1. Introduction
In an increasingly competitive international marketplace there is growing interest in the importance of tourism destination management as the key to destination management as the key to developing a tourism economy. The UN World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) estimates, for example, that there are now between 2,500 and 3,000 competent destinations in Europe alone. These destinations are all competing for similar growth markets and for market share. So how can a destination achieve standout with a differentiated offer?

International benchmarking undertaken by the Stevens View Partnership over the past three years has demonstrated the importance of innovation in this process. This applies to branding and marketing, as well as product development.

2. Market Focused Destination Development
This market-focused approach to destination identification has been informing tourism planning for the past ten years or so in North America and is now being increasingly accepted in Europe (McIntyre, 1993; WTO, 2004) and actively promoted by the UNWTO. It is clear that, from a visitor’s perspective, the destination has to make sense in terms of matching their perceptions (image, branding, marketing, knowledge) with their expectations and their actual experiences within the destination (products, services, infrastructure, people).

3. Destination Benchmarking
In order to clarify and quantify this emerging model of a destination an international benchmarking research programme was undertaken. Destination benchmarking is now recognised as a key planning tool that allows competitiveness to be quantified and progress towards goals and objectives measured (Crouch and Ritchie, 1999; Young and Ambrose, 1999; Kozak, 2004).

The use of the model initially focused upon mountain destinations that have to face up to the challenges of climate change and become year-round destinations.

Similar research into mountain destination benchmarking was also being undertaken in Australia (see Thomas 2004a and 2004b, Russel 2004) and in Eastern Europe (Kozak 2004). The primary motivation for examining mountain destinations is the need to address the challenge of climate change resulting in less reliable snow cover and the inevitable downturn in the winter sports markets. The threat to winter tourism in the European Alps has recently been highlighted by the OECD (2007).

Tourism in the Alps, as it is in the Highlands of Scotland, is a key contributor to the economy of the main Alpine countries of Switzerland, Austria, France and Germany.
In these three countries there are 60-80 million winter sports tourists each year and some 160 million skier days. The OECD study is the first cross-border study of the Alpine arc. The results show that at present 90% (609 out of the 666) medium to large Alpine ski destinations normally have adequate snow cover for at least 100 days a year. The other 10% are already operating under marginal conditions. Future climate change with 1°C increase in temperature would see the number of viable ski destinations in Europe reduce to 500. Destinations are already responding and adapting to these challenges and developing year-round tourism economics.

The research highlighted a common approach to successful destination management in these examples. The research base was subsequently expanded to include other non-mountain destinations at the same time the Stevens View Partnership successfully applied the model for destination management to three destinations in Scotland (Loch Ness, Aviemore and the Cairngorms and the Island of Arran).

The results have been carefully monitored. The success of these initiatives has resulted in the Scottish Government now applying the model across Scotland. The Partnership has also produced a Guidebook to Destination Development for the Scottish government. Further analysis of the critical success factors has clearly demonstrated the role of innovation in creating competitive destinations. In depth case studies of five leading destinations (including both traditional destinations that have repositioned and new, emerging destinations) have taken place. These examples include:

1. The City of Wine in Rioja Spain
2. Kitzbuhel in Austria
3. Zell-am-See in Austria
4. Lucerne in Switzerland
5. Cornwall in England
6. Bilbao in Spain
7. Champagne in France

4 Innovation in Tourism
The need to “innovate” and the importance of innovation in tourism to achieve a competitive edge for a country, destination or product is always highlighted as a requirement to succeed. The classic dictionary definition of innovate is “to renew, alter, to introduce something new, to make changes”. Ad to this “in order to maintain a market led, customer focused tourism offer” and we have a useful definition of tourism innovation. This is achieved by:

- Establishing a vision and expressing it in an overarching statement.
- Fighting the fear of change by promoting the need always to do better.
- Considering lots of proposals to balance the risk of losing with the upside of winning
- Encouraging stakeholders to propose new ideas.
- Challenging traditional assumptions and being prepared to break the rules.
- Always asking is there a better way of going the job.
- Collaboration is the key.
Encouraging a culture of experimentation.
Don’t debate new ideas, test them, build prototy whole models.
Focus passionately on things that have to be changed.

5 The Initial Benchmarking Exercise
The international destination benchmarking study involved a Delphic approach using an international Expert Panel to identify 15 destinations whose topographical to-{
- Touris am main economic driver
- Minimum 250m above sea level
- Highlands, with close proximity of lake, inland,
- Traditional, distinct winter/summer season and continental climate.
- Mature destination being regenerated / refreshed
- Within or close to or incorporating protected area
- Successful year round tourism product
- Clear signs of innovation and recent investment
- Minimum 90 minutes drive from major urban centre
- Multi dimensional tourism offer
- Tourist population exceeds size of resident population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whistler (Canada)</td>
<td>174.00</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lech (Austria)</td>
<td>170.33</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chamonix (France)</td>
<td>168.67</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Zell am See (Austria)</td>
<td>161.84</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Park City (USA)</td>
<td>160.30</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bad Klein (Austria)</td>
<td>158.83</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Blue Mountain (USA)</td>
<td>151.08</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Leysin (Switzerland)</td>
<td>143.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bled (Slovenia)</td>
<td>142.58</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kicking Horse (Canada)</td>
<td>142.32</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Les Arcs (France)</td>
<td>137.33</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jackson Hole (USA)</td>
<td>133.81</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jasper (Canada)</td>
<td>130.17</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Flagstaff (USA)</td>
<td>126.36</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mountain Creek (Canada)</td>
<td>122.66</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ABSC (Scotland)</td>
<td>68.96</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Overall Rank Order and Competitiveness
This research tool involves stakeholders in each destination responding to a series of 52 statements about different aspects of the destination. Hudson and his team at the University of Calgary (Canada) had successfully applied this methodology to a number of mountain destinations in Canada. The results of this survey are shown in Table 1.

For the visitor any destination has to be “fit for purpose”. It has to make sense in terms of matching perceptions (shaped by knowledge, images, branding and marketing) with their expectations and experiences of the destination (products, place, services, infrastructure, people). Critical to the success of the destination is ensuring that the overall visitor experience exceeds their expectation in terms of quality, value for money, choice, access and the integration of services. At the heart of the tourism system in the destination is a competent destination management organisation.

6 Conclusions
The successful destination is, therefore, very much a community, collaborative partnership effort. No single body can hope to control all the influencing factors. Individuals and stakeholders all have a role to play. The existence of strong, competent destination management organisation, is however, crucial to minimising the risk of failure and maximising the chances of success. The experiences of this researcher will be watched with interest by many tourism planners throughout Europe.
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This paper examines the concept of the destination in strategic tourism development. It will then look at international best practice and how the SVP/Hudson Model can be used as a tool to shape the planning, management and marketing of tourism destinations. This analysis will include a review of the critical success factors from leading destinations and in particular, the role of and need for innovation. The concept of
innovation in tourism will be examined and examples of how innovation has been used in a range of European destinations will be considered in detail. This will include evidence from key stakeholders, as well as analysis of the PR and media interest generated by an innovative approach to tourism destination development. The paper will examine key issues such as branding and positioning, along with the importance of clear strategic planning, having an effective destination management organisation and delivering benefits to the host community. In an increasingly competitive marketplace the need for destinations to ‘stand out in a crowd’ is essential.

International benchmarking is vital to understand how well you are doing compared with your competitors whilst innovation ensures that the competitive edge is always maintained.

The paper will include detailed case studies, consideration of the concepts of innovation and benchmarking and focus on the main lessons for destinations in emerging tourism economies.
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