



www.vitour.org

EUROPEAN GUIDELINES FOR WINE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT

WITH SPECIAL REGARD TO ENDANGERED AREAS AND VINEYARDS

Edited by Giuliana Biagioli, Michèle Prats and Joachim Bender

The VITOUR LANDSCAPE project is part-financed by the EU - E.R.D.F. 2007-2013 – Objective 3 – Territorial Cooperation Programme INTERREG IV C. The Interregional Cooperation Programme INTERREG IVC, financed by the European Union's Regional Development Fund, helps Regions of Europe work together to share experience and good practice in the areas of innovation, the knowledge economy, the environment and risk prevention. EUR 302 million is available for project funding but, more than that, a wealth of knowledge and potential solutions are also on hand for regional policy-makers.

The content of this publication reflects the views of the authors. The Managing Authority of the INTERREG IVC is not responsible in any way for the use which might be made of the information contained therein.

INDEX

- 4** **Preface: The ViTour Landscape project and its partners**
(Giuliana Biagioli)
- 5-7** **1. General Introduction**
1.1. Cultural landscapes: definitions (Michèle Prats)
1.2. The structuring elements of the landscape according to inhabitants, public and private stakeholders:
a view from the inside (Giuliana Biagioli)
1.3. The constituting elements of the winegrowing cultural landscapes according to the Vitour Landscape project:
the construction of a "glocal" view. (Giuliana Biagioli)
- 8-15** **2. The physical elements of the landscapes**
(Michael Schimek)
- 16-19** **3. Ecological system**
(Francesco Marchese)
- 20-25** **4. The agrarian/rural organisation of space, production and productivity: its characters**
(Giuliana Biagioli, Roberto Vezzosi)
- 26-32** **5. Settlement development and architecture**
(Sara Scheer, Filinto Girão)
- 33-38** **6. Accessibility and mobility**
(Jeanne Corthay, Emmanuel Estoppey)
- 39-45** **7. Governance and Vineyard Cultural Landscapes**
(Myriam Laidet)
- 46-48** **8. General Conclusions**
(Roberto Vezzosi)
- 49** **Bibliography**
- 50** **ViTour Landscape project partners**
- 51** **Credits**
-

PREFACE

THE VITOUR LANDSCAPE PROJECT AND ITS PARTNERS

(Giuliana Biagioli)

The cultural landscapes we are dealing with are different in history, economic and demographic structures, and they are ruled differently according to the various institutions which are in charge of their protection and enhancement. Different also are the laws and regulations – national and international - which should provide for this item. There is a great variety about sites:

- First of all, in terms of dimension: from the larger area, a surface of 2.943 square kilometers, Loire Valley, to the much smaller 1.368 hectares of the “core-zone” of Lavaux.
 - The variety of size means also a more or less complicated dealing with state/ regional/ local public and private stakeholders and the existence from the beginning of the inscription of management structures and plans, nowadays under revision, or a lack until now in some sites of such instruments, structure and plans.
- See, for the variety of situation, the case of the Val de Loire - two regions, four Departments, 161 local authorities and a consistent number of private stakeholders, being the third largest wine-producing area of France. Or the case of Upper Middle Rhine Valley - two federal States with their federal laws, three Directions, five administrative districts, 53 Municipalities. And again Fertö – Neusiedlersee - two nations, the first a federal state, the second a centralised one.
- Quite often, there are other protection types and structures in or near the UNESCO sites: see the Cinque Terre National Park , the ANPIL (Protected area of local interest) for Val d’Orcia, and also the numerous National or Regional Parks for other sites.

So there is also a problem and a scale of importance (and of cooperation) of these organisms, from the case of Cinque Terre in which the National Park overcame, at least from the administrative point of view, the existence of the UNESCO site, the public engineer structure, the interregional syndicat of Val de Loire.

