Preprint to the book chapter with the following reference:

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas

Arie Stoffelen

Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, KU Leuven, Belgium.

Introduction

The rapid increase of the cross-border mobility of people since the second half of the twentieth century has led to changes in the academic and practical approaches to transnational borderlands. Traditionally, borders were seen as physical and symbolic boundaries that manifest the state's territoriality and sovereignty. Borderlands were seen to be suffering from a 'double peripherality' consisting of economic disadvantages owing to their remote location combined with the barrier effect of the border (House, 1980). Nowadays, in the context of rapid globalization, borders are seen as much more complex entities and processes. They function as potential triggers rather than barriers for spatial development and as key processes and institutions for geopolitical and socio-cultural meaning-making (Brambilla, 2015; Newman, 2006; Van Houtum, 2000). In practical policy-making, this shift in thinking has led to views that borders have become transition zones that facilitate rather than block communication. Borders do not just function as discontinuities for economic flows but provide opportunities for future collaboration and for spatial development (Konrad & Nicol, 2011; Newman, 2006; Van Houtum, 2000). Notions of 'new regionalism', a regional development paradigm that emphasizes the central position of regions within multi-level governance and place-based innovation networks for economic competitiveness (Jones & Macleod, 1999), have challenged nation state-centred views of international relations, territorial sovereignty and socio-economic and cultural regulation. Consequently, more relational and regionalized focuses have gained ground in many borderlands (Paasi & Zimmerbauer, 2016). Nation state borders do not automatically coincide anymore with the boundaries of functional areas, in terms of economic development but also regarding identity and resource management in its broadest sense, including tourism destination development and management.

With these societal changes, tourism has become targeted in many borderlands from the viewpoint of simple visitor attraction as well as with aims of uncovering previously

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

neglected opportunities for socio-economic development. Because of the sector's perceived ease to develop across borders, its perceived political insensitivity compared to other sectors (Church & Reid, 1999; Deppisch, 2012; Stoffelen & Vanneste, 2017) as well as its symbolism for cross-border relations (Prokkola, 2007, 2011; Stoffelen & Vanneste, 2019; Vogel & Field, 2020), tourism has been highlighted by practitioners as a precursor for more intensive cross-border administrative contact and socio-cultural relations. In recent times, tourism has become a key instrument for initiating cross-border collaboration and for its potential direct socio-economic results.

However, despite relative optimism about the opportunities of cross-border tourism development, the mainstream tourism planning and governance literature continues to raise critical notes about the ease with which positive impacts could be achieved with tourism. Fragmentation of ownership structures, the uneven spatial distribution of tourism resources and stakeholders, unequal power relations and the cross-sectoral nature of tourism policy make tourism planning very much needed but notoriously complicated (Adu-Ampong, 2017; Bramwell, 2011; Hall, 2000; Saarinen, 2007). These reflections have led to a consensus among tourism scholars that inclusive, participatory governance, planning and management is needed to uncover the sector's potentials and to avoid inequality sprouting from tourism development (Saarinen et al., 2017). Plenty of evidence exists that achieving this is anything but straightforward. Disappointing regional and community development results are commonplace, both in the global north and in developing countries (e.g. Keyim, 2018; Rogerson, 2015; Stoffelen, Adiyia, Vanneste, & Kotze, 2020; Stoffelen & Vanneste, 2016).

An evident mismatch appears. If the sector's fragmentation makes inclusive tourism governance and planning necessary but very difficult, how could tourism be an 'easy' sector to facilitate cross-border contact and lead to cross-border regional socio-economic and cultural development? The need for systematic tourism cooperation and planning in borderlands has become increasingly apparent. It is needed to improve visitor management and tourists' experiences but also to distribute benefits and costs more equally among stakeholders and in space in these traditionally peripheral locations.

In this context, the purpose of this chapter is to look at the opportunities, challenges and barriers to transfrontier destinations from the perspective of governance, planning and

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

management. The chapter's second section outlines the necessity of systematic transnational collaboration in tourism if higher-order objectives are to be met. Without aiming to provide a comprehensive review of the tourism governance and planning literature, this section also highlights key elements that make planning and managing tourism with objectives of sustainability, equity and stakeholder integration notoriously difficult, even without considering borderland contexts. In the third section, I shortly reflect on the cross-border planning literature to reflect on structural difficulties that cross-border tourism planning may encounter. The following part is about the implications for managing tourism in borderlands. In the final section, I reflect on possible success factors for establishing integrative tourism planning and management in transboundary settings.

