system capable of creating coherent, integrated, qualified, and organized systems. Destination management becomes “the set of strategic, organizational and operational decisions through which to manage the process of defining and promoting tourism products expressed by whole territory, and not only by the tourism sector”. It is strategic “to generate incoming tourist flows and maintain the attractiveness and, therefore, competitiveness, of the tourist destinations in long term”(Martini, Baccarani, & Franch, 2005).

The concept of destination, recently, was increasingly used to identify, at the same time, tourist attraction points in space (place) and over time (event planning). In literature, a thriving beating was developed on this topic, for which it is customary to find equivalent names of the term "destination" - as area, place, region, district, district, system - accompanied by the adjective tourist. The destination can be studied from multiple perspectives: it can
be analyzed by the demand or the offer, or considered as a unit of analysis of a research. This last approach seems to be interesting because the classical reciprocity between demand and tourist offer is realized (Viola & Benvenuto, 2017).

In literature, there is a vast scientific production on the themes of tourism and sustainable development. Sustainability is not uniquely defined and universally accepted since there is a triple-bottom-line that is difficult to decline today (Chang, DiGiovanni, & Mei, 2019). Brundtland report of 1987 is the most famous document that defined the concept using foundations upon which sustainability must be based (M. E. Jarvie, 2019):

- holistic planning and strategic decisions that link economic, economic and social dynamics;
- the importance of preserving essential ecological processes;
- the need to protect biodiversity and human heritage.
- The possibility for future generations to benefit from the same development that we now have the goal of achieving a balance between opportunity and equity between different nations (M. Jarvie, 2011). Hence the pillars of sustainable development are:
- Economic sustainability: generating prosperity among the different levels of society;
- Social sustainability: guaranteeing respect for human rights and fairness of opportunities for the whole society;
- Environmental sustainability: managing is conserving resources, with particular attention to the kind of non-renewable resources that are important for their life support.

3. Sustainable, Slow and Widespread Tourism: A Literature Analysis for the Definition of Good Tourism Governance

The concept of sustainability has found a wide application in tourism, generating implications not only in defining new forms of tourism, but also producing definitions of new approaches to destination management and governance.

The present literature analysis aims to construct a summary report of the most cited scientific production in the last 10 years which allows us to understand the directions of tourism, to define management concepts and governance of the destinations, as well as the related measurement mechanisms.

3.1 Sustainable Tourism, Slow and Widespread

Tourism is a phenomenon analyzed by economic, social and environmental disciplines. It is recognized by the scientific and internationally community and it is defined as “a set of activities carried out by people during their travels and stays in places other than their residence, for a period that goes from at least two days (minimum one overnight stay) to one year, for holiday, work or other reasons”(UNWTO, 2008). Over time, tourism has become increasingly important due to the role it plays in territorial development, it is able to influence environment, and social and economic contexts of a destination (Castellani & Sala, 2010); for these reasons the scientific community studied it and talk about sustainable tourism (Gaodi et al., 2010; Hares, Dickinson, & Wilkes, 2010; Mihalic, 2016).

Sofield and Lia (2011), analyze the consequences of rapid Chinese economic growth starting from the high levels of organization and industrialization that have characterized the country. Their point of view focuses on the consequent depletion of natural resources and the reduction of the health status of the population. In Chinese cities the consumption of energy is over 20% compared to the average of OECD countries and China is the third country for watercourses pollution. The consequences noted by the authors can be classified substantially in the following domains: waste management, desertification and nature, and biodiversity protection. Sofield and Lia, speaking about the application of local management policies and processes for actions aimed to protect the environment, also recognized that the greatest obstacles reside in the relative implementation on the spot (Gössling, 2015; Miller, Merrilees, & Coghlan, 2015; Radwan, Jones, & Minoli, 2010).

Haukeland, Grue, and Veisten (2010) examined sustainable tourism from the demand side and identified different types of tourists through analysis of the literature according to their sensitivity to the environmental impacts generated by tourism. In their work they classified tourist in two macro-categories: soft and hard ecotourists. The former is characterized by soft activities and the search for comfort. The latter included all those tourists looking for completely naturalistic outdoor activities, characterized by intense physical activity and high involvement, are included (Neuhofer, Buhalis, & Ladkin, 2012).

