

Making heritage more valuable and sustainable through intersectoral networking

Kocovic, Milica

Institute of Economic Sciences
Belgrade, Serbia
milica.kocovic@ien.bg.ac.rs¹

Djukic, Vesna

Faculty of Dramatic Arts
Belgrade, Serbia
djukic.vesna@gmail.com²

Vićentijević, Danijela

Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Telecommunications
Belgrade, Serbia
danijelavicentijevic9@gmail.com³

Abstract

The subject of this paper is to show the importance of inter-sectoral and partnership activities, and added value of the heritage. The main goal is to emphasize the importance of the inter-departmental relations and forms of participatory governance that contribute to each pillar of sustainable development, in particular by activities related to the: preservation, conservation, restoration, greater visibility and valorization of the natural and cultural heritage. The work mainly rely on a qualitative analysis of previous empirical scientific research and practical examples of successful Worlds cases. We think that it is necessary to complement the operation of theory, practice and public policy papers, as well as international recommendations, to make all the relevant phenomena considered, so we will try to do that in relation to the subject and main goal of the paper. Paper reflects basic theory, examples and best practices in order to capture the importance of partnership strategies in participatory governance, with active participation in the decision-making process in order to make heritage more valuable.

Our main hypothesis is: Long-term preservation of heritage seeks for necessary interdisciplinary approach, and the actual market visibility by linkages of diferent departments such as: culture, economy, CCI environment, society, through responsible forms of tourism (eco-cultural).

Introduction

We are facing various different global challenges. This especially refers to the financial challenges, but also inadequate management solutions. With the respect to mentioned, the countries in the post-transition period are often characterized by different but similar *transitional diseases* such as: sluggish bureaucracy and lazy administration; unemployment, poverty, corruption etc. (Kocovic and Djukic, 2015). Traditional organizational structures, mostly public institutions, whose mission is managing of heritage, are faced with problems that require the search for new solutions, approaches and models. New direction would allow shared

¹ Milica Kocovic, associate researcher at Institute of Economic sciences, this paper will be part of macro projects: no. 17901 and no. 47009 Ministry of Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia, PhD student of Faculty of Dramatic Arts..

² Vesna Djukic, full professor on Faculty of Dramatic Arts on Cultural Policy

³ Danijela Vicentijevic, Senior Adviser at the Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Telecommunication of the Republic of Serbia, PhD student on Faculty of Dramatic arts.

responsibility between different sectors and departments on topics such as protection, management and valorization of cultural and natural heritage. The contemporary world is characterized by extremely fast development and experiencing, and consequential structural changes, which have high impact on societies, economics, governments and public administration (Farazmand 2004a, 2004b; Kocovic Đukic 2015).

As authors we were considering previous researches and supported by theories⁴ and practical approaches. There is still quite a bit of practical and scientific space to connect the fields, in order to achieve better valorization and use of heritage as a common good category. In this sense, we are able to point on the possibility of heritage to hold it's old and create the new value(s).

The paper will confirm that the value of heritage becomes more clear, visible and pragmatic category, through the operation of alternative forms of responsible tourism – eco-cultural, CCI, and various forms of social entrepreneurship and business in lateral branches (that are not strictly related to heritage). Previous mentioned also indicates on the flow of socially responsible creation of value, assuming a greater involvement of local people in all processes. This opens up opportunities for positive growth of socio-economic and socio-cultural indicators, with balanced development of heritage.

Our main research questiones are:

1. How to manage heritage – as common good, to provide the preservation of its existing values, with achieving added values?
2. Whether the better horizontal interconnectedness (of: sectors, departments, branches), lead to the higher value of heritage?
3. Does the synergy achieved from lateral branches can contribute to the sustainable development heritage and its higher value?
4. Is it possible to answer on these questions by our proposed model that includes participatory governance with linking strategy, strategy of diverfication through creation of new products, and risk management to minimize negative impact of risks that toreate heritage?

1. Theoretical review on value of heritage as a common good

The heritage belongs to a category of common goods. This means that for heritage existence all the people have equal responsibility. As Throsby emphasizes natural and cultural capital are determined with very similar elements, and it is - analogous to developmental principles relating to the sustainable development of the environmental dimension. It is possible to carry out cultural and sustainable criteria, which are based on principles: Inter-generational and inter-generational equity; importance of diversity; precautionary principle; interconnection. The principles that Throsby (Mikic 2015) defines, can be seen as a checklist for assessing the rate of development policies, which will provide cultural sustainability.

Table 1 - The similarities that define the natural and cultural heritage

Natural capital	Natural resources	Biodiversity	Natural ecosystems
Cultural capital	Cultural richness	Cultural Diversity	Cultural Networks

Source: Local Development and Creative Industries (Throsby and Mikic, 2015).

The similarities of natural and cultural heritage are more than obvious. Both types of heritage fit into the category of common and mixed properties. This means that these goods belong to everyone and that it is necessary to ensure their long-term survival, and also that they can be managed by numerous of sectors. The attempts of capturing the value of heritage are given from the different theoretical perspectives. In a

⁴ Such as: economics, cultural policy, cultural management, anthropology, tourism.

