

European Urban Regeneration through Intelligent Applications

Antonietta Ivona* 

University of Bari Aldo Moro, Department of Economy and Finance, Piazza Umberto I, 1, 70121 Bari BA, Italy
antonietta.ivona@uniba.it

Received: 7 November 2020; Revised: 24 November 2020; Accepted: 3 December 2020;
Published online: 10 December 2020

Abstract: With the advent of new technologies, cultural heritage can be experienced within a more complex tourist offer based on highly personalized products, tailored to the needs of visitors through feedback, geo-localization, advanced services and multifunctional information. and in real time. Among the types of tourism in constant and rapid growth there is that linked to cultural heritage, with the inevitable repercussions on local economies, destinations and local communities. Cultural tourism attracts an increasing number of tourists / travelers with changing needs; no longer and not only linked to the search for fun but, also, to those of new experiences aimed at satisfying an intellectual, personal, and emotionally satisfying involvement. The importance of innovation, also seen as a new support for the tourist development of the territories, is translated through ICT that facilitate the use of the territory, but also as a system of informal networks between the population and the territories. The transformative power of intelligent technologies not only in terms of economic potential but also of social and experiential dimensions is now widely recognized. From this perspective, the new initiative of the European Commission "EUROPEAN CAPITAL OF SMART TOURISM - ECoST" should be read, which through the holding of a competition aims to identify the European Capital of Intelligent Tourism. In addition to the deepening of the most recent theoretical conceptualizations, the study will be based on the deepening of the ECoST Project and on the examination of the potential of some Italian cities.

Key words: Tourism, sustainability, development, technology, cities, potentiality

Citation: Ivona, A. (2020). European Urban Regeneration through Intelligent Applications. *Central European Journal of Geography and Sustainable Development*, 2(2), 15-23. <https://doi.org/10.47246/CEJGSD.2020.2.2.2>

1. INTRODUCTION

Cultural tourism is one of the types of tourism in constant and rapid growth, with inevitable effects on local economies, destinations, and host communities. It attracts an increasing number of tourists/ travelers with changing needs related to the pursuit of fun and the desire to live new and lasting intellectual, personal, and emotional experiences. In particular, advanced technologies, combining augmented, virtual and imaginary reality, can offer a deeply immersive experience. They aim to provide multifaceted information on the site visited and improve the attractiveness of a tourist destination at different scales (regional, national, local).

Innovation and competitiveness and the development of smart applications have aroused much interest in Europe; since their inception they have been designed for end users who wish to live enriched tourism experiences using existing data combined and processed in new ways [1-2]. A considerable transformative power of local economies (where they are widespread), of social characteristics and experiential modes, is now widely recognized in intelligent technologies.

The new initiative of the European Commission "European Capital of Smart Tourism - ECoST" fits into the context just described. Through the holding of a competition, it aims to identify the European Capitals of Intelligent Tourism. The project will showcase the results achieved by some European tourist destinations with reference to themes deemed strategic such as cultural heritage, sustainability, digitization, and accessibility.

* Corresponding author: antonietta.ivona@uniba.it; Tel.: +39 0805049054.

From a methodological point of view, in addition to the in-depth review of the most recent theoretical conceptualizations, the study is aimed at deepening the ECoST Project, with an initial assessment of the possible candidacy of Italian cities as future smart tourism cities. In fact, the purposes of the aforementioned European project can also be found in the four axes of the Italian Tourism Strategic Plan 2017–2022 [3], which has identified some strategic axes that appear to be in line with the European ones of “smart” interpretation: the enhancement of cultural heritage, tourism as an integrator of policies, and digital technology as a platform for meeting supply and demand.

2. THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN TOURISM AND TECHNOLOGY

The growth of cultural tourism is also supported by the evolution in tourism models, which show a clear trend towards shorter stays and a fragmentation of holidays. The shortening of the holidays has resulted in a steady increase in short visits, mainly focused on urban and cultural tourism. According to a study by the European Commission (2010) [4], 20% of tourists in Europe and 60% of European tourists travel for cultural reasons. The increased demand for this form of tourism is also due to the changed needs of the tourist / traveler, no longer and not only related to the search for fun but also to those of new experiences. [5–8]. “Globalization, demographic changes, advances in technology and a shift in consumer value systems have shaped the demand for a new post-materialist tourism product. Experience-based tourism is the new concept that is gradually emerging to satisfy this need. This implies the need to go beyond the fleeting experience, expanding the tourist experience over time through an intellectual and emotional involvement able to continue even after the experience and to stimulate the fixation of recollection and memory [9] (p. 489). In general, producers of goods and services can no longer escape the need to diversify them in order to remain on the increasingly competitive market.

Even tourism, and in particular the cultural one, must adapt to this change, transforming the simple 'holiday' into an 'experience'. As McCann (2002) [10], states, the production of culture has therefore long become a central factor for tourism-based urban development strategies.

Since 1998 Álvarez [11], began to emphasize the importance of tourism management based on technological tools, such as intranet and Internet, which became part of the tourism system around the 1990s. His proposal promoted the commercialization of a tourist destination by increasingly using the Internet and other non-traditional channels, such as CD-Roms, or possible virtual communities, where information on tourist destinations can be collected.

What tools do tourism policymakers have today to implement the aforementioned strategies and improve the competitiveness of a tourist-cultural destination? Starting from the competitive success factors that make a cultural site attractive, these tools can be summarized as follows: particularities of cultural, artistic and historical values; level of accessibility; quality of the facilities and services (tangible and intangible) of tourism present; peculiarities of additional services. The latter may refer to the availability of multimedia services in the use of architecture, of historical-artistic works capable of determining an emotional involvement of the user: think of the possibilities of virtual reality and augmented reality, which allow the reconstruction in the space and time of a work and its context. More generally, technology can support the tourist offer and, therefore, the use of all its material and intangible, natural and artificial resources.

The technology is functional to the resolution of critical issues that have long limited the full development of the cultural sector. The use of technological innovations, adequately developed and applied, can facilitate the use and access to cultural assets and contents, to the advantage of a growing number of users [12–13]; and a greater enhancement of the historical and artistic favor of the whole community. According to Fusco Girard and D'Auria [9], the use of new technologies in the cultural heritage sector can be fundamental to reduce information asymmetries, and therefore the knowledge gap, between the demand side and the supply side; to reshape the structures and boundaries of the cultural tourism sector by increasing the number of potential visitors; to extend tourism demand in space, avoiding the well-known problem of concentration in limited areas also in order to redistribute the positive and negative impacts of tourism on the territory; finally to expand the tourist offer over time. Through effective intellectual and emotional involvement, the tourist experience would become unique and unforgettable; therefore, it would produce 'knowledge' and not just information thanks to virtual technology. The main requirement for sharing knowledge, communication and promotion is to integrate the physical experience with a virtual one, using tools that increase the information of reality by amplifying its contents and their value.

In addition, an increasing number of tourists express the desire to transform their travel experience from the usual one to a multi-sensory and more engaging one. [14]. Tourism experienced, therefore, as an experiential product also through technology and frequently multimedia. In this recent scenario, what Fusco Girard and D'Auria [9], define the "new urban cultural tourist" experiences the relationship with the

city according to three temporally different moments: the first refers to the pre-visit (virtual moment) with the acquisition of knowledge necessary for the visit such as accommodation, transport, places of interest; in the second moment, dedicated to the actual visit of the city (current moment), the tourist will use the information acquired virtually to better enjoy his stay in the chosen city; finally, there is the last emotional moment, attributable to the post-visit to the city, in which the tourist will spread their opinions, impressions and emotions about the city online. These, subsequently, can become information and knowledge in the pre-visit phase of other tourists.

According to Savelli [15], "The new information and communication technologies offer the local organized community enormous opportunities to present themselves to the stranger in all its articulations, even in the weakest and most exposed to the risk of disappearance; and to graduate the communicative intensity. The 'electronic rib' of the territory and the community that is settled there, allows the latter to present itself as a field of possibility that is always in excess of the tourist's capacity for experience, indeed, increasingly richer as the user there he ventures and builds his own access routes." In this scenario thus outlined, the initiatives are numerous and all aim to improve the tourist experience through a better use of technology.