The concept of sustainable tourism has recently been linked to “slow tourism”, characterized by a new concept
of vacation that let tourists live completely the journey and the destination. These two elements are declined according to a new concept of slowness (Lumsdon & McGrath, 2011) which allows tourists to abandon the rhythms typical of their routines and to fully immerse themselves in tourist destination ones (Dickinson, Robbins, & Lumsdon, 2010; Phillips & Moutinho, 2014). "Localness" is connected to slow tourism, understood as typical food production consumed by tourists. The food product becomes an integral part of the tourist experience and allows travelers to fully integrate with the destination (Sims, 2010).

3.2 Destination Management

Destination management has become recently an important issue in terms of sustainability. The strategy to realize forms of sustainable tourism must necessarily take into account continuous processes of consultation and planning with local actors. According to Castellani and Sala (2010) it is necessary to create management models that can guarantee benefits and good quality of life for residents while protecting the environment. The process must necessarily be inspired by the logic of planning-programming-control, typical of the Deming cycle, with particular attention to a continuous improvement of quality. The concept applied to destinations need to focus on five main phases. The first is to understand economic, social, cultural and environmental variables, in order to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the territories; the second one need a consultation with local stakeholders, to verify the existence of the strengths and weaknesses of the territories; the third is focused on planning of participatory processes; the fourth is dedicated to defining a strategy aimed at the development of sustainable tourism, characterized by an action plan intimately connected with the previous phases; and the last one request a general evaluation of the strategy and planned improvement actions.

Logar (2010) identified different policy tools that can support the application of sustainable management of a destination, all the tools introduced by the author are aimed to mitigate the demand for tourist services, or aimed to attract tourist segments that are particularly concerned with their impact on the community and the environment.

Tourism sustainability was also analyzed by the accessibility of the destination concerning the most common disability. Darcy, Cameron, and Pegg (2010) affirm that the best strategy that a tour operator could use to better align with needs of this customer segment is to introduce some of the following elements: the absence of architectural barriers; adaptation to international accessibility standards; involve subjects with disabilities in the planning rather than specialists. Finally, according to Lee, Huang, and Yeh (2010), different elements contribute to the sustainability of a destination, including tourist attractions, accessibility, amenities, and complimentary services.

3.3 Tourist Governance

Imran, Alam, and Beaumont (2014) focused their study on the effectiveness of local tourism governance concerning the objectives that the institutions had to achieve about their stakeholders. The authors highlight how institutional structures can be formal and informal networks characterized by an organizational autonomy, by its authority, with an internal coherence and governed by a set of rules. Tourist governance generally assume a form of public-private partnership that characterizes the decisions taken into specific issues through financial support, transfer of knowledge, and co-construction of skills for tourism industry. Scientific evidence shows that these structures are not static, settling and isolated about the context in which they operate, but they seem characterized by a slow change that allows them to transfer a set of values and practices, through a set of relationships that enhance the governance structure (Lane & Kastenholz, 2015; Sakata & Prideaux, 2013). The theme of networks in sustainable destination governance was analyzed by Erkuş-Öztürk and Eraydin (2010), they observe that most of the problems in tourism planning originate from different actors involved and from different conceptions they have about sustainability. There is a widespread literature stating that tourist governance is also affected by different levels of power expressed by the partners (Beritelli, 2011; Dredge & Whitford, 2011; Hall, 2010; Saufi, O’Brien, & Wilkins, 2014; Sofield & Lia, 2011; Styelidis, Biran, Sit, & Szivas, 2014).

4. Sustainability Indicators for the Tourist Destinations

Literature analysis expressed interesting insights and proposals about the nature and the structure of indicators used to describe the tourist destination from a sustainability perspective. As different authors stated, sustainable tourism (Table 1) is a concept that includes three different and balanced dimensions: social, economic and environmental.