pragmatic sense value is seen by the classical economic theory, as a category conditioned by factors of production. In the context of protected areas and natural heritage, Drašković (Draškovic, 2012) states that the value of protected areas can be viewed through two basic theoretical economic perspective: classical and neoclassical. In the classical theoretical sense value consists on the factors of production (especially land), labor and capital creation (ie. Its material form). Following on the above, the classical economic theory in a similar way can be applicable to the cultural heritage and expressions, with some modifications. Factors of production, would refer to the creativity of the creators, and their work in this context produces a value that despite all aesthetic and ethical, would also have material form. According to Marx's labor, theory of value says that the only creation of value comes from human work, where by the same theory, unpaid work represents the excess of the value and source of wealth. Liberal or neoclassical economic theory puts into the focus of value analysis the free market concept, where the value is determined by free choice and motivation of the individual. Economic perspective requires the principle of rarities during (e)valuation process. According to this principle in relation to the the character of rarity and uniqueness, value becomes attributed by cash equivalent. Previously mentioned is particularly important for heritage and its management aspect. In the context of the natural and cultural heritage in terms of their uniqueness, rarity and universality the protection mechanisms will grow – and they are directly related to the (e) valuation. Finally value of the heritage and perception about it is influenced by non-economic / intangible values contained in the natural and cultural heritage. Mentioned non-economic values in conjunction with economic values affect the final evaluative perception (Kočović, 2016). Extremely important in recognizing the value of heritage, is to capture all the indirect values that heritage can provide. Draskovic (2012) states that in the case of continual values in nature (ie renewable resources: solar energy, light, wind power, energy/water power), these values do not have immediate market value and they cannot be traded. Simultaneously, we can say the same for cultural heritage. Although there is no clear market valuation model, for these values it is almost axiomatically assumed the necessity of requirements for the creation of other new indirect value(s), which can result from the foregoing. Many authors indicate the immaterial aspect - the intrinsic value expressed through the experience of the viewer. McCarthy in this sense speaks about the *state of absorption, or focused attention* (McCarthy et al., 2004), which comes as a deep satisfaction emerged as a product of interaction with the artwork or cultural experience. Silverman (Silverman, 1993; 1995) refers on the intangible aspect of the value as *the capacity of man to explore the personal meaning*, through the disclosure of personal belief among the universal truths. Nozick introduces the significance of *core values* (Nozick, 1981) noting that some things have value only as an aid for something else that has value, while some things have value as its own internal featured category of intrinsic value. According to Nozick, the concept of core values is an essential, while other types of of values exist only in relation to the essential. Nozick's arguments that references to essential of values, refer to the unity-in-diversity (as the basis of core values); scientific value; the value of ecological systems, as well as the value of mind and body in the unity of thought (Nozick, 1981). David Graeber is committed to observe the society as an active project, and value as the imaginary and creative potential and action. In this way the value as category receives a broader sense of the potential for action (Graeber 2000; Bhaskar 1998; Munn 1973; Kisić 2014). Greber believes that it is necessary to find an adequate model that will allow the analysis of value, to avoid the disadvantages that are related to the value as a fixed category. Therefore the realization of value through the ideal that heritage itself is, assumes the existence of people's awareness about the heritage. It also assumes an understanding of the use of heritage and appreciation in order to preserve it. When (Scott, 2011) speaks of *intangible experiences*, Scott states that these include some of the most important dimensions of life: love, longing, inspiration, joy, excitement and pleasure, adding that these experiences cannot be always sensually perceived, although they are present in our daily life. Some authors also point to the collective aspects of social evaluation heritage. In this sense, the symbolic value is created through culture expression and social meanings (Holden, 2004) and

through social connections, connecting people (McCarthy et al, 2004), reinforcing the sense of unity and identity (Holden, 2004). Capturing and measurement of intangible values is the subject of operation various fields, including community development, private sector, government and museums (Scott, 2011).

Thus, the relevant institutions that are responsible for heritage (such as cultural organizations, national parks, tourist organizations and others), with the necessary inter-sectoral and cross-sectoral approach will contribute to the discovery of intangible values and clearer direction in the management of heritage in order to achieve sustainable development of cultural and natural heritage. Better horizontal connection (inter-sectoral inter-departmental) will provide a favorable socio-economic and socio-cultural effects. Values are closely linked to the protection of heritage. Since the culture and tourism correlate with other economic and non-economic sectors and operate within a given system, it can be concluded that the ratio of these two sectors should be based on partnership, networking, collaboration, linking culture sector, as well as internationalization and decentralization as forms of strategies for connecting them (Vićentijević and Kočović 2016). This is also the reason why new approaches should seek for better integration of disciplines, in order of achieving survival of heritage in long terms - ie the sustainable development of the same. This approach enables the identification of heritage value through hierarchy of importance, in relation to the type and priority of protection.

Certain guidelines for protection activities were mainly given by the relevant international bodies. These guidelines were later introduced by States Parties into their national legal frameworks. It is notable that legislation seeks to make better definitions of relevant terms, as well as to determine the (minimum) of direct participants in the process of protection and the specific activities. Accordingly, the management activities for the organizations that implement protection are defined by the laws. This is why management of heritage should have an integrative character. This implies that different approaches and disciplines must interact with each other, exactly through legislation (it would be good and clearer through explicit public policy, and implicitly through the horizontal connection), to make the protection process flow smoothly over time. Therefore, questions concerning the protection and values, they must be modernized in time, with the development of other laws, programs and policies that directly and indirectly affect the heritage, creating a favorable environment for the protection, promotion and use of heritage.

Accordingly, the value is determined by the willingness for someone to pay goods or services. Both approaches have drawbacks, because they would open the problems of evaluation of: nature, water, air, land, culture, art. While classical theory emphasizes labor costs and manufacturing (focus on offering), neoclassical theory emphasizes the importance of market mechanisms, and consumer behavior (focus on demand). In the context of the current neo-liberal economics, where subjectivity plays a decisive role in the choice of purchasing / consumption, the main question is:

- How to adequately achieve measurement of the value that is almost abstract phenomenon (due to the nature of value that assumes a layered set of intangible values)?

Answering on this question is close to finding optimal management solution. One of the starting points, to finding adequate solutions for the management of heritage, may be required in the new institutional economics (NIE). The new institutional economics (NIE) Klein perceived as an interdisciplinary enterprise that combining economics, law, organizational theory, political science, sociology and anthropology, in order to understand the institution's social, political and commercial life (Klein, 1999). The author also states that the basic language of NIE is economy, although NIE relies on other socio-humanistic scientific perspectives. The main objective of the NIE is reflected in determining the nature of institutions, their purpose, appearance, disappearance, and needs of reform in changing conditions.

Therefore, we can deduce that heritage (natural and cultural) has many similarities, both in the evaluation because they abound in intangible values, which is easy to feel. However, challenges arise in attempt to quantify intangible values and find management solutions. Due to the foregoing, studies related to the value

of intangible aspects were often dependent on the qualitative research. Qualitative research through the examination of specific behaviors, preferences, subjective evaluation and experiences of subjects, giving results, which indicate the importance of intangible elements of heritage values. Drawing on qualitative research, it is possible to discover the essence of the consumers needs, which is useful for forming the products on the supply side such as of new eco-cultural tourism products and routes (that will be discussed below).

2. Importance of hybrid scientific fields for affirmation of heritage

In the following text, there will be more words about the value of heritage as a resource, as well as importance of interdisciplinary approach in managing heritage. We will try to point out the important relationship of cultural and natural heritage with other sectors and branches, especially the economy and culture, and also economy and alternative forms of tourism (such as: Creative and Cultural Industries - CCI and eco-cultural tourism). With the aim of practical attempts to evaluate heritage, large number of scientific fields in synergy with the culture and ecology, evolved into the new hybrid disciplines. Culture and ecology are the subject of interest of many scientific disciplines. Over time, the researches came to the point where application of elements of the economy to the basic disciplines / sciences (Culture and Environment) were necessary. Cultural economics from the beginning have been causing controversy, from both perspectives: culture and art theorists, and from the perspective of the classical economists. Economists perceive this area as a lateral branch of the economy, in which they are not interested too much. We think that the reason for this situation above all, finds its stronghold in theoretical and practical ignorance, because creative expressions and capital have great economic potential. On the other hand, theorists of culture and art often mystify economy as a science, by seeing in economy only purpose - as the monetary expression of value and making a profit (it also indicates an enormous ignorance). The bright side is reflected in evident facts, that listed doctrines are conciliatory. Mentioned is supported by the reflected facts that are visible through: scientific and practical existence in the context of the "newer disciplines" that were hybrid developed such as CCI and eco-cultural tourism. As we could see, the direction of development new hybrid fields have hint in the mid-eighties. Author Van Beetz (Van Beetz, 1988; Isak, 2008) cites three factors that suggest that culture, like any other branch is the product of economic activity. In that sense culture is an important determinant factor that makes:

- the location attractive,
- convenient transport, and accessibility,
- good conditions and opportunities for employment.

