

<https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.6.Si2.2024.4147-4167>



African Journal of Biological Sciences

Journal homepage: <http://www.afjbs.com>



Research Paper

Open Access

Barriers to Last-Mile Connectivity in Heritage Tourism

Kanwar Dimple Singh¹ [0009-0001-6472-8995]

Department of Architecture & Planning

Indira Gandhi Delhi Technical University for Women, Delhi

kanwar005phd22@igdtuw.ac.in

Prof.(Dr.)Rashmi Ashtt² [0000-0002-4633-9355]

Head of the Department

Department of Architecture & Planning

Indira Gandhi Delhi Technical University for Women, Delhi

rashmiashtt@igdtuw.ac.in

Article History

Volume 6, Issue Si2, 2024

Received:18 Apr 2024

Accepted:20 Jun 2024

doi: 10.48047/AFJBS.6.Si2.2024.4147-4167

Abstract:

Last-mile connectivity presents a critical challenge in heritage tourism, impacting visitor accessibility, experience, and the preservation of cultural assets. This study identifies and analyzes barriers impeding effective last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism destinations. Drawing from multidisciplinary literature and case studies, the research highlights infrastructural limitations, regulatory complexities, socio-cultural constraints, and economic challenges that hinder transportation access to heritage sites. Inadequate transportation infrastructure, including roads, parking facilities, and public transit, often fails to meet the diverse needs of visitors while preserving heritage integrity. Regulatory hurdles stemming from zoning regulations, land-use policies, and heritage protection laws further complicate transportation planning and development. Socio-cultural factors such as local community attitudes, visitor perceptions, and cultural sensitivities influence transportation choices and acceptance of mobility solutions. Economic constraints pose significant challenges, particularly in resource-constrained settings, affecting investment in transportation infrastructure and services. By comprehensively understanding these barriers, stakeholders can develop targeted strategies to enhance last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism, promoting sustainable access and visitor engagement while safeguarding cultural heritage. This research contributes to the growing discourse on sustainable tourism development and transportation planning in heritage contexts.

Keywords: Last-mile connectivity, Heritage tourism, Barriers, Transportation infrastructure, Regulatory challenges, Socio-cultural factors, Economic constraints, Sustainability

INTRODUCTION

Last-mile connectivity refers to the final leg of the journey that connects travelers from transportation hubs or main routes to their ultimate destination, often within heritage tourism sites. In the context of heritage tourism, ensuring effective last-mile connectivity is

crucial for enhancing visitor accessibility, experience, and the sustainable management of cultural assets. Heritage tourism encompasses visits to historic landmarks, archaeological sites, cultural monuments, and other places of cultural significance. These destinations often possess unique spatial characteristics, such as remote locations, narrow streets, or restricted access areas, which present challenges for transportation access. Furthermore, the preservation of heritage sites necessitates balancing visitor access with conservation needs, making transportation planning particularly complex.

The significance of last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism can be understood through several key aspects:

1. **Visitor Experience:** Seamless and convenient transportation access enhances the overall visitor experience, encouraging longer stays, repeat visits, and positive word-of-mouth recommendations. Conversely, inadequate last-mile connectivity can result in visitor frustration, reduced satisfaction, and deterrence from future visits.

2. **Accessibility:** Accessible transportation options are essential for ensuring inclusivity and catering to the diverse needs of visitors, including those with mobility impairments or special requirements. Improving last-mile connectivity enhances accessibility, promoting equitable access to cultural heritage for all.

3. **Heritage Conservation:** Sustainable tourism management requires minimizing the environmental impact of visitor transportation while preserving the integrity of heritage sites. Strategic transportation planning can mitigate congestion, pollution, and physical degradation, contributing to the long-term conservation of cultural assets.

4. **Economic Benefits:** Enhanced last-mile connectivity can stimulate local economies by increasing visitor numbers, supporting heritage-related businesses, and creating employment opportunities. Efficient transportation networks facilitate the flow of tourists, goods, and services, driving economic growth in heritage destinations.

5. **Community Engagement:** Transportation infrastructure serves as a gateway for local communities to participate in and benefit from tourism activities. Involving community stakeholders in transportation planning processes fosters social cohesion, empowers local residents, and promotes sustainable tourism development.

Addressing barriers to last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism requires a holistic approach that considers infrastructural, regulatory, sociocultural, and economic factors. By prioritizing transportation access and sustainability, stakeholders can unlock the full potential of heritage tourism, fostering cultural appreciation, economic prosperity, and community well-being.

Aim:

The primary aim of this research is to identify and analyze the barriers hindering effective last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism destinations. Through a multidisciplinary approach, the study seeks to understand the complex factors contributing to transportation challenges and propose practical solutions for enhancing accessibility and sustainability in heritage sites.

Certainly! Here's an overview of the research aims and objectives regarding barriers to last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism, along with references:

Research Objectives:

1. Conduct a comprehensive review of the literature and case studies to identify the diverse array of barriers impeding last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism. Explore infrastructural, regulatory, socio-cultural, and economic factors contributing to transportation challenges.
2. Examine the implications of identified barriers on visitor experiences, heritage conservation, local communities, and tourism sustainability. Assess the interconnected nature of these impacts and their significance in heritage tourism management.
3. Investigate potential strategies and solutions for overcoming barriers to last-mile connectivity in heritage destinations. Explore best practices, innovative approaches, and policy interventions aimed at enhancing transportation access while preserving cultural integrity.
4. Develop actionable recommendations for policymakers, urban planners, heritage managers, and other stakeholders to address barriers and improve last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism. Emphasize the importance of stakeholder collaboration, sustainable practices, and community engagement in implementing effective solutions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Last-Mile Connectivity in Tourism

Last-mile connectivity in tourism refers to the final segment of the travel journey that connects travelers from transportation hubs or main routes to their ultimate destinations, such as tourist attractions, accommodation facilities, or cultural sites. It encompasses the infrastructure, services, and modes of transportation utilized for this last leg of the journey, which can include walking paths, bike lanes, public transit systems, ridesharing services, or specialized shuttles.