Cross-border tourism development, and the need for integrative planning

In light of increasing global cross-border human mobility, border regions have been systematically studied as possible tourism attractions at least since the 1990s. Shared or complementary resources along and across the border, including the presence of the border itself, may lead to very attractive tourism products (Gelbman & Timothy, 2010; Timothy, 1995). For these reasons, tourism and cross-border collaboration coincide throughout the world, with a range of objectives. Cross-border tourism development in Europe has been strongly embedded in the European neoliberal economic venture, with ultimate aims of breaking down economic and mental barriers as part of the European unification process (Stoffelen & Vanneste, 2019). Cross-border collaboration could unearth important but previously unrecognized opportunities of knowledge exchange and innovation (Trippl, 2010). The mobility fluxes related to tourism allow establishing relations between stakeholders and, consequently, the dispersal of new ideas, processes, products or services (Weidenfeld, 2013). Tourism innovation in borderlands mostly refers to diffusion of best practices, which could lead to improved competitiveness of tourism organizations (Makkonen et al., 2018). Whereas the permeability of borders influences the ease with which knowledge transfer could take place a degree of contrast or unfamiliarity (Spierings & van der Velde, 2013) gives room for more radical innovation and learning (Makkonen et al., 2018).

Preprint to the book chapter with the following reference:

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

In other places, for example sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), tourism has also been a key cross-border development tool but has been predominantly linked up with nature conservation, community development and pro-poor intentions, for example in Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs) (Chaderopa, 2013; Chirozva, 2015; Doppelfeld, 2006; Duffy, 2006). Supported by NGOs and international financial organisations, TFCAs depart from the idea that borders in SSA do not necessarily delineate the most effective nature conservation and community development areas (Duffy, 2006). Considering the substantial natural resources in many of these places, community-based ecotourism across borders is seen as a way to provide the means for nature conservation, to strengthen social and cultural ties with communities on both sides and to empower previously disadvantaged communities (Chirozva, 2015).

The fact that transnational borderlands remain the meeting point of different administrative systems and, in many cases, social and cultural characteristics could also have adverse effects on tourism planning. These include strong competition between tourism destinations on both sides, duplication of tourism investments and limited pro-active stances towards establishing integrated cross-border destinations (Ilbery & Saxena, 2011; Ioannides et al., 2006; Timothy, 1999, 2001). For example, borders may provide opportunities for knowledge exchange and innovation but the barrier effect of borders may limit this exchange and lead to competitive disadvantages compared to other places. Moreover, Chaderopa (2013) shows with a case study of TFCAs between South Africa, Mozambique and Zimbabwe that even though most borders in SSA have been artificially imposed by colonists, many borders have been strongly internalized by borderland inhabitants. This has led in some cases to "a sense of place that refuses to embrace a project that may interfere with the integrity of their identity" (Chaderopa, 2013, p. 58). Combined with external NGO involvement, such projects may lead to limited results, limited attention to internal dynamics within borderland communities and inequalities due to different development levels on both sides of the border (Duffy, 2006).

The bottom line of these reflections is that cooperation and coordination across the border is needed for successful tourism project development but also, and even more pressing, for reaching higher-order objectives such as integrative resource management and facilitating