Considering that the three criteria together have beneficial effects on the quality of the living environment and a place to live, work and creativity, Van Beetz in a way was futurist, talking about a phenomenon CCI. The existence of real needs have encouraged interests in professional public from various disciplines, as well as international organizations (EC, UNCTAD and others.) to accelerate the process of maturing discipline CCI / (as a unifying approach to the creative and cultural economy, ie – industry). Scott and Florida at the beginning of the 2000s started extensively development of concept about *creative class*, which applies to all who are engaged in creative works (Florida 2004; Scott 2008b), and the possibility of urban development of the region through creativity. Authors often report intensive impact, when they speak of the creative industries. CCI irreversibly reflect more and more innovation and design than other industries (Lash et al. 1994; Flew 2009). A growing cultural and economic discourse that are intertwined is topic for many authors (Yúdice 2003; Throsby 2008; Flew 2009). Throsby, as one of the most important authors, scientist and expert, insists that cultural policy must find its place in every respectable economic policy. Throsby is trying to reaffirm art and creative work in today's time through referrals. His work aims to ensure the successful survival of heritage in time. In that sense, Throsby insists that art should be relying on economic

knowledge, because it is seen as part of a broader economic dynamic images created in turbulent changes. Throsby points that art is part of a wider and more dynamic spheres of economic activity, which links to the information and economic knowledge that encourages creativity, new technologies and feeds innovations (Throsby, 2008). Rami Isac (Isac, 2008) states that the rich diversity of cultural events with their interdependencies creates an environment in which innovations are occurring and where the advertising, marketing, design, fashion and media - feel like home.

Summarizing the theoretical and empirical findings, we can say that natural and cultural heritage, indirectly are creating value by providing a direct condition for the creation and design of new creative and cultural expressions, the economy based on knowledge and innovation as well as new forms of tourism. This direction also presupposes socially responsible creation that creates values, assuming greater involvement of local people in all processes by opening up opportunities for positive growth of socio-economic and socio-cultural indicators. More about positive impact of heritage, will be given in the sequel.

3. Non-economic and intangible elements of heritage that makes positive economic effects through synergy of CCI and eco-cultural tourism

In the process of building heritage as the headquarters of stable, clear and strong values, it is necessary to take into account all economic and non-economic values. It is much more important to put stronger importance on non-economic values, since they are much more difficult to discover.

The Canadian International Development Agency (Canadian International Development Agency, Lavergne and Saxby 2001; Scott 2011), emphasizes the significance and role of detecting and intangible assets, as an integral part of providing community capacity. Moreover, the capacity of society to meet the needs of members depends on the available resources, but also the manner in which these resources (funds) are used (Lavergne and Saxby 2001; Scott 2011). Thus immaterial aspects of heritage lets community meet its human and social potential with maximum use (mutual interaction, learning, consuming heritage through institutions and non-institutional ways) ensuring greater social cohesion. In the business sector, non-material aspects are seen as drivers of economic value creation, directly this means - the importance of investment in their development (Youngman 2003; Jarboe 2007; Scott 2011; Borseková et al., 2013). In the nineties Governments on global level, recognized the role of intangible values, and formed national indicators that focus on the individuals, community and their welfare. These indicators appeared in response to the former global approach that quality of life is measured solely by economic categories (such as growth, fiscal and monetary stability GDP).

In this respect, development policies are increasing their focus at the inter-sectoral and interdepartmental operation of cultural and other social areas, including community building and individual well-being, through various forms of participatory activities (Jensen, 2006). To ensure the socio-economic and socio-cultural development (through building social capacity and greater cohesion) it is necessary to incorporate environmental and cultural indicators in the context of broader social indicators and economic policy frameworks. According to the European Commission, culture and creativity have a direct impact on diferent departments (such as eco-cultural tourism), representing an integral part of the value chain sector and other departments (such as fashion and other industries based on innovation), whereby their character (operation CCI) is recognized as key for economic development, because it is growing (European Commission, 2012).

Positive effects that derive from investing in heritage do not necessarily have a monetary value, but generate direct and indirect values, through spillover effects (Drašković 2013; Mikic 2015). The Flaming indicates that the spillover effects can occur in the form of transfer of knowledge, economic growth and networking (Mikić, 2015). Transfer of knowledge assumes creative work that encourages new ideas and continuity in innovation. This situation provides economic growth by creating new jobs and a favorable business climate, employment growth, a review of existing and creation of new business models, which will

allow greater cross-sectoral and cross-sectoral cooperation, thus ensuring concentration of certain jobs through networking (creative, ecological activities). Mikic indicates a positive relation of investing in the creative sector, with socio-economic development by recognizing three groups of effects: *effect of multiplication, accelerator effect and gravitational effect* (Mikić, 2015). The multiplier effect indicates the strength of investment in CCI, which is reflected in the growth of income and employment levels of the local community. Accelerator effect, indicating the favorable impact of investment in CCI to the growth dynamics of the local economy and its diversification. Gravitational effects occur in the long term and affect the improvement of quality of life, attractiveness of the region, improving the business climate, etc.

For greater visibility of the cultural and natural heritage, better perception, experience and valuation of consumers, we think it is necessary to encourage visits, by increasing understanding and visibility with the operation of the CCI and eco-cultural tourism. Since elemental base of CCI and eco-cultural tourism makes the same common denominator - heritage, we can say with great certainty that the same effects are valid for eco-cultural tourism. Also, these effects will inevitably (especially the multiplier effect) lead to positive socio-economic impacts in both fields of action (CCI and eco-cultural tourism). In her research author Murzin (Murzyn-Kupisz, 2012) drawing on mentioned studies of other authors, she stated that tourism multiplier effect takes place when the visitors of heritage spend money not only directly on heritage (direct economic effects) but also in various lateral departments that support tourism services. In this case, the consumption is taking place in the retail (accommodation, transport, cosmetics and medical services, sports, spa, handicrafts, souvenirs, food and beverages, books, photos, articles, etc. products KKI) leading to indirect and induced multiplier effects of tourism (Murzyn-Kupisz, 2012).

Natural and cultural heritage should be treated by integrative approach with the creation of new ways to use (new products). In this way, alternative forms of tourism such as eco-cultural tourism in cooperation with CCI can comprehensively treat heritage, contributing to their sustainable development and the creation of added value. Not only that this integrative approach is envisaged by many relevant international UN bodies (through integrative forms of governance by IUCN and UNESCO conventions and recommendations), but there are very good examples of world practice. In some countries the total coordination of cultural and natural heritage is done by one institution (either as direct control or as a supervisor - coordinator).