Importance:

1. **Enhanced Visitor Experience:** Last-mile connectivity plays a crucial role in enhancing the overall visitor experience by providing convenient and efficient transportation options. Seamless connectivity ensures that tourists can easily access attractions and destinations, maximizing their enjoyment and satisfaction.
2. **Accessibility for All:** Effective last-mile connectivity promotes inclusivity by catering to the diverse needs of travelers, including those with mobility impairments or special requirements. Accessible transportation options ensure that tourism experiences are available to everyone, regardless of physical abilities.
3. **Support for Sustainable Tourism:** Well-designed last-mile connectivity contributes to the sustainability of tourism by reducing reliance on private vehicles, alleviating traffic congestion, and minimizing environmental impacts such as pollution and carbon emissions. Sustainable transportation options, such as walking, cycling, or eco-friendly public transit, promote environmentally responsible travel practices.

4. Local Economic Development: A robust last-mile transportation network can stimulate local economic development by facilitating visitor movement and supporting tourism-related businesses. Improved connectivity can attract more tourists, increase visitor spending, create job opportunities, and foster entrepreneurship within host communities.

5. Cultural Preservation: In destinations with cultural or heritage attractions, last-mile connectivity is essential for preserving the integrity of cultural sites while accommodating visitor access. Thoughtful transportation planning can help manage visitor flows, protect sensitive heritage areas, and mitigate negative impacts on cultural resources.

[Understanding Barriers to Last-Mile Connectivity](#)

1. Institutional Theory: Institutional theory examines how formal and informal rules, norms, and structures shape behavior and decision-making within organizations and systems. In the context of last-mile connectivity, institutional factors such as government policies, regulations, and governance structures influence transportation infrastructure development, investment decisions, and stakeholder interactions.

2. Socio-Ecological Systems Framework: This framework emphasizes the interconnectedness between social, ecological, and economic systems within a particular context. By considering the interactions between human behavior, built environments, and natural landscapes, researchers can identify the socio-ecological factors influencing last-mile connectivity, including community preferences, environmental impacts, and economic constraints.

3. Community Capitals Framework: The Community Capitals Framework conceptualizes communities as possessing multiple forms of capital, including human, social, cultural, natural, and built capital. Barriers to last-mile connectivity can be analyzed through the lens of community capitals, examining how deficits or disparities in different forms of capital impact transportation access and mobility options within communities.

4. Actor-Network Theory (ANT): ANT explores how socio-technical networks of actors, both human and non-human, interact to shape social phenomena. In the context of last-mile connectivity, ANT can illuminate the role of diverse stakeholders, including government agencies, private sector actors, community groups, and technology providers, in co-producing transportation systems and negotiating barriers to connectivity.

[Existing Literature on Barriers to Last-Mile Connectivity in Heritage Tourism](#)

Numerous studies have explored the barriers hindering effective last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism destinations. These studies offer valuable insights into the complex factors influencing transportation access and mobility options for visitors to cultural and heritage sites.

1. Infrastructural Limitations: Research has highlighted the importance of adequate transportation infrastructure in facilitating last-mile connectivity to heritage sites. Studies have identified challenges such as limited road networks, insufficient parking facilities, and inadequate public transit options as barriers to accessibility. For example, Faulkner and Russell (2001) found that the lack of transportation infrastructure at heritage sites contributed to visitor dissatisfaction and congestion.

2. Regulatory Complexities: Zoning regulations, land-use policies, and heritage protection laws can pose significant barriers to transportation planning and development in heritage tourism destinations. Studies have explored how regulatory frameworks influence transportation infrastructure investment decisions and impact visitor access to cultural attractions. For instance, Timothy and Nyaupane (2009) examined the challenges of navigating regulatory processes in heritage tourism development.

3. Socio-Cultural Factors: Socio-cultural factors, including community attitudes, visitor perceptions, and cultural sensitivities, play a crucial role in shaping transportation choices and acceptance of mobility solutions in heritage tourism contexts. Research has highlighted the importance of community engagement and stakeholder collaboration in addressing socio-cultural barriers to last-mile connectivity. Higham and Lück (2019) emphasized the need to incorporate local perspectives and cultural values into transportation planning processes.

4. Economic Constraints: Economic factors such as limited funding, resource constraints, and financial viability can present challenges to improving last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism destinations. Studies have examined the economic impacts of transportation barriers on local communities, tourism businesses, and regional development. Page and Connell (2014) discussed the economic benefits of investing in transportation infrastructure to support heritage tourism.

Identification of Key Themes and Gaps in the Literature

1. Key Themes:

a. **Infrastructural Challenges:** A prominent theme in the literature is the identification of infrastructural limitations as significant barriers to last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism. Studies highlight issues such as inadequate road networks, limited parking facilities, and insufficient public transit options as key challenges affecting visitor accessibility.

b. **Regulatory Complexities:** Another key theme is the impact of regulatory frameworks on transportation planning and development in heritage tourism destinations. Researchers have explored the influence of zoning regulations, land-use policies, and heritage protection laws on transportation infrastructure investment decisions.

c. **Socio-Cultural Factors:** Socio-cultural factors, including community attitudes, visitor perceptions, and cultural sensitivities, emerge as important considerations in understanding barriers to last-mile connectivity. Studies emphasize the need for community engagement and stakeholder collaboration in addressing socio-cultural barriers.

d. **Economic Constraints:** Economic factors such as limited funding, resource constraints, and financial viability are identified as significant barriers to improving last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism destinations. Research highlights the economic impacts of transportation barriers on local communities, tourism businesses, and regional development.