Among the latest deployments, there is "ECoSt" developed and proposed at community level to favor the transformation of tourist cities into smart cities. According to various scholars including Giffinger [16], and Hollands [17], the term smart city defines a city model that through the aid of new technologies is able to implement a transparent and participatory governance policy, aimed at improving the quality of life of its citizens and to pursue sustainable development goals. Hence, for cities, the need to employ skills and resources for the construction of cultural offers that are equipped with specific contents but, at the same time, that provide appropriate forms of communication and methods of use facilitated by the aid of techniques, technologies and innovative tools that can integrate more traditional organizational and fruition models [18]. Therefore, it becomes essential for the public decision-maker to develop development strategies for tourist destinations. In these strategies, the role of the "territorial brand" linked to sustainable tourism and its visible tools has proved successful over the years [19–20].

Territorial diversity, therefore, as a successful tool for the affirmation of smart cities. As Paradiso [21] states, "Far from being uniform and omnipresent, the digital dimensions of places are fragmented along various factors such as the location of networks, linguistic and cultural aspects in general, and social aspects. The result is a consequent mosaicization of the representations and a personalization of the same on the non-repeatable (unique) set of skills and environments of individuals." This implies the adoption of a general operational framework (as will be seen for the ECoSt initiative), applied to individual urban realities.

3. THE ECoST INITIATIVE IN THE EUROPEAN CONTEXT

The European Capital of Intelligent Tourism-ECoSt initiative implemented by the European Commission is part of a broader action or Preparatory Action, proposed by the European Parliament, to strengthen the role of tourism as a driving economic activity for the countries of the Union. The central idea is to consolidate, or in some cases promote from scratch, the awareness of the tourism development potential of European cities. The Preparatory Action generally aims to:

- promote the rich tourism offer of European countries and increase citizens' sentiment of sharing local tourism-related values;
- strengthen tourism-generated innovative development in cities, their surroundings and their regions;
- increase the attractiveness of European cities that are awarded the title and strengthen economic growth and job creation;
- establish a framework for the exchange of best practices between cities participating in the contest and create opportunities for cooperation and new partnerships.

This new initiative complements other EU policy actions and initiatives in the tourism sector [22].

Tourism is the third largest socio-economic activity in the EU and accounts for around 10% of the EU's GDP. According to European Commission (2010) [4], innovation, accessibility and sustainability will be crucial for the future of tourism. Hence the need to implement an initiative designed and managed by the Directorate General of the European Commission for the internal market, industry, entrepreneurship and SMEs, around smart tourism in European cities. Smart tourism responds to new challenges and demands in a rapidly changing sector, including the evolution of digital tools, products and services; equal opportunities and access for all visitors; sustainable development of the local area; and support for creative industries, local talent and heritage.

In 2018, the European Commission launched the first edition of the "European Capital of Smart Tourism" award, with the aim of rewarding two European cities that stand out for their accessibility,

sustainability and digitization and for their attention to cultural heritage and creativity. The award is aimed at cities in the European Union with at least 100,000 inhabitants (in the absence of cities of this size, states can nominate the largest city). The aim is to encourage the development of innovative and inclusive solutions for sustainable and accessible tourism, with the use of digital technologies, supporting the combination of cultural heritage, tourism assets and creativity. Overall, tourism is the third largest socio-economic activity in the EU. It plays a crucial role in growth and job creation through the implementation of strategies aimed at improving the visitor experience, creating new partnerships and cooperation opportunities and enhancing innovation processes in European cities and regions. The Award to the cities that more than others favor the so-called intelligent tourism, also intends to promote the sharing of best tourist practices among European cities in the medium term. In this sense, the prize will be awarded to the two cities that will present the most intelligent, innovative and inclusive solutions in all four of the above-mentioned sectors; but four other cities will still receive a smart tourism award in recognition of their outstanding achievements in individual categories.

According to the Commission [22], it can be defined as the Capital of smart tourism "A city that implements innovative, intelligent and inclusive solutions in the tourism sector, uses its own territorial, social and human capital for the growth of the tourism sector, for the prosperity of city and for a better quality of life of its inhabitants, offers a rich and personalized tourist experience through the enhancement of local assets, respecting and involving local communities, facilitating access to tourist services and products thanks to the new technologies, interconnection and interoperability of services."