Table 2 - Examples of integrated management approaches of natural and cultural heritage

Country	Management (steering)	Jurisdiction
New Zealand	Department of Conservation (www.doc.govt.nz)	Concern for heritage, through activities: Managing natural and cultural heritage, protection of species, restoration of the city, Monitoring and reporting, risk management, mapping and data collection, propose new protected areas.
Canada	Office of Parks Canada (Parks Canada: www.pc.gc.ca)	Caring about the various heritage subjects, divided equally into 3 categories: National parks; National historic sites and national marine environments.

United States	National Services - National Park Service (www.nps.gov)	Caring about national parks that include natural and cultural heritage (sites with historical and cultural contexts of archaeological sites, monuments, memorial continents, places of important events. Under their supervision are museums such as Museum of Immigration (www.nps.gov/elis/index.htm).
Republic Srpska	Republic Institute for Protection of Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage of the Republic of Srpska (Www.nasljedje.org)	Equally concerned about the treatment of natural and cultural heritage.

Source: Krivošejev (2014: 164).

Objectives on cultural heritage are given in report Getting Cultural heritage to work for Europe by European Commission. Report argues that the EU should vigorously promote the innovative use of cultural heritage for economic growth and jobs, social cohesion and environmental sustainability. Three main objectives, by tree basic sustainable pillars are:

1. Economy: Promoting innovative finance, investment, governance, management and business models to increase the effectiveness of cultural heritage as an economic production factor. Society: Promoting the innovative use of cultural heritage to encourage integration, inclusiveness, cohesion and participation. Innovative use of cultural heritage has the potential to actively engage people - thereby helping to secure integration, inclusiveness, social cohesion and sound investment, all necessary ingredients of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.
2. Environment: Promoting innovative and sustainable use of cultural heritage to enable it to realize its full potential in contributing to the sustainable development of European landscapes and environments. Cultural heritage plays an important role in the sustainable development of rural and urban cultural landscapes. (EC 2015; Kocovic and Djukic, 2015).

With aim to point on possibility of heritage to create jobs, cohesion and participation, EC suggested four actions, that rely on their findings, and also grate examples.

1. Heritage led to urban regeneration,
2. Sustaining Cultural landscapes,
3. Inclusive governance,
4. Innovative business models for cultural heritage (EC 2015; Kocovic and Djukic, 2015).

What applies to all activities that it is desirable by their recommendation is to take into account 30 best practices, and base on their findings create good specific model. Everything they suggested is about and with an aim to increase knowledge; building capacities; job creation and growth, improving quality of life on local level; stronger and better link among actors; experimental and creative approaches; use of new technology; re-use etc. Relations between culture and the environment are inseparable, and it is easier to spot them through human creativity and action. Nature represents a kind inexhaustible inspiration for creative actions (similar as culture), while the creation of man in cooperation with nature creating a new culture, that relies on the existing one. Because of this natural and cultural heritage, as a unique and authentic common goods represent deepest relationship with someone's affiliation (locally, regionally,

nationally speaking) and identity. A mainstay of our research emphasizes the importance of consolidated managing of common goods (cultural and natural heritage) with respect to economic and non-economic elements of values. We consider this can be achieved through building better connected horizontal model (as a new system solution), which will include as many lateral branches of the total economy. In this way, inter-sectoral and interdepartmental linkages can be achieved (through the strategies of linking and partnerships), with a large number of participants who will address issues related to the heritage. This scenario we find the most close to the achievement of sustainable development of heritage with new created and added economic values (Kocovic and Djukic 2015).

4. Modeling the new system solution that contributes to a better valuation of heritage and its sustainable development

During extensive research for the purpose of doctorate: *Contribution of eco-cultural tourism to sustainable development of protected areas with associated cultural and natural heritage*, one of the authors of this paper Milica Kočović came to recommendations, we rely on. We think that modeling of any new system solution that is connected with heritage, should take into account some of recommendations that are useful, and that will be presented shortly in this paper.

New system solution for managing heritage in order to achieve sustainable development and new creation of values, should include tree recommendations:

1. Participatory governance of heritage with linking strategy and partnerships,
2. Creation of new products, that rely on heritage,
3. Risk management of heritage and visitors (Kocovic, 2016).

Participatory governance (PG) occurs as a response to the problems that characterize transitional societies in developing countries. The way in which PG provides its positive impacts on vulnerable society's shocks is through the higher transparency, active multi-sectoral cooperation, fair distribution and greater inclusion of local people (Kocović, Djukić 2015). It is also the way to achieve greater equity, through decentralization of power, management, decision-making and accountability. Community-based organizations (CBOs), local governments, and deconcentrated sectoral agencies, as well as private organizations such as NGOs and firms, should be linked more coherently in order to support improved empowerment, governance, service provision, and private sector growth. A spatially framed approach, which links such local organizations through their respective roles and relationships at local government and community levels, promises to improve coordination, synergy, efficiency, and responsiveness in local development processes (Kocovic and Djukic, 2015). PG as we see it, as a means is the system solution to meet the goals. Partnership is a strategy that assumes connection of public, private and NGO sector, without which it is impossible to encircle socio-cultural cycles and achieve above mentioned goals (Djukic 2010; Kocovic and Djukic, 2015). We see linking strategy (read partnership) as a basic support of integrative management. From a theoretical point of view linking strategy is often implemented to facilitate provision of financial resources and better international acceptance and recognition of participants. From the perspective of cultural management, this strategy is primarily related to productions; from the standpoint of cultural policies it implies a partnership of public, private and NGO sector (Djukic 2010; Kocovic and Djukic, 2015). Thus, this strategy from the standpoint of any public policy, is being implemented in order to facilitate financing (which is a very critical point when we talk about issues related to: culture, heritage, ecology, tourism, traditional crafts, social entrepreneurs, as well as an integrated activity of those different departments) (Kocovic and Djukic, 2015).

Efficiency and effective public sector demands horizontal changes and interactions between national agencies, local governments and other organizations that share governance at the local level, so policy coherence and technical competence will be ensured. This will lead to creation of opportunities for greater local discretion and stronger accountability. All stakeholders at different levels in a participatory approach

should take part in the decision making process. New system solutions with more integrative management approach with the desire to achieve synergies requires strengthening the power of all local actors. The field of cultural heritage management demonstrate a very wide range of activities and types of engagement with diverse social groups and diverse types of heritage, achieving a multiplicity of outcomes and impacts. The authors done very important job showed in publication, where it is possible to see more details about projects *Mapping of practices in the EU Member States on Participatory governance of cultural heritage to support the OMC working group under the same name (Work Plan for Culture 2015-2018) (EENC, 2015)*. Based on examples of good practices in represented examples, we could see that all of the good participatory governance practices are characterized by more flexible institutional approach (towards cultural institutions, museums new variants). Creativity, multidisciplinary approach, innovation, participation in decision-making processes and creation of strategies as an integrated process of relevant parties is very important. Multi-sectoral partnerships, with continual educative learning programs with the aim of increasing and built the total capacities (Kocovic and Djukic, 2015).