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

knowledge exchange and innovation. The classification of cross-border relations by Martínez (1994), updated by Timothy (1999), has proven influential in tourism studies to describe the level of planning alignment in borderlands. Martínez classified borderlands according to increasing levels of cooperation, starting from alienated borderlands on one end of the spectrum to integrated borderlands on the other. In alienated borderlands, there is little to no interaction between both sides of the border. At the other end of the scale, in integrated borderlands, boundaries hardly influence contact between stakeholders anymore. While this classification has proven useful for describing general situations and for comparison between different areas, this scheme also has limitations for understanding bottlenecks and best-practices of cross-border tourism planning. For example, case study evidence shows that obstacles to regional cross-border development do not disappear even in cases where cross-border contact is well-developed. Ioannides et al. (2006) and Prokkola (2007) show for the Swedish-Finnish border that even in this case where the border is to a large part 'invisible' and cross-border (tourism) relations are highly integrated, political and cultural differences such as language and traditions still create mental barriers that increase the perceived distance between places. This example shows that "while distinction is often drawn between mental boundaries and material boundaries, the two are, in fact, integrated" (Sofield, 2006, p. 103). Moreover, cross-border cooperation may be characterized by a selective opening and closing, or a sectoral, social, temporal and spatial bias (Timothy et al., 2016). This means that "transboundary exchange could be relatively straightforward in one domain, for one set of stakeholders or for the region on one side of the border, but the border may concurrently be hermetically closed for other sectors, stakeholders or the region on the other side of the border" (Stoffelen, 2017, pp. 1–2).

These reflections show that the underlying processes that explain why a certain level of (dis)integration is reached remains implicit in Martínez's (1994) framework. Yet, exactly these underlying processes are key in tourism planning (Blasco et al., 2014).

Saarinen et al. (2017) describe the consensus among tourism geographers that tourism, being a growth-oriented sector, requires holistic and inclusive planning to avoid negative externalities and to transform growth into more qualitative development. Similarly, Bramwell (2011) argues that tourism policy needs governance and planning to facilitate coordination

and cooperation between stakeholders to deal with power imbalances. The reason for these calls is that tourism planning with the goal of socio-economic development is difficult. The tourism sector is characterized by many stakeholders with different goals and visions but these stakeholders are simultaneously dependent on each other. There is a need to include different stakeholders in a participation process because of the diversity of involved actors, their inability to develop and manage tourism on their own, their mutual interdependencies and the ideas of regional development that include notions of equity (Hall, 2000; Jamal & Getz, 1995).

Since tourism as an economic activity is not self-regulating from an equity perspective, an active civil society and a regulatory framework are needed to guarantee equal opportunities for all stakeholders (Burns, 2004). Using the concept of adaptive co-management, Plummer and Fennell (2009) argue that tourism planning should be inclusive, flexible and continuous rather than focusing on top-down, rigid master planning. Tourism planning should build on a network of affected stakeholders to facilitate dynamic learning, conflict mediation, innovation and adaptation (Plummer & Fennell, 2009). Such characteristics increase the power of the network to deal with sudden changes in economic, social or ecological conditions (Jamal & Getz, 1995).

Establishing these dynamics requires skills and capacities, mutual trust, legitimacy of conveners, and the ability of individual actors to collaborate on issues where they may disagree with each other but still require each other's contribution. Consequently, many implementation gaps exist in uncovering the potentials of tourism in reality (Stoffelen & Vanneste, 2017). In borderlands, material cross-border interdependencies of social, economic, and environmental nature have to be addressed so that possible synergies could be created and negative externalities avoided (Prokkola, 2007). However, the processes needed to succeed with integrative networking and planning may be even more difficult to uncover due to the presence of political, natural and/or cultural boundaries.

The complementarity of tourism and cross-border planning studies

In a study published in 1998, Dallen Timothy argued that four types of cooperation are needed to establish integrative tourism planning: cooperation between government agencies,

between levels of administrations, between public and private sector and between same-level polities (Timothy, 1998). In other words, some form of cross-territorial policy alignment, be it transnational collaboration or inter-municipal exchange, is needed to deal with the fragmentation of tourism stakeholders, interests and resources discussed above.

Despite increased attention to cross-border tourism governance and planning since the publication of that paper, it remains striking that tourism scholars have only made tentative explorations into existing work in the academic field of (cross-border) spatial planning. In fact, cross-border spatial planning constitutes a relative mature academic field and the few papers refering to this literature have improved our insights in bottlenecks and success factors of integrative tourism planning in borderlands. For example, Stoffelen et al. (2017) presented an in-depth case study of tourism governance and planning obstacles in the borderlands between Germany and the Czech Republic. They found that "structural cross-border destination management does not exist because of (transnational) multi-scalar institutional alignment problems and (internal) tourism-specific destination-level power contestations" (Stoffelen et al., 2017, p. 126). Put differently, this study found that the tourism-specific complexities of inclusive participatory planning, discussed above, are compounded in borderlands by general border-related spatial planning complexities. Cross-pollination between the tourism planning and spatial planning literature is, thus, necessary to understand the difficulties that have led to calls that tourism governance in cross-border settings is generally disappointing (Blasco et al., 2014).