- There is an important difference, which needs further analysis, between sites more dependent on a federal or a regional or even more local government (as in Austria, Germany, Pico, Lavaux), sites of a sort of “mixed” situation (presence of the State but decentralised powers to regions, as in Italy) and more centralised institutional framework.

- The legislative framework, either European or national or regional and local, appears to be adequate at least to the preservation of all sites, in many cases also favouring the enhancement. But we know very well that good legislation does not avoid all risks and problems. In particular, problems related to development in many sites, and/or the population getting older and older, or urban pressure in other sites.

- There is a variety of management structures and plans. The majority of the sites have management plans approved by UNESCO. Only four did not have a UNESCO management plan approved by UNESCO by April 2012: the two Italian sites Cinque Terre and Val d’Orcia, Wachau and the Val de Loire. Of course, other planning instruments are present, but maybe their coherence with the UNESCO aims should be tested. Even where the UNESCO plans have been made, they have recently been reformulated or appear to need reformulation.

- This is a further problem: what it was promised would be done to get the inscription and what was really possible to do afterwards.

Taking all these differences into account, there is a very strong link between the cultural landscapes we propose as an example of good practices in our guidelines: they are all World Heritage sites.

Our intention is to present the case of our sites as an open laboratory of experiments in good practices, still in progress, useful for other protected and / or endangered sites.

1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1. CULTURAL LANDSCAPES: DEFINITIONS

(Michèle Prats)

1.2.1. THE UNESCO VIEW

The common factor of the ten VITOUR sites is that they are all on the World Heritage list, and all as “living cultural landscapes”. The term “cultural landscape” embraces a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and its natural environment.

“They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal. They should be selected on the basis both of their outstanding universal value and of their representativity in terms of a clearly defined geo-cultural region and also for their capacity to illustrate the essential and distinct cultural elements of such regions. Cultural landscapes often reflect specific techniques of sustainable land use, considering the characteristics and limits of the natural environment they are established in.”¹

According to the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage convention, there are three categories of Cultural landscapes:

- the clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man (such as gardens and parks)
- the organically evolved landscape, with two sub-categories:
 - a relict (or fossil) landscape;
 - a continuing landscape is one which retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time (which is the case of VITOUR landscapes).
- the associative cultural landscape, with a strong link with intangible heritage

This new category, the Cultural landscape, was adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 1992, the very year of the first “Earth Summit” in Rio, in order to bring nature and culture closer together, with a new vision of sustainable development in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, enhancing the evolving interaction between humankind and its natural environment.

After the widespread dissemination of Agenda 21, landscape diversity was recognised as a resource which should be maintained against economic, social, cultural and technological globalisation.

Other UNESCO conventions, which have been adopted since then, have also to be taken into account in the implementation of the World Heritage convention, and especially in the management of cultural landscapes: these are the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD, 1992), the Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture

(2001), the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) and on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005).

In our cultural landscapes, vineyards are not always the only feature, nor even the main feature, of the ten UNESCO VITOUR sites. Four VITOUR vineyards have been listed by themselves: Tokaj, Alto Douro, Pico and Lavaux, the other landscapes being “mixed”, in different proportions, with architecture, towns, nature, meadows or other kind of agriculture.

The World Heritage inscription brings the need for management respecting the “Outstanding Universal Value” (OUV) for which the site has been selected, as well as the authenticity and integrity of its “attributes”. Each OUV is based on various criteria and attributes which differ according to the characteristics of the site.

The UNESCO criteria are often presented and resented as being “outsider” and “top down” criteria, especially since there is a process of permanent monitoring by UNESCO, UICN and ICOMOS, in order to ascertain that the OUV is respected. But we must bear in mind that candidacy is not compulsory, and though the listing proposal has been made by the State, the initiative and selection of the sites, as well as of their remarkable attributes are due to the authors of the application files, who are generally local people, local authorities, with the help of local experts, and more and more, nowadays, with the inhabitants’ participation and their full implication. It is, with their association to the management, the best chance of success on the long term.