Table 3 represents selected examples of good practices, where activities from projects are focused on natural and cultural values and heritage, mostly trough area of ecotourism and eco-cultural tourism.

Table 3 - Examples of good partnership projects in area of alternative forms of tourism

Example/ Country	About project	Impact	Target
Queensland, Australia, Kuranda Skyrail Rainforest Cableway	Example of best practice of construction techniques, Cableway in national park. 114 gondolas, 650 passengers per hour, winning numerous awards.	Local community-capacity building, heritage preservation.	Visitors, locals
Australia Quarantine Station, New South Wales	Example of with public-private partnership. Infrastructure is partly rented for eco-tourism.	example of good practice environmental protection system management. Space of 30 hectares which includes 65 buildings, over 1000 stone inscriptions and images, heritage for diferent endangered species	local community, visitors, stakeholder management approach
Australia Sal Salis Ningaloo Reef	Partnership - a private project at the National Park. Assumed creation of the camp, 9 tents, according to environmentally friendly principles	example of good practice in the design, construction and management. Sal Salis aims to create minimal impact on the environment	local community, visitors, stakeholder management approach. „experience the untouched natural environment and marine life“.
Costa Rica, Lapa Rios, Osa Peninsula, Central America	private nature reserve on about 1,000 acres, 16 private bungalows framework NP, walking trails through the rainforest and stairs connecting the main building with all the bungalows. Objects are made of local materials, and was designed in accordance with the environment.	International good practice example Local Area community involvement and benefits for the community, in addition to the national park	local community, visitors.
Namibia, Damaraland Camp,	Owned by the local community on 80 acres, 10 straw tents and a main building.	management and restoration of	local comunity, visitors.

Huab River Valley	international example of good practice in community owned property. private-civil partnership. An example of how eco-tourism contributes to local community.	ecological values in a protected area	
Kenya Ecotourism Association	The protection, preservation and investment in the environment; Responsible use of resources such as land, water, energy, culture;	Responsible Tourism Investment in human resources (staff and locals) and empowerment local people	local community, visitors.
Vanuatu	Development of eco-cultural tourism strategy stakeholder approach, participatory governance.	"Tourism celebrates local culture and nature, empowers local people and visitors to the island binds".	local community, visitors.
Old Phuket Town, Phuket City Thailand	Preserving Old Town Architecture Reviving Traditions and as Tourist Attraction and Economic Driver Partnership; thematic areas: (1) people's participation in planning and decision making; (2) institutional governance; (3) inclusive of urban public services with a focus on urban areas; and (4) improve fiscal governance and investments.	(DELGOSEA) which involves the identification and exchange of best practices	local community and visitors governance and strategies to support investment.

Source: Selection on the basis of case studies (Kocovic, 2016). Selection is based on: *Best Practice Ecotourism Development Guidelines 2015*, *Strategy for the Development of Eco-cultural Tourism 2014 in South Pentecost*, *DELGOSEA 2015 Muriithi*, 2013.

Table 3 shows different examples related to projects mostly within protected areas, guided by different types of strategic partnerships and participatory governance. Management recommendations from these examples are primarily related to protection of Heritage; new forms of participatory governance and strategic partnership, which aims to empower local communities; experience for visitors. Eco-cultural tourism and similar alternative forms of tourism, individually and in synergy with the CCI contribute to sustainable development of natural and cultural heritage. Their positive impact is visible on the scale of local community, and the development of local level. In relation with the above we will present few more examples of good practice:

1. *Hidden Valley inn Reserve* is a private reserve with a number of innovative tourism products, based on natural and cultural heritage. It creates economic opportunities to strengthen local communities through the presentation and promotion of heritage. This is an example of a good set of sustainable tourism. This is example of the business model of a successful resort that maintains harmony between conservation, community, culture, nature, tourism and trade.
2. *Feynan Ecolodge* is located in the largest biosphere reserve in Jordan - Dana. Their objectives are focused on the contribution of local socio-economic development in total harmony with the environment, through the use of renewable energy sources and development of sustainable tourism (based on cultural and natural resources). Support to sustainable development is achieved through supporting activities for 4 pillars: (a) the sustainability of ecologically clean environment; (b) interactions with indigenous peoples (Bedouins) through the leather workshops and promotion of cultural values; (c) maximization of renewable energy sources, waste is reduced by 60%; (d) employment of local community accounts for 80% of total employees by development of various forms of social entrepreneurship. It is interesting that they made fund created of realized profit. Profit is entering into a fund for conservation of biosphere reserves, and the creation of new jobs.

3. *Fegato Private Island* used to be coconut and cinnamon plantation destination, that depleted by 1960. because of strong economics focus on production. This led to the destruction of 90% of vegetation and destroyed habitat. Systematic management process of recovery and re-colonization of habitats of plant and animal species, led to reconstruction around 70-80% of the island. Focus was placed on the field of conservation, resource management, economic and social development for the local population. Undertaken activities are made to ensure better working conditions, health care, the provision of credit, production of organic food; raising awareness about healthy nutrition and the environment; preservation of indigenous plant and animal species, improving energy efficiency; promotion of renewable energy sources; new jobs, decent salaries. Culture in this case remains at the level of intangible - old knowledge, traditions, local flora cultures and ways of tillage.
4. *Huang Shan Scenic Area Administrative committee* rated as China's top tourist spot with geological formations, beautiful landscapes and cultural richness. This project gained a certificate ISO14001 for environmental management in 2008. Also, project won international awards for outstanding achievements in the management and promotion of eco-tourism and conservation of landscape culture.

Selected examples support our research question that the lateral branches (or responsible forms of tourism and CCI) contributes to the conservation and preservation of heritage, with a focus on community development and local economic development. We could also see, that responsible types of tourism can make heritage more valuable. Eco-cultural tourism practically represents a model for the creation of new tourism products and routes, which combines natural and cultural heritage as an authentic resource (Kocovic, 2016). As such, the eco-cultural tourism receives conditions for further development, because it draws potentials of heritage. It also through touristic offer and synergy with various forms of social entrepreneurship and CCI (through creative work) has the power to mitigate the disadvantages of selected spaces rich by heritage. Amortisation of disadvantages is based on the ethical element that represents the base of eco-cultural tourism. Mitigation of disadvantages, also leads rounding process – that returns to the heritage necessary conditions for development and creation of additional value. Through the care of the heritage, that implies the potential for creating new products and services (eco-cultural tourism, CCI), it is possible to ensure the sustainable development of heritage. Eco-cultural tourism, as a responsible type of tourism, favors initiation intersectoral forms of cooperation, conservation and valuation of heritage, spreading awareness about important social issues, and socio-economic development in general. Eco-cultural tourism, as a responsible type of tourism, favors initiation of intersectoral forms of cooperation, conservation and valuation of heritage, important social issues, and socio-economic development in general. Although socially responsible issues are often the domain of the public sector and civil society, private sector can contribute just as good to the ultimate objective of sustainable development through partnerships and participatory forms of governance. Related to this, Table 4 shows the good examples of private sector contributions to the sustainable development, with added a fourth pillar - which refers to the culture.