To achieve this status, the cities concerned must adhere to four well-identified criteria that characterize the ECoST initiative (Figure 1). The first is accessibility, i.e. they must not present obstacles to the movement of travelers who have special needs, so they must be equipped with a functional and efficient internal transport network. The accessibility criterion must regardless of the age of the travelers, their economic or social condition. The second is sustainability. Cities that are deemed sustainable will be those committed to maintaining the balance between economic development and socio-cultural development, while respecting natural resources. The third criterion indicated is digitization; Smart tourism cities will have to offer tourism information, products, services, spaces and experiences using ITC digital tools. Finally, the fourth criterion is based on renewed and creative proposals of the cultural heritage present within its territory.



Figure 1. The four criteria of ECoST Initiative
Source: <https://smarttourismcapital.eu> [23]

The implications for the cities awarded the title of European Capital of Smart Tourism are manifold. They will be able to benefit for a year from the advice of experts in the sector to consolidate the renewed tourist image, will benefit from special advertising campaigns that will emphasize their role as pioneer city of smart tourism and, therefore, will be able to benefit from new flows of those tourists attentive to four typing criteria. The winners will also receive a large interactive sculpture, which will be installed in the city center to demonstrate their commitment to sustainable, accessible, digital and cultural tourism. According to the intent of the initiative, a smart tourism city is therefore one where accessibility is undoubtedly the absence of barriers to movement, but it must also be understood according to the dimensions proposed by the geography of tourism, namely spatial, economic and cultural. The presence of multilingual services, for example, digitally available to all travelers or visitors regardless of age, cultural background or any physical disability can reduce the physical distance, but also the functional one (costs, times, expected benefits, etc.). Digital technologies will improve all aspects of the tourist experience, thus promoting the accessibility and usability of the destination's cultural heritage. If all of the above is organized according to a long-term perspective, the economic benefits will affect the entire community and not just the tour operators directly involved.

At the end of the application process first and then evaluations, the European Cities of Intelligent Tourism for 2019, first edition, were Helsinki (Finland) and Lyon (France).

The other four cities awarded for one of the four criteria identified by the Initiative were Málaga (Spain) for accessibility; Ljubljana (Slovenia) for sustainability; Copenhagen (Denmark) for digitization and Linz (Austria) for cultural heritage and creativity. The other six cities, among the ten invited to submit their candidacy (i.e. the ten cities that passed the first selection) before a European jury in Brussels, are

Brussels (Belgium), Nantes (France), Palma de Mallorca and Valencia (Spain), Poznań (Poland), Tallinn (Estonia). Thirty-eight cities, belonging to nineteen EU states, have sent the candidacy. Gothenburg (Sweden) and Málaga (Spain) have been selected as the winners of the 2020 European Capital of Smart Tourism competition. In the overall assessment that earned it the ECOST Award, Gothenburg stood out particularly in the digitization of city services. They include current and future improvement solutions for traffic, transport, open data, and sustainability measures. Smart tourism is taking place in this city through the partnership between the various parties involved. The hope is that this model can be implemented in other European tourist destinations. Málaga has been awarded for its great commitment to transform itself into a modern city of intelligent tourism. The coastal city has a strong focus on using new technologies to enhance the visitor experience and increase the innovative capacity of local businesses. The widespread notoriety of Málaga will be useful in spreading a new model of intelligent and sustainable tourism.

In addition, four cities received 2020 European Smart Tourism Awards for their outstanding achievements in one of the categories of the competition: Breda (Netherlands) for Accessibility, Gothenburg (Sweden) for Sustainability, Ljubljana (Slovenia) for Digitalisation and Karlsruhe (Germany) Cultural heritage and Creativity. The following cities were also among the shortlisted finalists competing for the European Capital of Smart Tourism 2020 title: Bratislava (Slovakia), Bremerhaven (Germany), Nice (France), Ravenna and Torino (Italy). These four cities were also recognised with 2020 Awards for their outstanding achievements in the initiative's four categories. They received the highest individual category scores of all 35 applicant cities, during a pre-selection phase carried out by an independent panel of experts.