1.2.2. THE EUROPEAN LANDSCAPE CONVENTION

Besides the UNESCO corpus of conventions, the European Landscape Convention, adopted in Florence in October 2000 by the Council of Europe, recognises that landscape is an essential feature of human surroundings, that it contributes to the formation of local cultures and that it is a basic component of the European natural and cultural heritage, contributing to human wellbeing and consolidation of the European identity. It covers all types of landscapes, natural, rural, peri-urban and urban, outstanding as well as ordinary, that determine the quality of people’s living environment.

The European Convention aims to encourage public authorities to adopt policies and measures at local, regional, national and international level for protecting, managing and planning landscapes throughout Europe. The convention has been signed by 30 European countries, not including Austria and Germany.

¹ World Heritage Paper 26 World Heritage Cultural Landscapes A Handbook for Conservation and Management

1.2. THE STRUCTURING ELEMENTS OF THE LANDSCAPE ACCORDING TO INHABITANTS, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE STAKE HOLDERS: A VIEW FROM INSIDE (Giuliana Biagioli)

Cultural landscapes are deeply anthropised, living territories. Their inclusion in UNESCO's World Heritage sites does not deprive their inhabitants of the right to live their daily life according to their expectations in terms of economic development, social welfare and quality of life, all possibly at a higher level. On the other hand the commitments undertaken with UNESCO in terms of the preservation of a WH site can be in conflict with the needs of a changing population, economy or society. In fact, the cultural landscapes are the result of centuries of history, which makes them a unique and inestimable heritage, but the economic and social structures which have built them may not be present any more, so there is an urgent need to invent new initiatives to re-use the patrimony heritage in order to save it from being destroyed or from disappearing; and this is not an easy task.

Moreover, between the "external eye" of the international institutions and/or of the visitors and the "eyes" of the inhabitants there can be different views. The "natives" have an intimate relationship with their landscape which does not necessarily correspond, for instance, to the UNESCO criteria of inscription to the World Heritage List. Quite often the inhabitants expect some benefits for their territory from the inscription, which are often neither guaranteed nor implicit. In many cases the procedure for the inscription, at least for the majority of the cultural landscapes included in this analysis, was initiated at the highest levels of government – the national state – and then went down to the lower institutional levels. The inhabitants of the territory in question were therefore not really consulted, at least not decisively, and when the inscription on the World Heritage List was finally conceded by UNESCO, they simply expected a quasi-automatic economic return for their territory, which was followed by disappointment when they realised that there would be no such influx of money for everybody. The disappointment is even greater when the advantages and disadvantages of inclusion in the WH (both are always present) are not equally distributed among the inhabitants, with a part of the population gaining (money) and the other mainly losing (at least in terms of freedom, quality of life, social relations). Hence, not only could the gap between the views from outside and from inside the World Heritage site be very deep, but there could also be different and very divergent "views" from the inside as well.

Let us take two examples from a previous enquiry on two of the sites participating in the Vitour Landscape project, Cinque Terre and Tokaj, plus the Saint Emilion² site. Between 80 to 100 interviews were conducted for each site, half among ordinary inhabitants, half among winegrowers and institutional stakeholders.

In Cinque Terre, the majority of the inhabitants interviewed identified their intimate environment with "the natural surroundings, the food, the family environment,

the sun, the sea, the mountain, and so on", whilst one of the oldest people added "now it is not as true as it was", and it is worth considering this again, given the fact that another of those interviewed considered the proposed "beautiful viticultural landscape" to be an external, aesthetic announcement to visitors, but, in fact, it remained a superficial message which avoided the real problems. "You should not present the place as a postcard enriched by the UNESCO label". With a simple and standardised presentation to visitors, there is a risk of "slipping on Cinque Terre".

Of course, the sun, the sea and the smell of the food cannot be introduced as criteria for inclusion in the WH Cultural Landscapes. It is interesting, however, that this kind of evaluation belonging to the inhabitant's "intimate" landscape appears also in other cases; unfortunately this is not complete for all our sites.