Table 4 - Contribution of private sector to the sustainable development

Project Name / Location	Focus / Objective	Social Impact	Cultural Impact	Ecological impact	Economic impact
"Crosswaters Ecolodge," China, forest reserve, The world's largest commercial project of 2010	development of new products from bamboo, eco-tourism, community	communities are actively involved in the management process from the beginning	The project is planned in harmony with the environment and landscape, traditional	strong elements of respect for nature, natural building	focus on local engagement, great chances for the local economy.

with bamboos			knowledge and skills		
"Air New Zealand-Environment Trust", New Zealand, Environmentally responsible business	"Children restorers" "Clean and Green", reduce pollution levels by 15%, biofuels, conservation	Spreading awareness concerning the protection of heritage, especially focused on children,	an integrated approach to land management protection of local cultural landscape of Maori and their culture	Numerous projects of conservation of the biosphere (plant, animal species, nature)	Not in focus
"The Bushcamp Company" - Zambia, national park Lungava,	conservation company founded with the goal of building a safari camp	Conservation, benefits to the local community, fight against poaching, financing 2 local schools, provides transportation services for children, providing medical assistance,	Keeping tuition for the best cultural villages in Mfuve, promotion of rural Zambian traditional knowledge, Support for theater	Protecting wildlife and natural heritage, sustainable energy, "green" approaches	performs Fund-raising for 3 local NGOs, donation per person is evenly distributed on the activity: conservation and community projects
"Experiencias Xcaret" - Mexico, businesses linked to the goal of responsible tourism	partnership with the aim of maximizing the enjoyment of "natural, cultural and archaeological richness of Mexico"	Conservation of natural and cultural heritage through the preservation and promotion activities; Responsible Tourism Actions to help Mayan communities,	Reading ancient hieroglyphic letters, Promotion of the Intangible Cultural Heritage	Help turtles, Special open air schools - raising awareness of environmental issues, afforestation	Funds raised at the local level for small projects, and through responsible tourism activities.

Source: Authors selection of examples (Kočović, 2016) based on Wei for UN DESA, 2013.

Besides participatory governance and partnerships, other recommendation is reflected in the necessity of creating new products that rely on the the heritage attributes. We believe that new products should be supported and produced by participatory governance and partnerships from the field of eco-cultural tourism and CCI. This way allows establishment of dynamics that provides the synergy effects and create additional value. In order to set up, the new products require a good knowledge of the market. It is especially important to know: the nature new age tourism demand, as well as perceptions, needs, and behavior of new age tourists. Then it is possible to answer adequately from supply side, by creating new eco-cultural routes, by the diversification strategy. This will allow building new products on existing, in order to connect important natural and cultural heritage.

Why eco-cultural routes? The road infrastructure have been always important tool for connection, representing the basis of mobility. In addition to the initial character - primarily for linking socio-economic benefits for people who have used them (hunting, fishing, trade, research, pilgrimages, etc.). Trails and pathways are essential for travel and tourism, because they actively enabling merging of multilayer meanings and memories of the past with the present (Kocovic, 2016). By relocation of the original context of roads and routes, we add them new meaning and values (recreation, sport, cultural and historical revival, enjoying outings, holidays, etc.). This scenario does not exclude the old values, on the contrary. Old values are covered, with the potential to draw narratives and memories, events and preserved material and

immaterial culture that roads testify (Kocovic, 2016). Roughly, classification of routes can be made by type on cultural, natural and mixed routes (Timothy and Boyd, 2015). This classification also indicates the adequacy of routes in the formation of new products. Mixed routes and trails are particularly important for the topic of this paper, as they connect natural and cultural heritage. Intrinsically in practice, there are no strict natural or cultural routes. Nature will always have some elements of anthropogenic interventions, and vice versa, cultural routes are always placed in a natural context. Thing that is common to both types of routes that lead to a similar impact in the context of sustainable development is that: both natural and cultural routes will help preservation, interpretation and better understanding of heritage. Mixed routes can be located in urban, rural areas and protected areas. In the urban areas this mixed routes are generally located the parks linking the natural and cultural elements. Timothy gives examples about mixed routes, they could be bike paths, green areas, border roads, scenic routes, routes that follow the railway line (Timothy and Boyd, 2015). Because of nature, mixed routes allow most powerful valorization of the heritage. This is happening because pleasure and impressions reinforce by synergetic operation of the attraction based on both types of heritage (cultural and natural), that is connected by mixed routes. Eco-cultural routes should include characteristics related to all the attractions that are connected and basic information about them. Mixed routes are related to natural and cultural attractions, but it is also good to include the members of local community that are open to visitors and have to offer handicrafts. Handicrafts are authentic products, based on old knowledge and it is also a part of CCI. Management activities, which must be taken in relation to routes, are extremely complex and depends on many factors (type, space, terrain, users, purpose, etc.). Relying on the previous recommendation that highlights the importance of participatory governance and partnerships, it seems that after forming the eco-cultural routes, the most important thing to do in management process is to think about safety precautions.

This brings us to third recommendation that is about risk management of heritage and visitors.

Natural and cultural heritage (archaeological, built, historical, environmental entities), is under the influence of catastrophic risks. Catastrophic risks are related to the both, risks of natural disasters, and the risks resulting from the operation of the human factor. Usually, they result in huge material losses, human sacrifice, loss of heritage (Djukić and Kocovic 2016). Risk management, in terms of cultural and natural heritage is a major problem (especially in low-income countries), since the assessment of the value of cultural heritage is as difficult as evaluation of emotional pain in insurance (Kocovic 2015; Kocovic and Djukic 2015). In World number of frequent catastrophic risks affecting the heritage is increasing, whereby the insurance companies are less interested in this type of insurance. After the terrorist attacks in New York, this event changed the approach of insurance companies (insurers). This extreme case of insurance against negative human action - terrorism, is more and more present in the world, endangering the World cultural heritage (monasteries in Kosovo, Palmira, etc.). Also, there are problems to cover the caused damages. Because as a result of this damages can seriously jeopardize the financial position of insurers, who are not willing to submit themselves losses due to adverse events. This situation led to the conclusion about the necessity of introducing public-private catastrophic risk insurance model in which the State will amortize the excess risk, that exceeds the financial capacity of insurance companies (Djukic and Kocovic 2016). Catastrophic risk management model in which the State is acting as reinsurer, in literature, means the market-supportive approach. In this approach the State relies on the administrative capacity of the private insurance market in performing appropriate functions including marketing, broadcasting of insurance policies, collecting premiums, assessment and payment of claims. The financial resources of the state are activated when the insured losses after the occurrence catastrophic event overcome the retention of direct insurers. This approach combines the state's ability to provide a broader scope of insurance coverage with the ability of private markets to apply effectively the principles of insurance (Djukic and Kocovic, 2016). Last, but not least, the insurance company in the name of corporate responsibility, can consider investing in common goods,