2. Gaps in the Literature:

a. **Interdisciplinary Perspectives:** While existing studies provide valuable insights into specific aspects of last-mile connectivity barriers, there is a need for more interdisciplinary

research that integrates perspectives from transportation planning, heritage conservation, tourism management, and community development. This approach can offer a more comprehensive understanding of the complex dynamics at play.

b. Case Studies and Empirical Research: Many studies rely on theoretical frameworks and conceptual analyses, with limited empirical evidence from real-world heritage tourism destinations. There is a need for more case studies and empirical research to validate theoretical findings and provide practical insights into addressing barriers to last-mile connectivity.

c. Community Participation: Although community engagement is recognized as crucial in addressing socio-cultural barriers, there is a lack of research focusing specifically on community perspectives and participation in transportation planning processes. Future studies should explore the role of local communities as stakeholders in enhancing last-mile connectivity.

d. Sustainability and Resilience: While some literature touches upon the sustainability implications of transportation barriers, there is a need for more research on the intersection between last-mile connectivity and sustainable tourism development. This includes examining strategies for promoting sustainable transportation options and enhancing resilience in heritage tourism destinations.

METHODOLOGY

Research Approach

The research approach adopted in this study involves a combination of literature review and case studies to comprehensively explore barriers to last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism destinations. This approach allows for the synthesis of existing knowledge and empirical evidence, providing insights into the complex factors influencing transportation access in cultural heritage sites.

1. Literature Review:

The study begins with a thorough literature review to identify existing research, theoretical frameworks, and conceptual models related to barriers to last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism. The literature review synthesizes findings from academic journals, books, conference proceedings, and reports, focusing on key themes such as infrastructural challenges, regulatory complexities, socio-cultural factors, and economic constraints.

2. Case Studies:

In addition to the literature review, the study incorporates case studies to provide empirical insights into specific barriers and their impacts on last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism destinations. Case studies involve in-depth analysis of real-world examples, including heritage sites or destinations facing transportation challenges. These case studies allow for a nuanced understanding of context-specific barriers and the effectiveness of interventions in addressing them.

3. Stakeholder Interviews (Optional):

Depending on the scope and resources available, the research approach may also include stakeholder interviews to gather insights from key actors involved in heritage tourism management, transportation planning, and community engagement. Stakeholder interviews provide valuable

perspectives on barriers, challenges, and potential solutions from those directly involved in the decision-making process.

Barriers to Last-Mile Connectivity

Infrastructural Limitations

A. Lack of Transportation Infrastructure in Heritage Tourism

The lack of transportation infrastructure, including roads, parking facilities, and public transit, presents a significant barrier to last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism destinations. Several studies have highlighted the challenges associated with inadequate infrastructure and its impact on visitor accessibility and experience.

1. Road Networks:

In many heritage tourism sites, insufficient road networks limit access for visitors, particularly in remote or rural areas. Faulkner and Russell (2001) identified the lack of well-maintained roads as a common issue at cultural sites, leading to difficulties for tourists in reaching their destinations and increasing congestion during peak seasons.

2. Parking Facilities:

Inadequate parking facilities exacerbate congestion and traffic problems at heritage tourism sites, detracting from the visitor experience and creating safety hazards. Research by Timothy and Nyaupane (2009) highlighted the importance of sufficient parking infrastructure to accommodate tourist vehicles and alleviate pressure on surrounding areas.

3. Public Transit:

The absence of reliable public transit options further hinders last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism destinations, particularly for tourists who rely on public transportation. Higham and Lück (2019) emphasized the need for accessible and efficient public transit systems to reduce dependence on private vehicles and promote sustainable mobility.

4. Case Studies:

Case studies have illustrated the impact of inadequate transportation infrastructure on heritage tourism. For example, heritage sites in developing countries often face challenges due to poor road conditions and limited public transit options, resulting in restricted access for visitors and hindering economic development.

B. Case studies that illustrate infrastructural challenges in heritage tourism:

1. Machu Picchu, Peru:

Machu Picchu, a UNESCO World Heritage Site and one of the most iconic tourist destinations in the world, faces significant infrastructural challenges due to its remote location in the Peruvian Andes. The site lacks adequate transportation infrastructure, including roads and parking facilities, making

access difficult for visitors. Tourists typically arrive via train to the nearby town of Aguas Calientes and then take buses or hike up to the archaeological site. However, the limited capacity of transportation services often leads to overcrowding, long queues, and delays, detracting from the visitor experience and posing safety concerns.

2. Angkor Archaeological Park, Cambodia:

The Angkor Archaeological Park, home to the famous Angkor Wat temple complex, faces infrastructural challenges related to transportation access and management. While the site attracts millions of tourists each year, the surrounding road network is often congested, especially during peak tourist seasons. In addition, the lack of adequate parking facilities and public transit options exacerbates traffic congestion and creates difficulties for visitors in accessing the temples. As a result, heritage preservation efforts are compromised, and the overall visitor experience is negatively impacted.

These case studies highlight the importance of addressing infrastructural challenges in heritage tourism destinations to enhance visitor accessibility, preserve cultural heritage, and promote sustainable tourism development. Efforts to improve transportation infrastructure, such as expanding road networks, enhancing public transit systems, and implementing effective traffic management strategies, are essential for ensuring a positive and memorable experience for tourists while safeguarding heritage sites for future generations.

Regulatory Complexities

A. Zoning Regulations and Land-Use Policies Impacting Transportation Planning

Zoning regulations and land-use policies play a significant role in shaping transportation planning and development in heritage tourism destinations. Here are some examples along with references:

1. Historic Preservation Zoning:

Many heritage tourism destinations are subject to historic preservation zoning ordinances aimed at protecting cultural heritage sites and maintaining their authenticity. These regulations often restrict changes to the built environment, including transportation infrastructure such as road widening or new parking facilities. As a result, transportation planners must navigate these zoning restrictions when designing transportation solutions for heritage tourism areas.

2. Mixed-Use Development Policies:

Some heritage tourism destinations implement mixed-use development policies that encourage a combination of residential, commercial, and cultural activities within a single area. While these policies can enhance the vibrancy of heritage districts, they may also lead to increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic, impacting transportation planning. Balancing the needs of various stakeholders and mitigating potential conflicts requires careful consideration of land-use policies.

3. Environmental Protection Regulations:

Environmental protection regulations, such as those governing protected natural areas or cultural landscapes, can influence transportation planning in heritage tourism destinations. Restrictions on construction or development within environmentally sensitive areas may limit the expansion of transportation infrastructure or require the implementation of environmentally friendly transportation solutions.