The 30 indicators identified through literature analysis can be grouped into three macro-categories: demographic characteristics (such as population structure, age and expectation of life); population-based services (concerning,
for example, the conservation of culture or related to recreational services); impact of tourism on the population. The social dimension is flanked by the economic one, it includes 40 indicators clustered in: tourist (relating to the demand and the tourist offer); economic (able to highlight the impact of tourism on the community) and infrastructures (such as indicators related to infrastructure / roads, or to the development of telematics). The last dimension dedicated to sustainability is the environmental dimension: the 30 indicators are focused on the impact of tourism on environment. These include, for example, all the indices linked to the management of protected areas, waste management and consumption of water resources.

Table 1. Sustainable tourism indicators

| Sustainable tourism                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------|
| Social dimension                                     |
| Sport facilities per inhabitant                       |
| Health care equipment                                 |
| Number of passenger transport vehicles per inhabitant |
| Number of financial establishments per inhabitant     |
| Number of services sector establishments per inhabitant|
| Number of pharmacies per inhabitant                   |
| Provision of toilets and showers on the beaches       |
| Evaluation of destination safety by tourists          |
| Provision of safety and emergency services on the beaches|
| Conservation of the cultural heritage                 |
| Number of cultural sites designated as “assets of cultural interest” |
| Number of cultural volunteers                         |
| Pressure on cultural heritage                         |
| Variation of the population levels                    |
| Percentage of young population                        |
| Percentage of non-active older population             |
| Number of individuals per unit destination area       |
| Net migration rate                                    |
| Rate of natural increase                              |
| Percentage of foreign population                      |
| Ratio of tourist to locals                            |
| Life expectancy                                       |
| Variation of available income                         |
| Percentage of enrolled population in noncompulsory education|
| General demographic dependency index                  |
| Property value of real estate per inhabitant          |
| Availability of recreational facilities               |
| Cultural activities/entertainment                     |
| Opportunity to meet people from other cultures        |
| Economic dimension                                    |
| Total number of tourist arrivals                      |
| Average stay                                          |
| Tourist spending Property value of real estate        |
| Proportion of employees in the services sector        |
| Unemployment rate                                     |
| Volume of registered service sector investment        |
| Number of telephone lines in service                  |
| Number of ADSL lines in service per 1000 inhabitant   |
| Declared net income per inhabitant                    |
| Vacancies offered in restaurants                      |
| Number of tourist information offices per tourist     |
| Existence of a website that provides information about the destination |
| Percentage of official tourism accommodation establishments which are open all year |
| Ratio of low-season tourists to peakseason tourists   |
| Ratio of low-season tourism employment to peak-season tourism employment |
| Total number employed in the tourism sector           |
| Percentage of employees in tourism sector relative to total employment |
| Number of passenger transport vehicles per inhabitant  |
| Access time from the closest airport                  |

(Boley, McGhee, Perdue, & Long, 2014; Castellani & Sala, 2010; Cucculelli & Goffi, 2016; Jamal & Camargo, 2014; Rendeiro Martin-Cejas & Pablo Ramírez Sánchez, 2010; Stylidis et al., 2014; Tanguay, Rajaonson, & Therrien, 2013; Torres-Delgado & Palomeque, 2014)
Slow and widespread tourism (Table 2), according to the definitions identified, can be described by a set of indicators that allow to focus on his typical characteristics. The 18 selected indicators consider elements that allow the tourist to be able to fully enjoy a unique experience. For example, they focus on information availability or on the chance to be able to enjoy the destination in an immersive and unique way.
Table 2. Slow and widespread tourism indicators

| Slow and widespread tourism indicators                                      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| More nature paths for “self-guiding”                                       |
| More accessible information                                                |
| More and improved rambling tracks                                          |
| More picnic areas                                                          |
| More cycling tracks                                                        |
| More service persons                                                       |
| Increased opportunities for various activities                             |
| Zoning of different activities                                             |
| More service persons                                                       |
| Staged experiences for a greater audience                                  |
| Accommodation with good standard                                           |
| Well developed food and beverage facilities                                |
| Abundance of accommodation                                                 |
| Local food specialities                                                    |
| Guided tour/sightseeing to see animals/natural attractions                  |
| Guided tour/sightseeing to cultural attractions                            |
| Visitor centres with exhibitions                                           |
| Supply of roads, parking areas, etc.                                        |

The management of tourist destinations (Table 3) refers to the capacity of a destination to provide services and facilities that support tourists to fully enjoy all the comfort it can provide. For this reason, 48 indicators have been identified to provide a precise description of the ability of the destination to maintain, manage and improve the elements of attraction.