A key hindrance to establishing inclusive spatial planning in borderlands is asymmetry between institutions and multi-level governance arrangements on both sides of the border. This asymmetry refers to the contrasting scalar composition of administrative levels as well as mismatches between decision-making cultures, identities and official cross-border discourses on both sides. For example, García-Álvarez and Trillo-Santamaría (2013) describe how centralized decision-making structures in Portugal and more decentralized planning regimes in Spain complicate systematic planning between both sides (see Altinay and Bowen (2006) for a similar case of tourism planning between North and South Cyprus). Particularly the jumping of scales required of regional policymakers in Galicia (Spain) to communicate on topics that are the responsibility of the national government in Portugal proves extremely

difficult. Moreover, the authors identified a mismatch between Galician political discourses and daily experiences of inhabitants of this area. This situation complicates inclusivity in spatial planning in two ways: from the grassroots to regional planning on one side, and systematic alignment across the border from regional to national levels (García-Álvarez & Trillo-Santamaría, 2013).

Knippschild (2011) adds that since cross-border planning is mostly secondary to the within-country responsibilities of regional planners, lacking knowledge, motivation and experience further inhibit systematic decision-making across the border. The result is often a patchwork of existing governmental levels and territories responsible for cross-border spatial planning (Fricke, 2015; Perkmann, 1999). Tölle (2013) argues that even in cases where the multi-level governance systems on both sides of the border seem very compatible, internal dynamics make spatial planning across national borders very complicated. These dynamics include contrasting visions on which topics should be covered with spatial planning, who has final responsibility and when a plan is definitive and binding (Tölle, 2013).

These reflections directly apply to tourism. Case study evidence has shown that tourism planning and management remains embedded in national systems even in integrated borderlands (Blasco et al., 2014; Ilbery & Saxena, 2011; Ioannides et al., 2006; Saxena & Ilbery, 2008; Shepherd & Ioannides, 2020). For example, Ilbery and Saxena (2011) present a case study of the English-Welsh borderlands where no long-term cross-border plans have been established despite similar administrative structures. Tourism activities remain strongly embedded in existing, nationally organized tourism structures that compete with each other for attracting the same tourists. Similarly, Woyo and Slabbert (2019) show how separate tourism marketing of one shared resource (Victoria Falls between Zambia and Zimbabwe) results in duplication of investments and limits opportunities to attract tourists.

Hence, regarding tourism, institutional asymmetry refers not just to difficult alignment between public policy levels due to their different scalar organization. The concept also refers to the different centrality of existing cross-border tourism projects to the destinations on both sides. This includes different importance given to shared projects or resources in the respective tourism marketing on both sides and different possibilities of local stakeholders to tap into these sometimes high-profile tourism products (Stoffelen, 2018).

Preprint to the book chapter with the following reference:

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

Ineffective and exclusive tourism planning on one side may lead to uneven development possibilities with tourism products that are shared across the border (Stoffelen & Vanneste, 2017). Moreover, changes over time in multi-level relations on one side may influence how cross-border tourism projects are planned for by the stakeholders from that side. For example, Gao et al. (2019) show how practical cross-border tourism development activities in China follow from reactions of the national state and local stakeholders to each other's perspective on the border. For the national government "the border, whether open or closed, operates as a barrier to ensure state security as stability is the priority for Beijing, whereas, for local jurisdictions, a different discourse is premised on an open border as an economic resource" (p.11). Changing relations between local and national levels on border issues influence the level of empowerment of local communities and tourism stakeholders and, hence, the benefits that they obtain with cross-border tourism activities (Gao et al., 2019).