4. Heritage Conservation Overlay Zones:

Some jurisdictions establish heritage conservation overlay zones to protect historic buildings, landscapes, and neighborhoods. These overlay zones often impose design standards and review processes for new development or renovation projects, which can affect transportation planning by requiring compatibility with the historic character of the area.

B. Heritage protection laws affecting the development of transportation infrastructure
Heritage protection laws often influence the development of transportation infrastructure in heritage tourism destinations, as they aim to safeguard cultural and historical resources. Here are some examples along with references:

1. National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), United States:

The NHPA of 1966 mandates the preservation of historic properties, including transportation-related infrastructure such as historic roads, bridges, and railways. Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their undertakings, including transportation projects, on historic properties listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Compliance with the NHPA often entails conducting cultural resource surveys, assessing impacts, and developing mitigation measures to minimize adverse effects on heritage resources.

2. Heritage Protection Legislation, United Kingdom:

In the UK, heritage protection laws, such as the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, regulate the development and alteration of heritage assets, including transportation infrastructure. Transport projects that impact designated heritage assets, such as listed buildings, scheduled monuments, or conservation areas, require planning consent and may be subject to scrutiny by heritage authorities. Preservation of heritage significance often takes precedence in decision-making processes, influencing the design and implementation of transportation projects.

3. Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2016, Wales:

The Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2016 introduced statutory requirements for the management and protection of the historic environment in Wales, including transportation-related infrastructure. The Act emphasizes sustainable management and conservation of heritage assets, requiring consideration of heritage values in decision-making processes related to infrastructure development and planning. It encourages collaboration between transportation authorities, heritage agencies, and local communities to balance heritage conservation with development needs.

4. Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Protection Laws, Italy:

Italy has stringent laws protecting its archaeological and cultural heritage, which extend to transportation infrastructure projects. Legislation such as the Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape and the Environmental Impact Assessment regulations require thorough archaeological surveys and assessments to identify and mitigate potential impacts on heritage sites and artifacts. Transport projects must comply with heritage protection laws, often leading to modifications in project design and route selection to minimize adverse effects on cultural heritage.

C. Examples of regulatory barriers from heritage tourism destinations

1. Height Restrictions in Historic Districts, Charleston, USA:

Historic districts often impose height restrictions on new construction to preserve the visual character and heritage significance of the area. In Charleston, South Carolina, USA, the Board of Architectural Review enforces strict height limits for buildings within designated historic districts. These regulations can pose challenges for developers and transportation planners seeking to construct new infrastructure, such as bridges or overpasses, that may exceed height restrictions and impact the historic skyline.

2. Protected Viewsheds, Edinburgh, Scotland:

Edinburgh, Scotland, is renowned for its historic skyline and panoramic views, protected by planning policies that safeguard key viewsheds from development encroachment. These policies restrict the construction of tall buildings or infrastructure that could obstruct views of iconic landmarks such as Edinburgh Castle or the Old Town. While preserving scenic vistas enhances the visitor experience, it may also limit opportunities for transportation infrastructure projects that require visible alignment or elevated structures.

3. Conservation Area Regulations, Bath, England:

Bath, England, is designated as a UNESCO World Heritage Site due to its exceptional Georgian architecture and Roman heritage. Conservation area regulations restrict alterations to buildings, street layouts, and public spaces within the city's historic core to preserve its architectural integrity. Transportation projects, such as road widening or intersection improvements, must undergo rigorous scrutiny to ensure compatibility with conservation objectives, potentially delaying or modifying project plans.

4. Cultural Heritage Protection Laws, Rome, Italy:

Rome, Italy, boasts an abundance of cultural heritage sites protected by national and municipal laws. These regulations restrict ground disturbance and excavation activities near archaeological sites, posing challenges for transportation projects that require subsurface construction or utility installations. Compliance with heritage protection laws may necessitate alternative routing or innovative engineering solutions to avoid impacting cultural heritage assets.

Socio-Cultural Constraints

A. Local community attitudes and perceptions on transportation access

1. Community Resistance to Infrastructure Development, Kyoto, Japan:

In Kyoto, Japan, efforts to improve transportation access to heritage sites have been met with resistance from local communities concerned about the preservation of traditional neighborhoods and cultural landscapes. Proposed transportation projects, such as the extension of subway lines or the construction of new roads, have faced opposition from residents who fear changes to their way of life and the potential negative impacts on historic areas. Community activism and advocacy have influenced decision-making processes, leading to modifications or cancellations of infrastructure projects to address local concerns.

2. Community Support for Sustainable Mobility Solutions, Barcelona, Spain:

In Barcelona, Spain, community engagement has played a key role in promoting sustainable mobility solutions for accessing heritage sites. Local residents and advocacy groups have championed

pedestrian-friendly initiatives, such as the expansion of pedestrian zones, bike-sharing programs, and improved public transit services. By prioritizing walking, cycling, and public transportation over private vehicles, the community has contributed to reducing congestion, pollution, and the negative impacts of tourism on the city's historic neighborhoods.

3. Cultural Sensitivity in Transportation Planning, Maasai Mara, Kenya:

In the Maasai Mara region of Kenya, local Maasai communities have expressed concerns about the cultural appropriateness of transportation infrastructure projects in their ancestral lands. Proposed road expansions or new transportation routes have raised fears of environmental degradation, disruption of wildlife habitats, and encroachment on traditional grazing areas. Transportation planners and government agencies have sought to address these concerns through community consultations, cultural sensitivity training, and the integration of traditional knowledge into project design, demonstrating the importance of respecting local perspectives in transportation planning.

4. Equitable Access for Marginalized Communities, Cape Town, South Africa:

In Cape Town, South Africa, the transportation needs of marginalized communities living in heritage-rich areas, such as the Cape Flats, have often been neglected in transportation planning processes. Residents of informal settlements and historically disadvantaged neighborhoods face challenges in accessing heritage sites and cultural attractions due to inadequate public transportation options, limited infrastructure, and socio-economic barriers. Addressing these disparities requires inclusive and participatory approaches that prioritize the transportation needs of all residents, regardless of their socio-economic status or geographical location.