Table 3. Destination Management indicators

| Destination Management indicators                                         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Accessibility                                                              |
| Environmental value of the territory                                      |
| Level of tourism and service infrastructures                               |
| Promotional policies                                                      |
| Level of tourism and service infrastructures                               |
| Promotional policies                                                      |
| Environmental Policies                                                    |
| Natural resources                                                         |
| Investment and innovation                                                 |
| Activation of networks                                                    |
| Involvement of private                                                    |
| Quality of the entertainment                                              |
| Quality of the information provided                                       |
| Institutional connection                                                  |
| Communication intensity                                                   |
| Contact ease                                                              |
| Information exchange                                                      |
| Starting initiatives                                                      |
| Success of initiatives                                                    |
| Natural resources                                                         |
| Climatic phenomena                                                       |
| Forest landscapes and scenery                                             |
| Rare flora and fauna                                                       |
| Cultural assets                                                           |
| Special events                                                            |
| Historical structures                                                     |
| External access                                                           |
| Road network                                                              |

(Hares et al., 2010; Haukeland et al., 2010; Sims, 2010)
Good tourist governance must be based on the maximum capacity to generate consensus on a shared vision with the community (Table 4). For these reasons, and with the aim to maximize sustainability for the tourist communities, it becomes necessary to identify a list of indicators that can assess the impact of governance policies and initiatives that have on the social, economic, and environmental context.

Table 4. Tourist Governance indicators

| Indicator                                                                 | Source                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Low quality of accommodation                                             |                                                                        |
| Low tourism profitabilit                                                |                                                                        |
| % of beds in 4- and 5-star accommodation facilities                      |                                                                        |
| % of private accommodation                                               |                                                                        |
| % of total destination revenues generated by tourism                     |                                                                        |
| Estimated percentage of total tourist overnight stays                    |                                                                        |
| % of total tourism revenues earned from June to September                |                                                                        |
| Average occupancy rate in accommodation facilities                       |                                                                        |
| % of jobs in tourism industries which are permanent                      |                                                                        |
| % of work force employed in hotels and restaurants                      | (Boley et al., 2014; Cuccia, Guccio, & Rizzo, 2016; Erkuş-Öztürk & Eraydin, 2010; Logar, 2010; Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2014) |
| Number of students graduating from tourism professions yearly            |                                                                        |
| % of labor imported (from other regions and countries)                  |                                                                        |
| % of built-up land in the total town area                                |                                                                        |
| % of the town area allocated for further construction                    |                                                                        |
| Total construction area (built and allocated for building)               |                                                                        |
| Newly built area per year                                                |                                                                        |
| % of tourist overnight stays from June to September                      |                                                                        |
| Ratio of number of tourists in peak month to lowest month               |                                                                        |
| Number of tourists per resident in the peak period                       |                                                                        |
| Ratio of water consumed in the month with the highest and the lowest number of tourist overnight stays |                                                                        |
| Relations formed to increase Business Efficiency (overbooking, transportation, financial relations) |                                                                        |
| Relations formed for Promotion (advertising, cultural and natural conservation and its promotion, festivals etc.) |                                                                        |
| Relations formed for Problem Solving (legal, managerial and administrative problem solving) |                                                                        |
| Awareness-Raising Projects (education programs, conference organisations) |                                                                        |
| Relations Related to Inputs (supply of food, textiles, furniture, electronic goods etc. from producer companies) |                                                                        |
| Environmental Cleaning & Protection                                      |                                                                        |
| Infrastructure & Purification Systems (sewerage system, waste water treatment, waste decomposition, etc.) |                                                                        |
| Innovative Environmental Projects (such as, biodiversity projects, Caretta Caretta protection projects, 100 different |                                                                        |
birds projects, endemic plants projects, Religious Garden Project, projects against mosquitoes, houseflies and sand flies etc.)