But there are much more important problems:

While the UNESCO label and its criteria were more or less accepted in Cinque Terre by the all of the inhabitants interviewed, the situation was quite different in Tokaj. Here the inscription as a winegrowing site was not accepted by the non-winegrowing interests and a division between wine producers and other inhabitants clearly emerged in the different representations of the landscape and the effects of its inclusion in the WH as a historical winegrowing landscape. The inhabitants interviewed who do not take part in winegrowing represent their landscape as being much richer in natural resources and history: forests and, above all, rivers as community links, instead of winegrowing.

In Tokaj, more than in Cinque Terre and Saint Emilion, not only do the opinions of the ordinary inhabitants on the landscape differ, but they are the opposite of the "official" ones (the criteria of UNESCO was identified by the majority of those interviewed as being in the interest of the great wine producers and the cause of an increase in social differences).

The big problem, common to any protected area, and emerging in our project, certainly for the two Italian sites at least, is that there are, at the same time, social categories immediately or potentially gaining from the protection provided by the WH, with others losing. The first group could also be part of an external area, with only some benefits also for the local inhabitants (as in the case of Tokaj), but in all cases, there are local residents gaining from the protection (tourist operators, wine producers and sellers, etc.) and for whom the protection of the territory is in itself an added value for their business. On the other hand, a part of the population which, in the case of the absence of a policy of social redistribution of the "cultural landscape earnings", will just suffer from the transformation of their territory into "another place" sometimes resembling an anonymous postcard.

1.3. THE CONSTITUTING ELEMENTS OF THE WINE GROWING CULTURAL LANDSCAPES ACCORDING TO THE VITOUR LANDSCAPE PROJECT: THE CONSTRUCTION OF A “GLOCAL” VIEW. (Giuliana Biagioli)

This is the aim in the last part of our project: the transfer of local practices from one site to another.

The protected areas, as with any other area in the world, are affected by the globalisation phenomenon. In this sense, although it is not the inscription itself which transfers the effects of global factors to the local sphere, it does, however, amplify their impact on the inscribed territories. In fact, the inscription shines a beacon on each site, which can now be seen everywhere in the world, and reveals a new heritage to all eyes on the planet.

The inscription brings added value, not only symbolic, but also economic as a result of the arrival of immediate economic benefits (the growth increase in the tourism sector is an example). On the other hand, an inscription predominantly depends on the “authenticity” and “uniqueness” of a local area and it is for this reason, as stated above, that “landscape diversity was recognised as a resource which should be guarded and maintained against economic, social, cultural, and technological globalisation”.

Authenticity and diversity are required by tourists, as well as by the consumers of local products. Cultural lands-

scapes are local, unique places - otherwise they would not be WH - but, at the same time, they become part of World Heritage, their territories must adapt themselves to new global expectations which must coexist with and be integrated into their local identity.

Therefore, the policies relating to world heritage sites well illustrates the consubstantiality of the process of construction of an identity of the local space with the phenomenon of globalisation.

- The inscription, in fact, qualifies the local space relative to the global; it amplifies the uniqueness of a small area in relation to the rest of the world.

- At the same time, these territories receive, and are influenced by, global views prepared by non-local institutions and players during discussions and debates on such topics as general sustainable development, climate change, GMO, food safety, and so on, all of which have a worldwide origin and importance.³ These issues must, however, be applied, on a local scale, more incisively and accurately in the WH sites than in other territories, as they are supposed to be an example of excellence. A “glocal” view, therefore, is a necessity.

³ Paysages d'exception, paysages au quotidien, p. 19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PREFACE AND INTRODUCTION

AUDRERIE Dominique, SOUCHIER Raphaël, VILAR Luc, *Le patrimoine mondial*, Paris : P.U.F., 1998.