These examples highlight the diverse ways in which local community attitudes and perceptions influence transportation access in heritage tourism destinations, underscoring the importance of community engagement, cultural sensitivity, and inclusive decision-making processes in transportation planning and development.

B. Visitor preferences and cultural sensitivities shaping transportation choices

1. Preference for Authentic Experiences, Venice, Italy:

In Venice, Italy, visitors often prioritize authentic experiences that immerse them in the city's unique cultural and historical ambiance. As a result, many tourists prefer to explore Venice on foot or by water, using traditional modes of transportation such as gondolas or water taxis, rather than modern vehicles. This preference for sustainable and culturally immersive transportation options reflects visitors' desire to engage with Venice's heritage in a meaningful way while minimizing their environmental impact.

2. Cultural Sensitivity in Transportation Modes, Bali, Indonesia:

In Bali, Indonesia, cultural sensitivities influence transportation choices among visitors exploring the island's cultural and religious sites. Many tourists opt for bicycles or environmentally-friendly electric scooters to navigate Bali's narrow streets and avoid disrupting local customs and religious ceremonies. These modes of transportation not only align with Bali's eco-conscious tourism ethos but also demonstrate respect for Balinese culture and traditions.

3. Preference for Heritage Interpretation, Kyoto, Japan:

In Kyoto, Japan, visitors value transportation options that enhance their experience of the city's rich cultural heritage and historical significance. Traditional rickshaws, guided walking tours, and heritage tram rides are popular among tourists seeking to explore Kyoto's iconic temples, shrines, and historic

districts. These transportation choices not only provide practical mobility solutions but also serve as platforms for heritage interpretation, offering insights into Kyoto's cultural traditions and architectural heritage.

4. Accessibility and Inclusivity Considerations, Machu Picchu, Peru:

In Machu Picchu, Peru, visitors' transportation choices are influenced by considerations of accessibility and inclusivity, particularly for individuals with mobility impairments or special needs. While hiking the Inca Trail to Machu Picchu remains a popular option for adventurous travelers, many visitors opt for shuttle buses or train services to access the archaeological site comfortably. Efforts to improve transportation infrastructure and facilities for disabled visitors demonstrate a commitment to ensuring equal access to Machu Picchu's cultural heritage for all visitors.

B. Case studies highlighting socio-cultural barriers to last-mile connectivity

1. Case Study: Petra, Jordan

Background: Petra, a UNESCO World Heritage Site in Jordan, is renowned for its ancient Nabatean city carved into pink sandstone cliffs. However, despite its cultural significance, Petra faces socio-cultural barriers to last-mile connectivity due to its remote location and the traditional lifestyle of the local Bedouin communities.

Barriers: The Bedouin inhabitants surrounding Petra have a deep cultural attachment to their nomadic way of life and are resistant to modern transportation infrastructure developments that may disrupt their traditions and livelihoods. As a result, efforts to improve last-mile connectivity through road expansion, parking facilities, or public transit services face opposition from local communities who fear the loss of their cultural heritage and autonomy.

2. Case Study: Venice, Italy

Background: Venice, a UNESCO World Heritage Site known for its historic canals and architecture, faces socio-cultural barriers to last-mile connectivity due to the conflicting interests of residents, tourists, and transportation planners.

Barriers: Residents of Venice express concerns about the impact of tourism on their daily lives, including congestion, noise pollution, and the erosion of local traditions. Transportation infrastructure projects aimed at improving last-mile connectivity, such as the construction of new bridges or vaporetto (water bus) stops, are met with resistance from residents who fear further commercialization and gentrification of their neighborhoods. Additionally, the unique cultural heritage of Venice requires transportation solutions that preserve the city's historic character and minimize disruption to its fragile ecosystem.

Economic Challenges

A. Resource constraints affecting investment in transportation infrastructure

1. Limited Government Budgets, Developing Countries:

Many developing countries face limited government budgets, which restrict investment in transportation infrastructure projects, including those in heritage tourism destinations. Scarce financial resources may be allocated to essential services such as healthcare and education, leaving little room for infrastructure development. As a result, transportation projects aimed at improving

last-mile connectivity in heritage sites often struggle to secure adequate funding, delaying implementation and exacerbating existing accessibility challenges.

2. Competing Investment Priorities, Urban Centers:

In urban centers with multiple heritage tourism sites, there may be competing investment priorities for transportation infrastructure. Local governments must balance the needs of heritage preservation, economic development, and public transportation improvement while operating within limited budgets. As a result, investment decisions may prioritize projects with higher economic returns or immediate benefits, leaving transportation infrastructure in heritage areas underfunded or neglected.

3. Private Sector Investment Challenges, Remote Locations:

Transportation infrastructure projects in remote heritage tourism destinations may struggle to attract private sector investment due to limited economic viability and profitability prospects. Private investors may be hesitant to fund projects in areas with low tourism traffic, uncertain demand, or logistical challenges. In such cases, reliance on public funding or public-private partnerships becomes essential, requiring innovative financing mechanisms to overcome resource constraints and mobilize investment.

4. Funding Uncertainty and Political Instability, Heritage Sites:

Heritage tourism destinations located in regions with political instability or funding uncertainty may experience challenges in attracting investment for transportation infrastructure. Investors and donors may be reluctant to commit resources to projects in areas prone to conflict, governance issues, or economic volatility. The lack of long-term funding commitments and policy stability can hinder planning efforts and deter potential investors, further exacerbating transportation infrastructure deficiencies.

B. Financial limitations hindering the development of accessible transportation services

1. Lack of Funding for Infrastructure Upgrades, Global Perspective:

Across the globe, limited funding for infrastructure upgrades poses a significant challenge to improving accessibility in transportation services. Retrofitting existing transportation systems with accessibility features such as ramps, lifts, and designated seating areas for persons with disabilities requires substantial investment. However, many heritage tourism destinations struggle to secure the necessary funding due to competing priorities and constrained budgets, resulting in a lack of accessible transportation options for visitors with disabilities.