Issues of integrative destination management in borderlands

Because of the processes and complexities of integrative tourism planning in transborder areas discussed above, tourism planning in these places is mostly about alignment rather than real destination development and management. Only a few academically recorded exceptions exist of situations where transboundary destination management has replaced existing territorial tourism management (e.g. Hartmann, 2006; Stoffelen & Vanneste, 2018). Even Euroregions, which constitute European cross-border network organizations and contact brokers within a specific territory (Perkmann, 1999) complement rather than replace administrative levels on both sides of the border.

While it makes sense from a policy perspective to focus on alignment rather than new destination development considering the transaction costs involved, it does pose challenges from a management perspective. Supply and demand-oriented visitor management techniques will be split up between destination agencies. For example, spatial zoning mechanisms to regulate access and environmental impacts of tourism will inevitably differ when multiple jurisdictions are involved and different planning regulations apply. The same goes for providing uniform marketing, market research and monitoring of visitors. For example,

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

monitoring the use of tourism trails is already notoriously difficult within one destination (Meschik, 2012), let alone in cross-border settings where trails are popular tourism products. Similarly, Hartmann (2006) highlights the difficulty of dealing with incompatible booking systems in the otherwise highly integrated Lake Constance destination between Germany, Switzerland and Austria. Solving such issues often means dealing with massive bureaucracy (Timothy, 1999; Yodsuwan et al., 2018). Finally, the financing of tourism projects is one of the main highlighted difficulties in tourism development and management resulting from the presence of administrative borders (e.g. Doppelfeld, 2006; Hartmann, 2006; Shepherd & Ioannides, 2020).

The danger exists that positive impacts of existing transboundary tourism activities are simply assumed. Yet, the possibility of uneven development in borderlands is very real. Socio-economic contrasts between both sides could result in different investment opportunities and a different quality of tourism services provided. Furthermore, tourism resources are distributed unevenly throughout destinations and on both sides of the border. Tourists' imaginaries, cross-cultural expectations and language contrasts may lead to preferences for one side over the other among the tourists with highest spending power. Finally, and most crucially, uneven levels of participation and stakeholder integration on both sides of the border could mean that the distribution of decision-making power and of benefits sprouting from tourism development may differ between areas.

In these situations, tourism projects could confirm and even worsen existing situations instead of alleviate inequality (Timothy, 2001), even when cross-border tourism projects are commercially viable. For example, the earlier described separation of tourism marketing and planning between Zimbabwe and Zambia regarding Victoria Falls promotes uneven development between both sides. Zimbabwe benefits disproportionally, partly due to better access from nature-based destinations in Botswana (Woyo & Slabbert, 2019). The same situation emerged in the German-Czech borderlands, where despite the presence of many cross-border projects the stakeholders on the German side benefit more than their Czech counterparts owing to a much more inclusive, participatory tourism management system (Stoffelen et al., 2017).

Preprint to the book chapter with the following reference:

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

These reflections show that transborder tourism planning and management should distinguish between tourism product development and more systematic tourism planning and management. For the former, local-level exchange could suffice to create commercially viable tourism products. For the latter, higher-level integrative planning is needed. In other words, scale matters in transboundary tourism planning and management. Whereas individual contact and personal relations, such as between mayors of municipalities, could overcome border-related planning obstacles like different decision-making cultures, language contrasts and unfamiliarity with the planning system on the other side (Ilbery & Saxena, 2011), higher-level alignment is often more sensitive to institutional asymmetry and boundary effects of the border (Perkmann, 1999). If tourism development in transboundary settings is to be planned for in an integrative, holistic way these key cooperation issues as well as possible consequences should already be considered in the very first planning phase, even before tourism projects are financed and developed (Burns, 2004); in the 'problem-setting' rather than 'direction-setting' or 'implementation' stages of collaborative tourism planning (Jamal & Getz, 1995).

Success factors for transborder tourism planning and management

Even though establishing integrative transborder planning and destination management is simultaneously necessary and difficult, it is not impossible. Several studies have highlighted crucial success factors. Some of these are contextual elements that are hard to facilitate from a planning standpoint. For example, a shared language, good cross-border accessibility, a shared currency and long histories of collaboration could help lower functional barriers for transboundary tourism cooperation. Consequently, Blasco et al. (2014) argue that serendipity should not be disregarded when explaining successful cases of cross-border tourism governance.