4. THE POTENTIAL OF ITALIAN CITIES

As mentioned above, the main requirement for candidacy for the European City of Intelligent Tourism is the demographic size of at least 100,000 inhabitants, in addition to the four pillars of the initiative which are accessibility, sustainability, digitization, attention and creativity. towards cultural heritage. From the analysis carried out considering the demographic factor in the first instance, it emerges that only 46 municipalities out of 7,954 total (ISTAT 2020 data), have a population such as to be able to present a possible candidacy for 2020 (Table 1).

Table 1. Italian municipalities with 100,000 inhabitants

	Municipality	Population	Area km²	Density of inhabitants / km²	Rank in ICityRate 2019
1.	Roma	2.873.494	1.287,36	2.232	15°
2.	Milano	1.351.562	181,67	7.440	1°
3.	Napoli	970.185	119,02	8.151	73°
4.	Torino	886.837	130,01	6.821	5°
5.	Palermo	673.735	160,59	4.195	77°
6.	Genova	583.601	240,29	2.429	32°
7.	Bologna	388.367	140,86	2.757	3°
8.	Firenze	382.258	102,32	3.736	2°
9.	Bari	324.198	117,39	2.762	62°
10.	Catania	313.396	182,90	1.713	85°
11.	Venezia	261.905	415,90	630	7°
12.	Verona	257.353	198,92	1.294	16°
13.	Messina	236.962	213,75	1.109	92°
14.	Padova	209.829	93,03	2.256	13°
15.	Trieste	204.234	85,11	2.400	24°
16.	Taranto	199.561	249,86	799	94°
17.	Brescia	196.670	90,34	2.177	11°
18.	Parma	194.417	260,60	746	8°
19.	Prato	192.469	97,35	1.977	31°
20.	Modena	184.727	183,19	1.008	9°
21.	Reggio Calabria	182.551	239,04	764	99°
22.	Reggio Emilia	171.491	230,66	743	10°
23.	Perugia	166.676	449,51	371	40°

24.	Ravenna	159.057	653,82	243	18°
25.	Livorno	158.916	104,50	1.521	51°
26.	Cagliari	154.083	85,01	1.812	37°
27.	Foggia	151.726	509,26	298	101°
28.	Rimini	148.908	135,71	1.097	20°
29.	Salerno	134.850	59,85	2.253	82°
30.	Ferrara	132.009	405,16	326	28°
31.	Sassari	127.533	547,04	233	78°
32.	Latina	126.151	277,62	454	72°
33.	Giugliano in Campania (NA)	123.839	94,62	1.309	--
34.	Monza	122.955	33,09	3.716	34°
35.	Siracusa	122.031	207,78	587	84°
36.	Pescara	120.420	34,36	3.504	61°
37.	Bergamo	120.287	40,16	2.995	4°
38.	Forlì	117.946	228,20	517	22°
39.	Trento	117.417	157,88	744	6°
40.	Vicenza	112.198	80,57	1.393	29°
41.	Terni	111.455	212,43	525	54°
42.	Bolzano	106.951	52,29	2.045	26°
43.	Novara	104.284	103,05	1.012	36°
44.	Piacenza	102.355	118,24	866	23°
45.	Ancona	100.696	124,84	807	38°
46.	Andria	100.331	402,89	249	96°

Source: www.tuttitalia.it [24]

According to the "ICityRate 2019" [25] which annually draws up the ranking of smart Italian cities, or rather "closer to the needs of citizens, more inclusive, more livable, more capable of promoting development by adapting to changes" (p. 2), the top five smart cities in Italy are ranked in order of points: Milano, Firenze, Bologna, Bergamo and Torino. Milano is confirmed as the most advanced Italian city with respect to the use of urban intelligence tools to promote and manage development in sustainable ways. Firenze and Bologna follow it, which are detached from all other urban realities, increasingly assuming the value of reference models.