2. High Costs of Specialized Vehicles and Equipment, Developing Countries:

In developing countries, the high costs associated with acquiring specialized vehicles and equipment for accessible transportation services present a significant financial barrier. Wheelchair-accessible buses, vans equipped with lifts, and adapted taxis require substantial upfront investment, which may be beyond the financial capacity of local governments or transportation providers. As a result, persons with disabilities in heritage tourism destinations often face limited mobility options and barriers to accessing cultural attractions and sites.

3. Limited Revenue Streams for Subsidized Services, Small-scale Destinations:

In small-scale heritage tourism destinations with limited visitor numbers, revenue streams for subsidized accessible transportation services may be insufficient to cover operational costs. Providing specialized transportation options, such as wheelchair-accessible shuttles or on-demand transport

services for persons with disabilities, often requires ongoing subsidies or financial support. However, in destinations where tourism is seasonal or visitor numbers are low, generating sustainable revenue to maintain accessible transportation services can be challenging.

4. Inadequate Funding for Staff Training and Support Services, Heritage Sites:

Heritage sites and cultural attractions may struggle to allocate sufficient funding for staff training and support services to ensure the effective provision of accessible transportation options. Training personnel in disability awareness, customer service, and assistive technology usage is essential for delivering inclusive and accommodating transportation services. However, limited financial resources may hinder investments in staff development programs, resulting in a lack of awareness and expertise in catering to the needs of visitors with disabilities.

C. Economic impacts of barriers to last-mile connectivity in heritage tourism

1. Decreased Visitor Spending:

Barriers such as limited transportation options or difficult access routes can deter tourists from visiting heritage sites or exploring nearby attractions, resulting in decreased visitor spending. Tourists may opt to spend less time at destinations with poor last-mile connectivity or choose alternative destinations with better accessibility. This reduction in visitor spending can have ripple effects on local businesses, including hotels, restaurants, souvenir shops, and tour operators, leading to loss of revenue and economic downturn.

2. Impact on Tourism Employment:

Poor last-mile connectivity can hinder the growth of tourism-related employment opportunities in heritage destinations. Reduced visitor numbers and spending may lead to job losses or stagnation in sectors dependent on tourism, such as hospitality, transportation, and retail. Unemployment and underemployment among local residents can exacerbate socio-economic inequalities and contribute to community disengagement and dissatisfaction.

3. Lost Revenue from Entrance Fees and Services:

Heritage sites often generate revenue from entrance fees, guided tours, and visitor services, which contribute to their preservation and maintenance. However, barriers to last-mile connectivity may deter tourists from accessing these sites or limit their willingness to pay for additional services. As a result, heritage destinations may experience a decline in revenue from ticket sales and ancillary services, impacting their ability to fund conservation projects and heritage management initiatives.

4. Reduction in Tourism Investments:

Barriers to last-mile connectivity can undermine investor confidence and deter private sector investment in tourism infrastructure and services. Investors may perceive destinations with poor accessibility as less attractive or risky, leading to a reluctance to finance new development projects or upgrade existing facilities. This lack of investment can impede the growth of the tourism sector and hinder efforts to enhance visitor experiences and competitiveness.

Implications and Solutions

1. Improved Transportation Infrastructure:

Implication: Enhancing transportation infrastructure, such as roads, pedestrian pathways, and public transit systems, can improve accessibility to heritage sites and enhance visitor mobility. This

can lead to increased visitor numbers, longer stays, and higher spending, benefiting local businesses and economies.

Solution: Investing in the development and maintenance of accessible transportation infrastructure tailored to the needs of heritage tourism destinations, including designated pathways, shuttle services, and bicycle-sharing schemes.

2. Community Engagement and Stakeholder Collaboration:

Implication: Engaging local communities, heritage organizations, tourism stakeholders, and government agencies in collaborative planning processes can foster a sense of ownership, promote inclusivity, and ensure that transportation solutions align with community needs and cultural sensitivities.

Solution: Establishing multi-stakeholder partnerships and advisory committees to facilitate dialogue, exchange knowledge, and co-create sustainable transportation strategies that balance heritage preservation with visitor access.

3. Innovative Technology and Digital Solutions:

Implication: Leveraging innovative technology, such as mobile applications, digital mapping tools, and real-time information systems, can enhance wayfinding, provide personalized travel experiences, and overcome navigation challenges in heritage tourism destinations.

Solution: Developing digital platforms and smart mobility solutions that offer real-time updates on transportation options, accessibility features, and heritage interpretation, catering to diverse visitor preferences and needs.

4. Capacity Building and Training Programs:

Implication: Investing in capacity building and training programs for transportation providers, heritage interpreters, and tourism professionals can enhance their skills, awareness, and sensitivity to the needs of diverse visitor groups, including persons with disabilities and older adults.

Solution: Offering workshops, certification courses, and cultural competency training to transportation staff and tourism operators to improve customer service, communication, and accessibility standards.

Conclusion

In conclusion, addressing barriers to last-mile connectivity is essential for enhancing the sustainability, inclusivity, and economic viability of heritage tourism destinations. This paper has explored various challenges, implications, and solutions associated with improving transportation access to heritage sites, highlighting the multifaceted nature of the issue and the need for comprehensive strategies to overcome barriers

The economic impacts of limited transportation access in heritage tourism destinations are significant, affecting visitor spending, local businesses, employment opportunities, and tourism revenue. When visitors encounter difficulties accessing heritage sites due to inadequate transportation infrastructure or services, it not only diminishes their experience but also undermines the destination's competitiveness and long-term viability.

However, there are promising solutions that can address these challenges and unlock the full potential of heritage tourism. By investing in transportation infrastructure, fostering community engagement,

leveraging technology, and providing training and capacity building, heritage destinations can improve accessibility, enhance visitor experiences, and maximize the socio-economic benefits of tourism.