However, integrative cross-border planning relations do not only develop by chance. Blasco et al. (2014) found in the same study of tourism collaboration between Spain and France that social and cultural affinity could foster individual and organizational relationships across the border. Focusing on the 'softer' elements of cross-border cooperation, such as establishing social interactions and trust relations, could facilitate transborder exchange more

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

efficiently than focusing on 'hard' projects like infrastructure development (Makkonen et al., 2018). Knowledge about the respective decision-making cultures could smoothen cross-border negotiations and speed up planning processes (Stoffelen et al., 2017).

Moreover, culture and spatial identity could be obstacles but also policy tools for establishing integrative cross-border tourism planning and management. Chaderopa (2013) found for a TFCA between South Africa, Mozambique and Zimbabwe that culture and spatial identity could function as a cooperation barrier when mismatching with cross-border tourism policies. The reverse also seems true. Stoffelen and Vanneste (2018) found with a case study of the Vogtland destination between two German federal states that shared histories were strategically used by policymakers in an internal marketing campaign to grow cross-border identities among residents. By doing so, the policymakers managed to create support for an ultimately financially driven cross-border destination merger. Cultural identity seems, at least to some degree, malleable for purposes of transboundary tourism planning.

A recurring success factor in many case studies is the presence of personal relations and mutual trust between individuals in key positions on both sides of the border. Establishing formal administrative channels across the border is complex. Moreover, established formal transboundary exchange procedures are often inflexible and time-consuming (Timothy, 1999). Good individual contacts, based on trust, between stakeholders could advance the decision-making process. Informal arrangements could avoid red tape and establish a common sense approach regarding cross-border information exchange that is otherwise inhibited by inflexible or incompatible formal procedures (Princen et al., 2016). For example, Kozak and Buhalis (2019) found that the linking up of seaside destinations between Greece and Turkey was seen by many tour operators as potentially bringing competitive advantages to the area. The practical linking up happened on the basis of individual business decisions rather than through systematic organizational collaboration and public policy support. Practically, small ferry operators provided and promoted cross-border transport possibilities for tourists, partly but not completely filling the void left by local politics on both sides (Kozak & Buhalis, 2019).

However, dependency on individual contacts with limited institutionalized arrangements backing up these contacts makes it hard to deal with the tourism sector's

fragmentation. It also makes tourism planning vulnerable for changes in personnel (Stokke & Haukeland, 2018). Hence, despite the undoubted value of individual relations in establishing cross-border tourism activities, several studies emphasize that systematic alignment and planning remains crucial to reach higher-order objectives with tourism in cross-border areas (e.g. Altinay & Bowen, 2006; Ilbery & Saxena, 2011; Kozak & Buhalis, 2019). Blasco et al. (2014) and Stoffelen and Vanneste (2017) both argue that institutionalized bridging actors could facilitate the upscaling of cross-border relations from individual contact to systematic and more durable organizational alignment. Furthermore, very practical discussions such as deciding on durable funding arrangements of cross-border projects could increase these projects' long-term viability and provide a stepping stone towards establishing more systematic planning agreements (Stoffelen, 2018).

On final reflection, Yodsuwan et al. (2018) point to the importance of recognizing cultural practices when dealing with these systematic complexities in cross-border tourism planning. Using a case study of the Thai side of the Golden Triangle between Thailand, Laos and Myanmar, they argue that Thai cultural behaviour and expectations, valuing among others hierarchy and individual relations over institutional efficiency, require culturally sensitive adaptations to the solutions discussed above. For example, they propose establishing collaborative groups comprising of participants of similar societal standing to encourage open dialogues. Such a solution would require a step by step participatory process instead of one continuous round-table forum.

Conclusion

Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas is a double-edged sword. On the one hand, the tourism sector provides clear opportunities to reach higher-order spatial development objectives in borderlands. These objectives could include knowledge exchange, combined nature conservation and pro-poor effects, and socio-economic and cultural region-building. On the other hand, inclusivity in tourism planning and management is difficult to achieve even without considering border-related cooperation barriers, let alone in cross-border contexts. Yet, systematic participatory planning is a prerequisite if one wants to move beyond individual tourism project development.