The overall score of Milan is the transversal result of all the sustainability indicators; that of Florence, on the other hand, depends on its consolidated role as a tourist city, which in addition to the usual tourist-cultural attractions has achieved a profound digital transformation and sustainable mobility. The Bologna score, then, comes from its primacy in the field of governance/civil participation and in that of digital transformation, education, research and innovation. Bergamo and Torino, although of quite different demographic sizes, have worked hard in recent years to implement intelligent solutions. The ICity Rank is the ranking of Italian cities, drawn up every year by FPA, which measures the dimensions of the sustainable development of a smart city. The index and the ranking of the ICR are built starting from 6 indices (and relative rankings) dedicated to the 6 dimensions in which urban quality can be expressed: economic solidity, sustainable mobility, environmental protection, social quality, governance capacity and digital transformation. The 6 indices are, in turn, elaborated from over 100 indicators (which use more than 250 variables) taken from qualified sources or from specific surveys. The sector indices are then transformed and aggregated into a single summary value that allows the calculation of a final index.

Among the indicators there is tourist and cultural attractiveness (Table 2). The tourist and cultural attraction indicator places Firenze in first place: followed by Bologna and Milano. The tourist and cultural attractiveness index is based on ten indicators (four municipal and six provincial) which also consider activities indirectly linked to tourism (Figure 2). The score of Firenze and, therefore, its position at the top, is the result of sectoral indicators relating to the attractiveness and density of cultural heritage (more than 20 properties subject to restrictions per sq km). While the third place in Bologna is the result of a maximum score in the indicators of cultural employment and entrepreneurship.

Which, then, are the Italian cities that could be candidates for European Capitals of Intelligent Tourism? Starting from a further consideration that smart cities or intelligent cities are those centers capable of developing innovation processes using digital technologies in a widespread manner in order to favor businesses, improve the quality of life of citizens and pursue economic sustainability objectives. and environmental and by comparing the information referred to above, it is clear that based on the demographic criterion and the other four requirements envisaged by the European ECoST initiative, only

fifteen cities would be eligible (Roma, Milano, Torino, Genova, Bologna, Firenze, Venezia, Verona, Padova, Parma, Modena, Reggio Emilia, Bergamo, Trento, Piacenza).



Figure 2. The ten indicators of tourist and cultural attractiveness
 Source: Own elaboration on Data processing <https://forumpa.it>, 2019 [26]

Among the latter, only Milano, Roma, Torino, Firenze and Bologna could meet the five requirements necessary for candidacy as the European Capital of Intelligent Tourism; the other ten possess satisfactory requirements to apply for the Award in only one of the four categories of the competition. Table 2 below compares the four cities that have already won the European Smart Tourism Award 2019 and 2020, and the others who have won the prize in individual categories. However, this implies visibility on the initiative's website and a promotion of one's image. In the column on the right, the Italian cities that are possible candidates to compete for the next 2021 Award. The candidacy is important not only to spread the knowledge of the city; the crucial aspect would be the conversion of some of them towards sustainable and smart tourism models. In short, an opportunity not to be missed. In this phase, the role of public actors will be increasingly important. They are entrusted with the role of decision maker and promoter and also guardian of the heritage of a place. A cultural, natural and social heritage that must be preserved and enhanced according to the modern standards of tourism sustainability [27–30].

Table 2. European Capital of Smart Tourism, winning cities and potential Italian candidates

2019 WINNING CITIES AND MAIN MOTIVATION	2020 WINNING CITIES AND MAIN MOTIVATION	POTENTIAL ITALIAN CANDIDATES FOR THE 2021 AWARD
<p>Helsinki</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ranked second at the Accessible City Awards in 2015 • 143 measures in place to help Helsinki become carbon neutral by 2035 • An innovative approach to cultural tourism 	<p>Gothenburg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Municipality has made large investments for widespread digitization • City authorities, in collaboration with local tourism industry stakeholders, make use of all digital channels to enhance the visitor experience • The city was a sustainability pioneer in issuing green bonds and was one of the first places to set consumption-based emission targets 	<p>Milano, Roma, Torino, Firenze, Bologna, Venezia, Bergamo, Padova, Reggio Emilia, Piacenza</p>