through the policies or better insurance conditions. In this manner, they will send a positive image to the public on the operations of insurance company, which is good for its image. At the same time this can initiate and wider acceptance of values and valuation of common goods by the community. In order to be adequately valorized, heritage must be factually, meaningful and symbolically rewarded in the consciousness of the community (Djukić and Kočović 2016). One of solution is seen through the participatory form of a new insurance, based on the establishment of pools of insurance (Djukic and Kocovic, 2016). In such solution, government should establish the compensation fund to manage catastrophic risks that represents a threat to heritage. Within such a fund, resources could be allocated to the specific types of risks (vandalism, natural heritage, cultural heritage, eco-cultural routes, etc.). In their previous scientific paper Djukic and Kocovic explained how pool works when it comes to risks of cultural heritage. In their example - case of sanctuaries in Kosovo and Metohija, by the model that the authors mentioned, monasteries would be ensured by pool of insurance on certain insured sum. In case that the harmful consequences increase, those damages would be endured and took over by formed dedicated compensation fund (Djukić, Kocovic 2016). Problems related to insurance of heritage, mostly relies on the problem of determining the insured amount / sum or the value of heritage. In determining the insured amount (which influences the amount of compensation from insurance in case of realization of the risk) we should use data from the past about the cost of restoring the damaged or destroyed natural and cultural heritage. When insured amount is calculated, it is necessary to add the item for prevention, which would be used for securing natural and cultural heritage (routes, tracks) from catastrophic risks. In the context of the natural heritage Kocovic stated that one of the ways to protect against the risk of environmental catastrophes and disasters is ecological insurance (whether initiated by natural disaster risks and action of man) (Kocovic, 2015). This type of insurance imposes mandatory application of preventive measures by the insured, such as companies and entrepreneurs, whose activity has resulted in disruption of the functioning of the environment.

Particularly significant aspect of the total participatory management of cultural and natural heritage is the management of heritage visits. Uncontrolled visits led to negative consequences, which should be prevented. The level of use or visit an area with associated heritage, brings with it endangering risks for vulnerable elements of the sites. Such risks / number of visitors are depended on location, season, type of activity, physical, economic and social characteristics of the environment. There are several variations on the theme of visitor management, which the author Kocovic explained in the thesis (Kocovic, 2016). Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS), is varied and has been modified over time in relation to needs. Different variations of ROS tools are designed, in order to manage the elements of nature and wild areas of various types of protected areas and heritage. As such, the ROS is an excellent tool for the development of new products eco-cultural tourism, visitor management, administration routes and link for attractions. In this manner ROS is a preventive tool for risk management.

Conclusion

Common resources are our common responsibility, and it is necessary to find as many alternative options to make their sustainable development secured. The challenges we are facing especially in the field of endangered environment through environmental degradation and climate change have been questioned sustainable development cultural and natural heritage. The significance of heritage value is reflected in the fact that the natural and cultural resources / heritage, through human labor, interpretation, protection and use, transfers symbols, meaning and providing new creative ways to be used.

We could see that in order to achieve this scenario – making heritage sustainable and make it more valuable, it demands horizontal changes and better institutional interactions between sectors, branches and departments that share governance, and risk management. Also, this scenario gives enough space for any interested relevant actor from the fields of eco-tourism and CCI, and it is very desirable in context of creation

new products. This will lead to scenario where sustainable development of heritage is secured over time and also creation of new values is supported by synergic operations from different fields, levels and sectors. We have selected some good examples that support our research question that the lateral branches (or responsible forms of tourism and CCI) contributes to the conservation and preservation of heritage, with a focus on community development and local economic development. We suggested new system solution that means more integrative management approach through participative governance. New model for heritage should connect many different sectors, departments, branches, variables. In this way, social, economic, environmental, cultural effects are stronger and more visible. More Integrative management solution that assumes participatory governance and mentioned strategies besides the issues important for use and values of cultural and natural heritage, should also include issues connected with: ecology, environmental protection, culture, tourism, economy, employment, insurance options for heritage from the catastrophic risk etc.

Based on findings of our research, it could be conducted that is necessary to design new system solutions in the management of heritage. New model of participative management with partnerships and linking strategies, would be much more effective because such a form of integrated action leads to the better social conditions in general. We also think that the way of dealing with heritage values, presupposes strong commitment in understanding specific markets that are relevant for heritage (eco-cultural tourism, CCI). This is important because it assumes optimal demand and creation of new products, that will led to better valuation of heritage. It is also important, as we could see from shown examples to develop as much as possible conditions that are conducive to the creation of synergy effects of eco-cultural tourism and the CCI. Because we consider eco-cultural tourism and CCI most relevant for the better understanding, perception, valorization, creation of added value, sustainable development - when it comes to heritage. Finally, our last recommendation refers to the importance of risk management and visitor management that threaten the heritage. Mentioned precautions should be adopted in any comprehensive approach to management of heritage, so heritage may achieve its primary objectives: the existence, storytelling, and creation of values. This paper is important because it gave directions for heritage treatment. Heritage as the common good is the oldest witness of culture and different events.

References

- BEETZ, V. F. (1988) *Cultuur en steden, Ruimtelijke Verkenningen*, The Hague: RPD.
- BHASKAR, R.A. (1998) *Critical Realism Essential Readings*. London: Routledge.
- BORSEKOVA, V.; PETRIKOVA, K.; PEVCIN, P. (2013) *Creativity and Intangibles in the 103 Public Sector: Sources and Socio-Economic Importance in Slovakia and Slovenia*. *Mednarodna revija za javno upravo*, XI(3–4), 103–120. <http://uprava.fu.uni-lj.si/index.php/IPAR/article/viewFile/250/232> approach: 8.08.2014.
- DJUKIC, V. (2010) *State and Culture. Studies of contemporary cultural policy*. Belgrade: Faculty of Dramatic arts.
- DJUKIC, V.; KOCOVIC, M. (2016) Risk management in the financial services sector: chapter 34: *The role of state in the insurance of cultural heritage from terrorism risk*, Ed: Jelena Kočović, Biljana Jovanović Gavrilović, Dejan Trifunović, Chris Daykin, Marina Evgenevna Baskakova, Drago Jakovčević, Branislav Boričić. pp: 565-580. Belgrade, Faculty of Economics, Publishing Centre.
- DJUKIC, V. (2015) *Problems with insurance of cultural heritage from catastrophe risks caused by natural disasters in Serbia. Chapter in monograph: Catastrophic risks and sustainable development*. Belgrade: Faculty of Economics, Publishing Centre.
- DRAŠKOVIĆ, B., (2012) *Ekonomski aspekti ekološke politike*. Institut ekonomskih nauka i BBA, Čigoja štampa, Beograd.