Preprint to the book chapter with the following reference:

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

The general complexities of participatory tourism planning, which have been widely documented over the years, also apply to borderlands settings. The cross-sectoral nature of tourism policy means that there are high transaction costs for coordinating between sectors, interests, land uses and stakeholders with different power positions (Hooghe & Marks, 2003), also in borderlands. Specifically, within cross-border tourism negotiations, interests and objectives may differ also between tourism-specific actors. For example, the objectives of cross-border knowledge exchange and innovation, focusing ultimately on economic competitiveness of (cross-border) tourism destinations, are not necessarily in line with combined pro-poor efforts and environmental sustainability strived for in TFCAs.

Moreover, spatial planning in borderlands encounters structural complexities that also apply to the tourism sector. The review in this chapter has highlighted the necessity to reflect on the compatibility of multi-level tourism governance and planning systems on both sides as well as across the border. Even though local-level cross-border exchange is regularly relatively feasible, systematic and inclusive tourism planning requires institutional alignment also on higher scales where coordination complexities are often more pronounced.

Quick fix solutions seem insufficient to deal with structural tourism planning issues in borderlands. This makes achieving higher-level objectives with cross-border tourism difficult, particularly in places where cross-border relations are tense but also in less contested places such as those that could benefit from European cross-border co-funding arrangements like INTERREG. These funds are potentially very helpful to support policymakers cramped for time and finances. However, they could entice stakeholders to focus on short-term, local-level goals and individual projects rather than systematic, inclusive planning (Shepherd & Ioannides, 2020).

Tourism planners should explicitly reflect on stakeholder inclusivity as well as structural institutional compatibility and alignment across the border, irrespective of the position of their area in Martínez's (1994) continuum of cross-border relations. The identification of the multi-level institutional organization of tourism on both sides of the border as well as across the border should take place in the very earliest planning phase. This mantra particularly applies to areas where funding schemes are available or individual cross-border contacts have been made already; circumstances when individual tourism project

development may seem relatively straightforward but where systematic planning often lags behind. In less integrative borderlands, attention to softer elements of cross-border collaboration such as social interactions between people should be emphasized in addition (Makkonen et al., 2018) to avoid structural institutional problems later on.

References

Adu-Ampong, E. A. (2017). Divided we stand: institutional collaboration in tourism planning and development in the Central Region of Ghana. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 20(3): 295–314. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2014.915795

Altinay, L., & Bowen, D. (2006). Politics and tourism interface. The case of Cyprus. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(4): 939–956. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2006.03.020

Blasco, D., Guia, J., & Prats, L. (2014). Emergence of governance in cross-border destinations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49: 159–173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.09.002

Brambilla, C. (2015). Exploring the critical potential of the borderscapes concept. *Geopolitics*, 20(1): 14–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2014.884561

Bramwell, B. (2011). Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: A political economy approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5): 459–477. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.576765

Burns, P. (2004). Tourism Planning: A Third Way? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(1): 24–43.

Chaderopa, C. (2013). Crossborder cooperation in transboundary conservation-development initiatives in southern Africa: The role of borders of the mind. *Tourism Management*, 39: 50–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.04.003

Chirozva, C. (2015). Community agency and entrepreneurship in ecotourism planning and development in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 14(2–3): 185–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2015.1041967

Church, A., & Reid, P. (1999). Cross-border co-operation, institutionalization and political space across the English Channel. *Regional Studies*, 33(7): 643–655. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343409950078684

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

Deppisch, S. (2012). Governance processes in Euregios. Evidence from six cases across the Austrian–German border. *Planning Practice and Research*, 27(3): 315–332. https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2012.670937

Doppelfeld, M. (2006). Collaborative stakeholder planning in cross-border regions. The case of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park in Southern Africa. In H. Wachowiak (Ed.), *Tourism and borders. Contemporary issues, policies and international research* (pp. 113–138). Ashgate.