<p>Lyon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lyon-Saint-Exupery is one of 25 airports in just nine countries to be classed as carbon neutral • Sustainable development is one of the city's main priorities • The 'Bouchons Lyonnais' quality label guarantees the restaurateurs follow strict traditions, serving local dishes in a convivial environment 	<p>Málaga</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability, innovation and culture have been concepts present in the strategic plans of the city for many years • The principles of sustainability have been implemented in all urban economic sectors • It has successfully transformed itself from a city known for its sunny beaches to a city of art and culture 	Milano, Roma, Torino, Firenze, Bologna, Bergamo, Modena, Reggio Emilia, Parma, Genova
2019 EUROPEAN SMART TOURISM AWARDS IN FOUR CATEGORIES	2020 EUROPEAN SMART TOURISM AWARDS IN FOUR CATEGORIES	
Ljubljana - Sustainability	Göteborg - Sustainability	Milano, Roma, Torino, Firenze, Bologna, Venezia, Bergamo, Padova, Reggio Emilia, Piacenza
Málaga - Accessibility	Breda - Accessibility	Milano, Roma, Torino, Firenze, Bologna, Venezia, Bergamo, Padova, Reggio Emilia, Piacenza
Copenhagen - Digitization	Ljubljana - Digitization	Milano, Roma, Torino, Firenze, Bologna, Bergamo, Modena, Reggio Emilia, Parma, Genova
Linz - Cultural heritage and creativity	Karlsruhe - Cultural heritage and creativity	Milano, Roma, Torino, Firenze, Bologna, Bergamo, Modena, Reggio Emilia, Parma, Genova

Source: author's elaboration

5. CONCLUSIONS

Table 1 shows, in summary, the "state of the art" of Italian cities on the theme of the new intelligent tourism and its fields of action. In many cases the potential is already present and therefore it will be necessary to further highlight it or, in other cases, to aim for an application that emphasizes other resources. The case of Linz, in 2019, can help; won its award in the category "Cultural heritage and creativity" also for its membership in the Unesco Creative Cities Network since 2014 and European Capital of Culture in 2009. The Unesco Creative Cities Network includes 9 out of 180 Italian cities overall. They are: Milano (for literature), Roma (for cinema), Torino (for design), Bologna (for music), Parma (for gastronomy), Alba (for gastronomy), Carrara (for crafts and popular art), Fabriano (for crafts and popular art), Pesaro (for music). The first five are among the cities also eligible for the European Smart Tourism award. Certainly, the selections are complex, but from what has been said so far, some Italian cities seem ready to apply. A final consideration concerns the gap between the cities of central-northern Italy and the southern ones; data from the 2019 FPA Report confirm the delay of the latter in addressing the challenges of ICT in general, and in tourism in particular. The competition between tourist destinations will increasingly have to base its strategies on the ability to intercept visitors through new experiences also through the use of new technologies available (multimedia, virtual museums, augmented reality, cultural communities on the web) and through a simpler use of the tourist-cultural offer of the city suitable for all people without any distinction. Once again, the possibility of carrying out new projects in the area cannot ignore the dialogue between private parties and institutions.

REFERENCES

1. Gretzel, U., Sigala, M., Xiang, Z. et al. (2015). Smart tourism: foundations and developments. *Electron Markets*, 25, 179–188.
2. Kauppila, S. (2017). Smart Tourism: Achieving Sustainable Development, *Jyväskylä University Digital Repository*. Retrieved from <https://jyx.jyu.fi>
3. MIBACT - Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali e del Turismo (2016). *Piano Strategico del Turismo italiano 2017–2022*. Retrieved from <https://www.beniculturali.it>
4. European Commission (2010). *Europe, the world's No 1 tourist destination – a new political framework for tourism in Europe*. Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu>
5. Ejarque, J. (2003). *La destinazione turistica di successo*, Milano, Italy: Hoepli Editore.