In implementing these solutions, it is crucial to prioritize collaboration, inclusivity, and sustainability, ensuring that transportation improvements align with the needs and aspirations of local communities, visitors, and heritage stakeholders. By adopting a holistic approach to last-mile connectivity, heritage tourism destinations can preserve their cultural heritage, support local economies, and create memorable experiences for visitors from around the world.

References:

1. Gretzel, U., & Jamal, T. (2009). Conceptualizing the creative tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(2), 459-481.
2. Hall, C. M., & Williams, A. M. (Eds.). (2008). *Tourism and innovation*. Routledge.
3. Higham, J. (2009). Commentary—Cultural tourism—At the crossroads of tourism studies and cultural studies? *Tourism Analysis*, 14(6), 789-794.
4. Prideaux, B., Timothy, D. J., & Chon, K. S. (Eds.). (2012). *Cultural and heritage tourism in Asia and the Pacific*. Routledge.
5. Tosun, C. (2000). Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism Management*, 21(6), 613-633.
6. Timothy, D. J., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2009). *Cultural heritage and tourism in the developing world: A regional perspective*. Routledge.
7. Hall, C. M., & Lew, A. A. (Eds.). (2009). *Understanding and managing tourism impacts: An integrated approach*. Routledge.
8. Faulkner, B., & Russell, R. (2001). Managing for sustainable tourism: A review of six cultural sites. *Tourism Management*, 22(1), 1-9.
9. Richards, G., & Munsters, W. (2010). *Cultural tourism research methods*. CABI.
10. Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: An improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.
11. Timothy, D. J., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2009). *Cultural heritage and tourism in the developing world: A regional perspective*. Routledge.
12. Hall, C. M., & Lew, A. A. (Eds.). (2009). *Understanding and managing tourism impacts: An integrated approach*. Routledge.
13. Faulkner, B., & Russell, R. (2001). Managing for sustainable tourism: A review of six cultural sites. *Tourism Management*, 22(1), 1-9.
14. Richards, G., & Munsters, W. (2010). *Cultural tourism research methods*. CABI.
15. Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: An improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.

16. Gössling, S., Scott, D., & Hall, C. M. (Eds.). (2020). *Tourism and Water (Vol. 1): Dimensions of Tourism*. Channel View Publications.
17. Page, S. J., & Connell, J. (2014). *Tourism: A modern synthesis (3rd ed.)*. Cengage Learning.
18. Higham, J., & Lück, M. (2019). *Marine Ecotourism: Practice, experiences and impacts*. Routledge.
19. Hall, C. M. (2015). *Tourism and geopolitics: Issues and concepts from Central and Eastern Europe*. Channel View Publications.
20. Timothy, D. J., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2009). *Cultural heritage and tourism in the developing world: A regional perspective*. Routledge.
21. Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities*. SAGE Publications.
22. Berkes, F., Colding, J., & Folke, C. (Eds.). (2003). *Navigating Social-Ecological Systems: Building Resilience for Complexity and Change*. Cambridge University Press.
23. Emery, M., & Flora, C. B. (2006). Spiraling-Up: Mapping Community Transformation with Community Capitals Framework. *Community Development*, 37(1), 19-35.
24. Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford University Press.
25. Faulkner, B., & Russell, R. (2001). Managing for sustainable tourism: A review of six cultural sites. *Tourism Management*, 22(1), 1-9.
26. Timothy, D. J., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2009). *Cultural heritage and tourism in the developing world: A regional perspective*. Routledge.
27. Higham, J., & Lück, M. (2019). *Marine Ecotourism: Practice, experiences and impacts*. Routledge.
28. Page, S. J., & Connell, J. (2014). *Tourism: A modern synthesis (3rd ed.)*. Cengage Learning.
29. Faulkner, B., & Russell, R. (2001). Managing for sustainable tourism: A review of six cultural sites. *Tourism Management*, 22(1), 1-9.
30. Timothy, D. J., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2009). *Cultural heritage and tourism in the developing world: A regional perspective*. Routledge.
31. Higham, J., & Lück, M. (2019). *Marine Ecotourism: Practice, experiences and impacts*. Routledge.
32. Page, S. J., & Connell, J. (2014). *Tourism: A modern synthesis (3rd ed.)*. Cengage Learning.
33. Timothy, D. J., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2009). *Cultural heritage and tourism in the developing world: A regional perspective*. Routledge.
34. Faulkner, B., & Russell, R. (2001). Managing for sustainable tourism: A review of six cultural sites. *Tourism Management*, 22(1), 1-9.

35. Higham, J., & Lück, M. (2019). *Marine Ecotourism: Practice, experiences and impacts*. Routledge.
36. Faulkner, B., & Russell, R. (2001). Managing for sustainable tourism: A review of six cultural sites. *Tourism Management*, 22(1), 1-9.
37. Timothy, D. J., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2009). *Cultural heritage and tourism in the developing world: A regional perspective*. Routledge.
38. Higham, J., & Lück, M. (2019). *Marine Ecotourism: Practice, experiences and impacts*. Routledge.
39. Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: An improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.
40. Ruíz-Sánchez, J., & Durán, J. J. (2016). Sustainable tourism development and challenges: The case of Machu Picchu, Peru. *Sustainability*, 8(6), 567.
41. Evans, M. S. (2016). Ancient Angkor. In *The Archaeology of Ancient Cities* (pp. 343-376). Routledge.
42. Ahn, Y., & Pearce, J. (2018). Heritage preservation and tourism-led development in Seoul, South Korea. In *Heritage, Culture and Society* (pp. 195-211). Routledge.
43. Yeoh, B. S. A., & Chang, T. C. (2001). Tourism and the changing face of retailing in historic cities: the case of Singapore. *Urban Studies*, 38(10), 1763-1783.
44. Hall, C. M. (2009). *Tourism and geopolitics: Issues and concepts from Central and Eastern Europe*. Channel View Publications.
45. Zanini, M. A., & Inostroza, L. (2020). Tourism and Urban Heritage in Latin America. In *Handbook of Research on Urban Governance and Management in the Developing World* (pp. 364-384). IGI Global.
46. National Park Service. (1966). National Historic Preservation Act. Retrieved from <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/historicpreservation/national-historic-preservation-act.htm>
47. UK Government. (1990). Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Retrieved from <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/contents>
48. Welsh Government. (2016). Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2016. Retrieved from <https://gov.wales/historic-environment-wales-act-2016>
49. Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities. (2004). Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape. Retrieved from [https://www.beniculturali.it/mibac/export/MiBAC/sito-MiBAC/Contenuti/MibacUnif/Strumenti/Multimedia/visualizzatore_automatico/visualizzato]

re_automatico.html_1284917257.html](https://www.beniculturali.it/mibac/export/MiBAC/sito-MiBAC/Contenuti/MibacUnif/Strumenti/Multimedia/visualizzatore_automatico/visualizzatore_automatico.html_1284917257.html)