Awareness-raising Studies (seminars on environmental protection, education programmes, sponsorship, advertising the natural environment etc.)

Relations related to Quality Control (environmental quality and hygiene standards)

Forestation

Tourists/ha

% urban land

% land zoned for development

% non-developable land

4. Model Definition and Discussion

In a changed tourist context, characterized by a new sensibility towards the concept of sustainability, the slow and widespread approach to tourism can represent the suitable field to experiment a new model to evaluate and manage tourist destinations. The Tourist Ecosystem Model (Figure 1) is designed for tourist destinations that intend to apply slow and widespread forms of tourism. In these destinations, strategic planning focuses on six key elements: territory, aggregation, inclusion, internationalization, innovation and sustainability.

The territory is the key element of any tourist destination, it represents the heritage to be exploited, it integrates the rural, seaside and urban areas with territorial intelligence dynamics; territorial coalitions are the foundation for building an eco-sustainable territorial system; to make a destination truly inclusive and representative, it is necessary to develop a model focused on community and fair economy; internationalization concerns the ability of the destination to maintain its distinctive and specific characteristics (tradition and culture), approaching dynamics of openness to global dynamics; innovation in destination is imagined as the creation of a social capital based on research, professionalism and competences which insist on the territory; in the end sustainability is intended as a strategic element to reaffirm the quality of life of both the community and the tourists of the destination.

Using the indicators identified by the literature analysis in the previous section, we classified and cataloged them to outline a strategic tool for analysis and control of a tourist destination characterized by a Tourist Ecosystem Model (table 5).
| **Territory** | **Aggregation** | **Inclusion** |
|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| Number of passenger transport vehicles per inhabitant | Property value of real estate per inhabitant | Net migration rate |
| Number of financial establishments per inhabitant | Availability of recreational facilities | Percentage of foreign population |
| Number of services sector establishments per inhabitant | Sport facilities per inhabitant | Opportunity to meet people from other cultures |
| Conservation of the cultural heritage | Cultural activities/entertainment | Percentage of non-active older population |
| Number of cultural sites designated as “assets of cultural interest” | Accessible information | Percentage of enrolled population in noncompulsory education |
| Pressure on cultural heritage | Number of picnic areas | Unemployment rate |
| Number of tourist information offices per tourist | Number of cycling tracks | % of income generated by tourism in the community |
| Access time from the closest airport | Number of service persons | % of new jobs in the tourism sector occupied by local residents |
| Newly built area per year | Increased opportunities for various activities | Percentage of employees in tourism sector relative to total employment |
| Density of roads | Zoning of different activities | Proportion of employees in the services sector |
| Vacancies in official tourism accommodation establishments | Recreation facilities | Involvement of private |
| Number of non-official tourism accommodation establishments | Activation of networks | Information services |
| Number of visits to heritage and cultural site | Relations related to inputs (supply of food, textiles, furniture, electronic goods etc. from producer companies) | Visitor centers |
| Existence of solidwaste treatment installations | | Guided walks |
| Construction density per unit area | | |
| Total surface with erosion problems | | |
| Total area dedicated to landscape | | |
| Road network density | | |
| Guided tour/sightseeing to see animals/natural attractions | | |
| Number of cultural volunteers | | |
| Ratio of tourist to locals | Number of ADSL lines in service per inhabitant | |
| Total number of tourist arrivals | Number of telephone lines in service | |
| Average stay | Existence of a website that provides information about the destination | |
| Tourist spending | Number of businesses that acquired an eco-responsible label | |
| Ratio of low-season tourists to peakseason tourists | Existence of an environmental administrative unit | |
| Ratio of low-season tourism employment to peak-season tourism employment Total number employed in the tourism sector | Well developed food and beverage facilities | |
| Percentage of official tourism accommodation establishments which are open all year | Accessibility | |
| Information exchange | Promotional policies | |
| Institutional connection | Environmental Policies | |
| Communication intensity | Promotional policies | |
| Quality of the information provided | Awareness-Raising Projects (education programs, conference organisations) | |
| | Infrastructure & Purification Systems | |
| | Innovative Environmental Projects | |
| | Awareness-raising Studies (seminars on environmental protection, education programmes, sponsorship, advertising the natural environment etc.) | |