BERLAN-DARQUÉ M., LUGINBÜHL Y., TERRASSON D. (sous la dir. de), *Paysages : de la connaissance à l'action*, Paris : Quæ, 2008

BATISSE, Michel, et BOLLA, Gérard, *L'invention du « patrimoine mondial »*, Les Cahiers d'Histoire, Paris : AAFU (Association des anciens fonctionnaires de l'Unesco), 2003 (Cahier n° 2).

BLAKE Janet, « On defining the Cultural Heritage », *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 49, n° 1, 2000, p. 61-85.

BIAGIOLI, Giuliana, *I paesaggi UNESCO tra eccezionalità e quotidianità. Gli effetti economici dell'iscrizione nella WHL in termine di aumento del turismo e di plus-valore simbolico*, in «Siti. Trimestrale di attualità e politica culturale», a. IV, n, 3, 2008, pp. 28- 33.

BIAGIOLI, Giuliana *Le Parc national de Cinque terre, in Valeurs universelles, valeurs locales: pour qui, pour quoi un site est-il grand?*, Paris: ICOMOS France- Ministère de l'Ecologie, Ministère de l'Ecologie, de l'Energie, du développement durable et de la mer, pp. 151- 157

BRIFFAUD Serge, « Le paysage comme patrimoine. Réflexion sur l'histoire récente d'une patrimonialisation des apparences », dans *Le regard de l'Histoire, Emergence et évolution de la notion de patrimoine au cours du XXème siècle*, Actes des Entretiens du patrimoine, Paris :Fayard, 2003, p. 243-252.

BROCHOT Aline, CROS Zsuzsa, LUGINBUHL Yves, *Analyse comparative de la construction sociale et territoriale du patrimoine dans les vignobles de Champagne et de Tokaj (Hongrie)*, Strates/ Ministère de la Culture-Mission du Patrimoine Ethnologique, 1997,111 p. + annexes.

GAMBINO Roberto, *Conservare innovare. Paesaggio, ambiente, territorio*, Torino : Utet Libreria, 1997.
«Cultural Landscapes : the challenges of Conservation », *World Heritage Papers 7*, Paris :Unesco, World Heritage Centre, 2003.

GRAVARI-BARBAS Marie (dir.), *Habiter le patrimoine: Enjeux, approches, vécu*, Rennes :Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2005, 618 p.

JOKILEHTO Jukka et al., « What is OUV ? Defining the Outstanding Universal Value of Cultural World Heritage Properties », *Monuments and Sites*, n°XVI, 2008 (ICOMOS). *Les paysages culturels viticoles*, ICOMOS, 2004

MERODE Eléonore De, SMEETS Rieks and WESTRICK Carol (edited by), « Linking Universal and Local Values: Managing a Sustainable Future for World Heritage », *World Heritage Paper 13*, Paris : Unesco, World Heritage Centre, 2004

Paysages de vignes et de vins. Patrimoine-Enjeu-valorisation, Colloque international, Abbaye Royale de Fontevraud, 2,3, et 4 Juillet 2003, InterLoire, Pôle Technique, 2003

BRIFFAUD, Serge, *Paysages d'exception, paysages au quotidien. Une analyse comparative de sites viticoles européens du Patrimoine Mondial*, https://pdd.cemagref.fr/resultats_projets. World Heritage 2002. Shared Legacy, Common Responsibility An International Congress organized by UNESCO's World Heritage Centre and Regional Bureau for Science in Europe (ROSTE) with the support of the Italian Government on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention, Cini Foundation, Island of San Giorgio Maggiore, Venice, Italy,14–16 November 2002. , UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Paris 2003

CHAPTER 03 "ECOLOGICAL SYSTEM"

Besio M. (2002), *Il vino del mare; il piano del paesaggio tra i tempi della tradizione e i tempi della conoscenza*, Marsilio, Venezia ISBN 8831779818

Ingegnoli V., Pignatti S. (1996), *L'ecologia del paesaggio in Italia*, Città Studi Edizioni, Torino ISBN 8825101104