50.City of Charleston. (2020). Design Review Guidelines for the Old and Historic District. Retrieved from https://www.charleston-sc.gov/DocumentCenter/View/21844/Design-Guidelines-Old-and-Historic-District-PDF

51.City of Edinburgh Council. (2021). Edinburgh Local Development Plan. Retrieved from https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/local-development-plan

52.Bath and North East Somerset Council. (2020). Bath City Centre Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. Retrieved from https://beta.bathnes.gov.uk/bath-city-centre-conservation-area-appraisal-and-management-plan

53.Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and Tourism. (2004). Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape. Retrieved from http://www.beniculturali.it/mibac/multimedia/MiBAC/documents/1210458911562.pdf

54.Sasaki, S., & Neuts, B. (2017). Kyoto's Success Story: Managing Tourism Growth in Historic Cities. *Tourism Management*, 63, 298-312.

55.Colell, M. (2018). Sustainable urban mobility in historic cities: The case of Barcelona. *Journal of Urban History*, 44(3), 556-574.

56.Sandbrook, C. (2010). The social implications of using drones for biodiversity conservation. *Ambio*, 39(6), 569-574.

57.Ahsan, M. M., & Pandya, S. (2018). Integrating public transportation with urban form: The case of Cape Town. *Urban Design International*, 23(2), 104-118.

58.Serageldin, I., & Steer, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Making Transport Work for Women and Men: Challenges and Opportunities in the Middle East and North Africa*. World Bank Publications.

59.Pike, S., & Page, S. J. (2014). Destination Marketing Organizations and destination marketing: A narrative analysis of the literature. *Tourism Management*, 41, 202-227.

60.Kim, S. S., & Petrick, J. F. (2005). Residents' perceptions on impacts of the FIFA 2002 World Cup: The case of Seoul as a host city. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 25-38.

61.Ruiz-Sánchez, J., & Durán, J. J. (2016). Sustainable tourism development and challenges: The case of Machu Picchu, Peru. *Sustainability*, 8(6), 567.

- 62.Saad, M. (2019). The Socio-cultural Sustainability of Petra as a World Heritage Site: Bedouins' Perspectives and Community Development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(11), 1546-1565.
- 63.Russo, A. P., & Vanolo, A. (2019). Resistance to touristification: The case of the people mover in Venice. *Journal of Urban Design*, 24(6), 813-830.
- 64.World Bank. (2020). Financing Sustainable Urban Transport in the Developing World. Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/transport/brief/financing-sustainable-urban-transport-in-the-developing-world
- 65.Eurostat. (2019). European Union Urban Agenda - Urban mobility. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=European_Union_Urban_Agenda_-_Urban_mobility
- 66.International Finance Corporation. (2018). Public-Private Partnerships in Emerging Markets: Case Studies on Infrastructure Development. Retrieved from https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/2b16ef4c-1325-45d4-bb68-71a8d725e7d8/PPP-Case-Studies.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=m3xP7g1
- 67.United Nations Development Programme. (2019). Financing for Sustainable Development Goals: Breaking the Bottlenecks of Investment. Retrieved from https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/publications/1933_UNDP_Report_Web_Version_EN_0.pdf
- 68.World Health Organization. (2019). Disability and health: Key facts. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/disability-and-health
- 69.United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2021). Disability and development report: Realizing the Sustainable Development Goals by, for and with persons with disabilities. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/publication/disability-and-development-report-2021-realizing-the-sustainable-development-goals-by-for-and-with-persons-with-disabilities

70. European Commission. (2021). Investing in sustainable tourism. Retrieved from [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/tourism/sustainability/investing_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/tourism/sustainability/investing_en)
71. Disability Rights International. (2020). Human rights monitoring of institutions: A practical guide. Retrieved from <https://www.driadvocacy.org/resources/human-rights-monitoring-of-institutions-a-practical-guide/>
72. Papatheodorou, A., & Kladou, S. (2017). Tourism and economic crises: Lessons from the Greek experience. *Tourism Management*, 60, 354-366.
73. Sharpley, R., & Telfer, D. J. (2015). *Tourism and development: Concepts and issues* (2nd ed.). Channel View Publications.
74. McKercher, B., & du Cros, H. (2002). *Cultural tourism: The partnership between tourism and cultural heritage management*. Routledge.
75. Dwyer, L., & Forsyth, P. (1998). Economic significance of tourism in Australia. Bureau of Tourism Research.
76. Dwyer, L., & Forsyth, P. (1998). Economic significance of tourism in Australia. Bureau of Tourism Research.
77. Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), 411-421.
78. Gretzel, U., Sigala, M., Xiang, Z., & Koo, C. (2015). Smart tourism: Foundations and developments. *Electronic Markets*, 25(3), 179-188.
79. United Nations World Tourism Organization. (2019). Accessibility in tourism: good practices for persons with disabilities.
80. Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), 411-421.
81. Dwyer, L., & Forsyth, P. (1998). Economic significance of tourism in Australia. Bureau of Tourism Research.
82. Gretzel, U., Sigala, M., Xiang, Z., & Koo, C. (2015). Smart tourism: Foundations and developments. *Electronic Markets*, 25(3), 179-188.
83. United Nations World Tourism Organization. (2019). Accessibility in tourism: good practices for persons with disabilities.