6. Katsoni, V., Upadhyaya, A., & Stratigea, A. (2017). *Tourism, Culture and Heritage in a Smart Economy: Third International Conference IACuDiT, Athens 2016*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing AG.
7. Mangano, S., & Ugolini, G. M. (2017). Nuove tecnologie e *smart map* per un turismo urbano e una mobilità intelligente. *Bollettino della Associazione Italiana di Cartografia*, 160: 8–21.
8. Swarbrooke, J., & Horner, S. (1999). *Consumer Behaviour in Tourism*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
9. Fusco Girard L., & D'Auria A. (2011). Turismo culturale e sviluppo locale: un modello basato sull'uso creativo delle ICTs, *L'ACROPOLI*, 5, 487–501.
10. McCann, J. E. (2002). The cultural politics of local economic development: Meaning-making, place-making and the urban policy process. *Geoforum*, 33, 385–398.
11. Álvarez, C. (1998). Turismo y nuevas tecnologías. *Revista Valenciana d'Estudis Autònoms*. 25, 135–150.
12. IESE (2018). *Cities in Motion Index 2018. Smart Urban Governance: rising to challenge*, Retrieved from <https://www.iese.edu>
13. Malpas, J. (2008). Cultural heritage in the age of new media, in Kalay Y. E., Kvan T. E Affleck J., *New Heritage: New Media and Cultural Heritage*, New York: Routledge, 21–36.
14. Amoretti, G., & Varani, N. (2016). *Psicologia e geografia del turismo. Dai motivi del turista all'elaborazione dell'offerta*, Padova, IT: libreriauniversitaria.it edizioni.
15. Savelli, A. (1997). Dai recinti alle reti. Uomo e tecnologia nelle relazioni turistiche. In Guidicini P., Sgroi E. (Eds.) *Valori, territorio, ambiente*, Milano, Italy: Franco Angeli, 23–34.
16. Giffinger, R. (2007). *Smart cities. Ranking of European medium-sized cities*. Retrieved from <https://www.smart-cities.eu>
17. Hollands, R.G. (2008). Will the real smart city please stand up? Intelligent, progressive or entrepreneurial? *City*, 12(3), 303–320. Retrieved from <https://doi: 10.1080/13604810802479126>.
18. Amodio, T. (2017). Nuove tecnologie per la fruizione dei beni culturali. L'iniziativa 'Salerno in particolare. Beni culturali e innovazione. *Bollettino della Associazione Italiana di Cartografia*, 160, 22–35. Retrieved from <https://www.aic-cartografia.it>
19. Braga, A. (2014). *Lo sviluppo del turismo sostenibile*, Roma, Italy: Ediesse Ed.
20. Cantone L., Risitano M., & Testa P. (2007). Strategie di sviluppo delle destinazioni turistiche e ruolo della marca territoriale. *Mercati e Competitività*, 1, 21–47.
21. Paradiso, M. (2013). Per una geografia critica delle «smart cities» tra innovazione, marginalità, equità, democrazia, sorveglianza. *Bollettino della Società Geografica Italiana*, 6(4), 679–693.
22. European Commission (2018). *Will your city be the next european capital of smart tourism?*. Retrieved from <https://www.smarttourismcapital.eu>
23. www.smarttourismcapital.eu. Retrieved from <http://www.smarttourismcapital.eu>.
24. www.tuttitalia.it. Retrieved from <http://www.tuttitalia.it>.
25. FPA (2019). *ICity Rank rapporto annuale 2019 - La classifica delle città intelligenti italiane, settima edizione*. Retrieved from <https://www.forumpa.it>
26. www.forumpa.it. Retrieved from <https://www.forumpa.it>.
27. Pearce, D.G. (1995). Planning for Tourism in the 1990s: An Integrated, Dynamic, Multi-Scale Approach. In Butler, R. W., Pearce, D. G. (Eds) *Change in Tourism: People, Places, Processes*. London, UK: Routledge, 229–44.
28. Richards, G., & Wilson J. (2006). Developing creativity in tourist experiences: A solution to the serial reproduction of culture? *Tourism Management*, 27, 1209–1223.
29. Timothy, D.J., & Boyd, S. W. (2007). *Heritage e Turismo*, Milano, Italy: Ulrico Hoepli Editore.
30. Todisco, E., Pezzulli, S., Carlin, P., & Melchiorri, C. (2000). L'importanza dei siti turistici: un tentativo per stabilirne il valore. *Bollettino della Società Geografica*, 5, 393–416.



© 2020 by the author. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC-BY-NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).