Magnaghi A. (a cura di, 2007) *Scenari strategici. Visioni identitarie per il progetto di territorio*, Firenze, Alinea ISBN 978-88-6055-1

McHarg I. (2007), *Progettare con la natura*, Franco Muzio Editore, Padova ISBN 978-88-7413-152-5

McHarg I. (1969), *Design with nature*, Doubleplay & Company, Inc. Garden City, New York

Marchese F., Marchese S. (2005), "Valorizzazione del patrimonio agricolo e trasformazione degli agroecosistemi" in *Urbanistica Informazioni* n°200 marzo-aprile, pp. 29-31

Todaro V. (2010), *Reti ecologiche e governo del territorio*, Franco Angeli, Milano ISBN 9788856825008

CHAPTER 04 THE AGRARIAN/RURAL ORGANISATION OF SPACE, PRODUCTION AND PRODUCTIVITY: ITS CHARACTERS

Azzari M., Rombai L. (1991), "I quadri paesaggistici delle regioni collinari" in Greppi C., a cura di, *I paesaggi delle colline*, Marsilio, Venezia.

Baldeschi P. (2010), "Introduzione", in F. Lucchesi a cura di, *La carta del Chianti* , Passigli, Firenze.

Carta M. (2011), *Lara presentazione nel progetto di territorio* , Firenze University Press, Firenze.

Lucchesi F. (2010), "Il quadro conoscitivo" , in F. Lucchesi a cura di, *La carta del Chianti* , Passigli, Firenze.

Sereni E., (1961), *Storia del paesaggio agrario italiano* , Laterza, Roma-Bari.

Secchi B. (1988), "Siena" , Casabella 545.

Tosco C. (2007), "Il paesaggio come storia" , Mulino, Bologna.

CHAPTER 05 "SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT AND ARCHITECTURE"

Initiative Baukultur für das Welterbe Oberes Mittelrheintal (Hrsg.) (ohne Jahr): *Leitfaden Baukultur. Anregungen, Tipps und Ideen für das Bauen im Welterbe Oberes Mittelrheintal*. Koblenz (D)

Initiative Baukultur für das Welterbe Oberes Mittelrheintal (Hrsg.) (ohne Jahr): *Leitfaden Farbkultur. Analysen und Anregungen für das farbliche Gestalten im Welterbe Oberes Mittelrheintal*. Koblenz (D)

VITOUR LANDSCAPE PROJECT PARTNERS



PARCO NAZIONALE DELLE CINQUE TERRE

Italy (Lead Partner)
www.parconazionale5terre.it



VEREIN WELTERBE FERTÖ-NEUSIEDLER SEE

Austria (Partner No. 2)
www.welterbe.org



SYNDICAT MIXTE INTERREGIONAL " MISSION VAL DE LOIRE"

France (Partner No. 3)
www.valde Loire.org · www.paysagesduvalde Loire.fr



ARBEITSKREIS WACHAU REGIONALENTWICKLUNG

Austria (Partner No. 4)
www.arbeitskreis-wachau.at · www.wachau-dunkelsteinerwald.at · www.vinea-wachau.at



ZWECKVERBAND WELTERBE OBERES MITTELRHEINTAL

Germany (Partner No. 6)
www.welterbe-oberes-mittelrheintal.de · www.welterbe-mittelrhein.de



COMUNE DI MONTALCINO

Italy (Partner No. 7)
www.montalcinonet.com · www.parcodellavaldorcia.com



COMISSÃO DE COORDENAÇÃO E DESENVOLVIMENTO REGIONAL DO NORTE

Portugal (Partner No. 8)
www.ccdr-n.pt · www.ccdr-n.pt/emd



COMMISSION INTERCOMMUNALE DE LAVAUX

Switzerland (Partner No. 10)
www.lavaux-unesco.ch



TOKAJ HEGYALJA, TAKTAKÖZ, HERNÁD VÖLGYE IDEGENFORGALMI ÉS KULTURÁLIS EGYESÜLETE

Hungary (Partner No. 11)
www.tokaj-turizmus.hu



AZORINA - SOCIEDADE DE GESTÃO AMBIENTAL E CONSERVAÇÃO DA NATUREZA, S.A.