**Internationalization**

| **Innovation** |
|----------------|
| Number of cultural volunteers |
| Number of ADSL lines in service per mill inhabitant |
| Number of telephone lines in service |
| Existence of a website that provides information about the destination |
| Number of businesses that acquired an eco-responsible label |
| Existence of an environmental administrative unit |
| Well developed food and beverage facilities |
| Accessibility |
| Promotional policies |
| Environmental Policies |
| Promotional policies |
| Awareness-Raising Projects (education programs, conference organisations) |
| Infrastructure & Purification Systems |
| Innovative Environmental Projects |
| Awareness-raising Studies (seminars on environmental protection, education programmes, sponsorship, advertising the natural environment etc.) |

**Sustainability**

| **Health care equipment** | Variation of available income | Number of individuals per unit destination area |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Number of pharmacies per inhabitant | Average occupancy rate for official tourism accommodation establishments | Rate of natural increase |
| Variation of the population levels | Price of land/housing | Percentage of the destination considered to |
5. Conclusions

Nowadays a tourist destination must no longer be just an attractor, registering high number of arrivals and stays. It is no longer sufficient to provide the basic tourist services to have a destination pleasant, but it is necessary to develop a joint action that sees actors, communities and tourists work together to preserve local assets (Dodds, Graci, & Holmes, 2010). Natural, cultural, historical or landscape amenities (Beritelli, 2011) represent a *unicum* that allows a territory to compete on a local and global scale (Martini, 2017), those elements are the basis of ecotourism (Haukeland et al., 2010). While destinations hold or can create facilitators that allow tourists to reach them physically or virtually (Lee et al., 2010), on the other side they need a careful programming, planning, and control activities (Logar, 2010) that allow them to preserve uniqueness of their assets for as long as possible.

To compete in the tourism sector, a destination has to maintain its competitive advantage over rival destinations that, thanks to the web and transport systems (ever faster, safer and cheaper), are more easily identifiable and reachable by tourists (Viola & Benvenuto, 2017). To date the competition is taken to a new level: the uniqueness of the destination. In order to result unique, a destination need to understand the territories, to analyze the tourism impacts according to the triple bottom line of sustainability (Gaodi et al., 2010; Hares et al., 2010; Mihalic, 2016), and to define the dynamics that lead to good management and governance (Imran et al., 2014). But destination management need to consider other aspects deeply connected with tangible and intangible resources of a territory (Castellani & Sala, 2010). Social impacts are strategic to gather the relationships that are triggered between tourism and community (Boley et al., 2014; Jamal & Camargo, 2014; Stylidis et al., 2014); the economic ones measure the weight of tourism on the local economy (Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2014); environmental impacts assess the pressure generated on environment, natural resources and landscape (Cucculelli & Goffi, 2016; Rendeiro Martin-Céjas & Pablo Ramírez Sánchez, 2010). These impacts, however, are not yet sufficient. When a tourist territory evolves into a destination, it needs tools that allow it to tangibly measure the consequences of the strategies implemented and the degree of involvement and participation of the local actors.

For these reasons, the indicators selected from the literature analysis and reclassified in table 5 can represent a starting point for analyzing and monitoring a tourist destination characterized by a slow and widespread tourism (Haukeland et al., 2010), comparing it with similar destinations and / or nearby ones, according to the Tourist Ecosystem Model (Figure 1): territory, aggregation, inclusion, internationalization, innovation and sustainability. In order to be implemented, the results thus far adduced need to be applied to heterogeneous cases and it would deserve an application in the medium to long term. In addition, the business, social, and environmental context of the territories presents different aggregates, both in size and in structural terms, therefore it would be necessary to normalize the model and apply it in order to obtain results in line with the characteristics of *genius loci* (Mintzberg, 1989).
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