- FARAZMAND, A. (2004a) *Sound Governance in the Age of Globalization: A Conceptual Framework*. In Sound.
- FARAZMAND, A. (2004b) *Globalization and governance: A theoretical analysis*. In Sound Governance: Policy and Administrative Innovation.
- FLEW, T. (2009) The cultural economy moment, *Journal of Cultural Science*, 2(1), New Directions, <http://cultural-science.org/journal>
- FLORIDA, R. (2004) *The Rise of the Creative Class*, revised paperback edition. New York.
- GRAEBER, D. (2001) *Towards an Anthropological Theory of Value: The False Coin of Our Own Dreams*. New York: Palgrave.
- HOLDEN, J. (2004) *Capturing cultural value: how culture has become a tool of government policy*, pp: 33-34. DEMOS, London.
- ISAAC R. (2008) *Understanding the Behaviour of Cultural Tourists: Towards a Classification of Dutch Cultural Tourists*. pp: 16-25; 31-37. doctoral dissertation.
- JARBOE, K, P. (2007) *Measuring Intangibles: A Summary of Recent Activity paper commissioned by the Alliance for Science & Technology Research in America (ASTRA) as part of its Innovation Vital Signs project*.
- JENSEN, C, R.; GUTHRIE, S,P. (2006) *Outdoor Recreation in America* (6th edn) Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- KISIĆ, V. (2014) *Strategijsko upravljanje baštinom kao model za generisanje društvenih vrednosti*, Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of philosophy, Belgrade University.
- KLEIN, P. (1999) *New Institutional Economics*, internet source: <http://encyclo.findlaw.com/0530book.pdf>
- KOCOVIĆ, M. (2015) *The role of protected areas in managing catastrophic risks and its contribution to sustainable development*. Chapter in monograph: *Catastrophic risks and sustainable development*, Belgrade: Faculty of Economics, Publishing Centre.
- KOCOVIĆ, M., DJUKIĆ, V. (2015) Partnership as a strategy to achieve optimal participatory governance and risk mitigation (of cultural and natural heritage), *The ENCATC Journal of Cultural Management and Policy*, I SSN 2224-2554, online magazine
- KOCOVIĆ, M. (2015) *Doprinos upravljanja rizicima prirodnih katastrofa održivom razvoju zaštićenih područja*. Anali Ekonomskog Fakulteta u Subotici., ISSN: 0350-2120.
- KOCOVIĆ, M. (2016) *Contribution of eco-cultural tourism to sustainable development of protected areas with associated cultural and natural heritage*, PhD thesis, Faculty of Dramatic arts, Belgrade University.
- LASH, S.; URRY, J. (1994) *Economies of Signs and Space*, London: Sage.
- LAVERGNE, R.; SAXBY, J. (2001) *Capacity Development: Vision and Implications*. Capacity Development Occasional Series, pp:2-3, No 3: January 2001, Canadian.
- MCCARTHY, K.; ONDAATJE, E Z.L.; BROOKS, A. (2004) *Gifts of the muse: reframing the debate about the benefits of the arts*, pp:45-46. Rand Corporation, Santa Monica.
- MIKIĆ, H. (2015) *Local development and cultural industries*. GKE, pp. 42-53; 108-121, Belgrade.
- MUNN, N. (1973) *Symbolism in a Ritual Context: Aspects of Symbolic Action*. . p. 579–612. In: Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology (J. J. Honigmann, ed.), Chicago: Rand McNally.
- MURIITHI, J. (2013) *Eco-certification and Insertion of Socioeconomic and Cultural Best Practices in Ecotourism Operations in Kenya*. Department of Environmental Studies and Community Development, Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya.
- MURZYN-KUPISZ, M. (2012) Cultural, economic and social sustainability of heritage tourism: issues and challenges, *12(2)*, pp: 113-133, Krakow University of Economics, Poland.
- NOZICK, R. (1981) *Philosophical Explanation*. MA. pp: 162-164. Belknap Press, Cambridge.
- SCOTT, C. A. (2011) Measuring the immeasurable: capturing intangible values (pp. 1-20). *Marketing and Public Relations International Committee of ICOM*, Conference Keynote Brno, Czech Republic 19th.

- SCOTT, A. J. (2008b) *Social Economy of the Metropolis: Cognitive-Cultural Capitalism and the Global Resurgence of Cities*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SILVERMAN, L. (1993) Making meaning together: Lessons from the field of American history, *Journal of Museum Education*, 18(3), 7-11.
- SILVERMAN, L. (1995) Visitor meaning making in museums for a new age. *Curator-The Museum Journal*, 18(3), 161-169.
- THROSBY, D. (2008) Modeling the Cultural Industries, *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 14(3), 217-232.
- TIMOTHY, D.J.; Boyd, S.W. (2015) *Tourism and Trails Cultural, Ecological and Management Issues*, British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data.
- VICENTIJEVIC, D.; KOCOVIĆ M. (2016) Tourist valorization of the Gracanica monastery based on the Hilary du Cross model, *Thematic proceeding I, pp.452-468, The 1st International Scientific Conference*, Vrnjacka Banja. Faculty of tourism. University of Kragujevac.
- Best Practice Ecotourism Development Guidelines* October 2015. internet approach: <http://www.npsr.qld.gov.au/tourism/pdf/eoi-best-practice-ecotourism.pdf>
- DELGOSEA projects, internet approach: <http://www.delgosea.eu/cms/News/DELGOSEA-at-the-2015-ASEAN-Cities-Mayors-Forum>.
- Strategy for the Development of Eco-cultural Tourism*, in South Pentecost, 2014.
- EC, *Getting cultural heritage to work for Europe*. Report of the Horizon 2020, Expert Group on Cultural Heritage (2015).
- EENC, *Mapping of practices in the EU Member States on Participatory governance of cultural heritage to support the OMC working group under the same name (Work Plan for Culture 2015-2018)*. In Sani, M.; Lynch, B.; Visser, J.; Gariboldi, A. (eds.) (2015) *Short Analytical Report*. June.
- European Agenda for Culture 2011-2014, EC, http://ec.europa.eu/culture/library/publications/cci-policy-handbook_en.pdf
- Compendium of Best Practices in Sustainable Tourism, Wei, F. Prepared for United Nations, department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2013. internet approach: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/3322Compendium%20of%20Best%20Practices%20in%20Sustainable%20Tourism%20-%20Fen%20Wei%2001032014.pdf>
- YOUNGMANN, R. (2003) *Understanding and Measuring Intangibles: a journey of learning* viewed 3rd August and 4th September 2011 <http://www.intangability.com/wpcontent/uploads/2009/03/prism-understanding-and-measuring-intangibles.pdf>
- YUDICE, G. (2003) *The Experience of Culture: Uses of Culture in the Global Age*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.