Portugal (Partner No. 12)
parquesnaturais.azores.gov.pt

www.vitour.org · <http://db.vitour.org> · <http://my.vitour.org>

Credits

Edited by:

Giuliana Biagioli, Michèle Prats and Joachim Bender

Technical coordination of the edition:

Filinto Girão, Vitor Devesa, Stefan Moritz

ViTour Landscape Project Management:

Vittorio Alessandro (President of National Park Cinque Terre), Patrizio Scarpellini (Director of National Park Cinque Terre), Giuliana Biagioli (Knowledge Manager and leader of Expert team), Michèle Prats & Joachim Bender (Expert team), Stefan Moritz (Senior Project Manager), Marco Foschini (Senior Financial Manager), Francesco Marchese (Junior Project Manager), Silvia Paolillo (Communication Supervisor), Daniele Moggia (webmaster), Michael Wagner (web-editor).

Graphic Design:

Expactive – Tiago Ribeiro, Porto (P)
Formid'graphic, M. Colin Montet (CH)

Translations:

Graça Spratley & C^a, Lda., Porto (P)

Printed in Italy, Oct./Nov. 2012

Many thanks to all executives and collaborators of all 12 partner organisations, as well as to all consultants and experts involved, which all contributed to the success of our common work since the ideation and planning of the project in 2007-2008!

In the same way we want to thank very much the INTERREG IVC Managing Authority, Region Nord-Pas-de-Calais (F), and the Joint Technical Secretariat, and in particular our project officers Mrs. Kelly Zielniewski and Mr. Mahesh Bhardwaj, that supported the ViTour Landscape project, its partners and the project management team so generously!

Photo credits:

Covers, preface, introduction and conclusions:

Christoph Sonderegger, Sébastien Staub, József A. Tóth, Laurent Massillon, Mission Val de Loire, Legambiente Liguria, Régis Colombo/diapo.ch, Richard Giefing, vision-air.ch, montreuxriviera.com, Weissenkirchen, Gamerith, Romantischer Rhein, Thomas Merz, Hans-Peter Siffert, Rudesheim Tourist AG, Parco Nazionale Cinque Terre, Massimo Bindi

Chapter 02: Michael Schimek, Bierbaum.Aichele. landschaftsarchitekten/PGM-Architekten.Innenarchitekten, Jean-Pierre Houel "The Loire between Amboise and Lussault, Musée des Beaux-arts de Tours" provided by Mission Val de Loire, Günter Kargl, Petr Blaha, Fernando Oliveira, Anna-Marie Lun

Chapter 03: Cinque Terre National Park, Davide Marciasini, Francesco Marchese

Chapter 04: Massimo Bindi, Francesco Ripaccioli, Lucrezia Messina, Parco delle Cinque Terre

Chapter 05: Hubertus Jäckel, Architects Heidger, Architects Johannes Götz and Guido Lohmann, Torsten Raab, Michael Jordan, Büro stadmland, Architect Francisco Vieira de Campos, Filinto Girão / Douro Mission / CCDR-N, Rothkegel

Chapter 06: Christoph Sonderegger, Cinque Terre National Park, Francesco Marchese

Chapter 07: The Allegory of Good and of Bad Government – Scenes from the frescos by Ambrogio Lorenzetti between 1337 and 1340 at the Palazzo Pubblico in Siena, Italy. Copyright Municipality of Siena

Richard Giefing, Nationalpark Neusiedlersee-Seewinkel, Foto Pico, Régis Colombo/diapo.ch, Romantischer Rhein, DLR, Laurent Massillon / Mission Val de Loire, Vinea Wachau, Myriam Laidet, Interloire