Duffy, R. (2006). The potential and pitfalls of global environmental governance: The politics of transfrontier conservation areas in Southern Africa. *Political Geography*, 25(1): 89–112. https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2005.08.001

Fricke, C. (2015). Spatial Governance across Borders Revisited: Organizational Forms and Spatial Planning in Metropolitan Cross-border Regions. *European Planning Studies*, 23(5): 849–870. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2014.887661

Gao, J., Ryan, C., Cave, J., & Zhang, C. (2019). Tourism border-making: A political economy of China's border T tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 76: 1–13.

García-Álvarez, J., & Trillo-Santamaría, J.-M. (2013). Between regional spaces and spaces of regionalism: Cross-border region building in the Spanish 'State of the Autonomies.' *Regional Studies*, 47(1): 104–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2011.552495

Gelbman, A., & Timothy, D. J. (2010). From hostile boundaries to tourist attractions. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(3): 239–259. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500903033278

Hall, C. M. (2000). *Tourism planning. Policies, processes and relationships*. Pearson Education Limited.

Hartmann, K. (2006). Destination management in cross-border regions. In H. Wachowiak (Ed.), *Tourism and borders. Contemporary issues, policies and international research* (pp. 89–109). Ashgate.

Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2003). Unraveling the central state, but how? Types of multi-level governance. *American Political Science Review*, 97(2): 233–243. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055403000649

House, J. W. (1980). The frontier zone: A conceptual problem for policy makers. *International Political Science Review*, 1(4): 456–477.

https://doi.org/10.1177/019251218000100403

Ilbery, B., & Saxena, G. (2011). Integrated rural tourism in the English–Welsh cross-border region: An analysis of strategic, administrative and personal challenges. *Regional Studies*, 45(8): 1139–1155. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2010.486785

Ioannides, D., Nielsen, P. Å., & Billing, P. (2006). Transboundary collaboration in tourism: The case of the Bothnian Arc. *Tourism Geographies*, 8(2): 122–142. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616680600585380

Jamal, T. B., & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1): 186–204.

Jones, M., & Macleod, G. (1999). Towards a regional renaissance? Reconfiguring and rescaling England's economic governance. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 24(3): 295–313. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0020-2754.1999.00295.x

Keyim, P. (2018). Tourism collaborative governance and rural community development in Finland. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(4): 483–494. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287517701858

Knippschild, R. (2011). Cross-border spatial planning: Understanding, designing and managing cooperation processes in the German–Polish–Czech borderland. *European Planning Studies*, 19(4): 629–645. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2011.548464

Konrad, V., & Nicol, H. N. (2011). Border culture, the boundary between Canada and the United States of America, and the advancement of borderlands theory. *Geopolitics*, 16(1): 70–90. https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2010.493773

Kozak, M., & Buhalis, D. (2019). Cross-border tourism destination marketing: Prerequisites and critical success factors. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 14, 1–9.

Makkonen, T., Williams, A. M., Weidenfeld, A., & Kaisto, V. (2018). Cross-border knowledge transfer and innovation in the European neighbourhood: Tourism cooperation at the Finnish-Russian border. *Tourism Management*, 68: 140–151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.03.008

Martínez, O. J. (1994). *Border people: Life and society in the U.S. - Mexico borderlands*. University of Arizona Press.

Meschik, M. (2012). Sustainable cycle tourism along the Danube cycle route in Austria.

Tourism Planning & Development, 9(1): 41–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2012.653478

Newman, D. (2006). The lines that continue to separate us: Borders in our "borderless" world. *Progress in Human Geography*, 30(2): 143–161. https://doi.org/10.1191/0309132506ph599xx

Paasi, A., & Zimmerbauer, K. (2016). Penumbral borders and planning paradoxes: Relational thinking and the question of borders in spatial planning. *Environment and Planning A*, 48(1): 75–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X15594805

Perkmann, M. (1999). Building governance institutions across European borders. *Regional Studies*, 33(7): 657–667. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343409950078693

Plummer, R., & Fennell, D. A. (2009). Managing protected areas for sustainable tourism: Prospects for adaptive co-management. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(2): 149–168. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580802359301

Princen, S., Geuijen, K., Candel, J., Folgerts, O., & Hooijer, R. (2016). Establishing cross-border co-operation between professional organizations: Police, fire brigades and emergency health services in Dutch border regions. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 23(3): 497–512. https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776414522082

Prokkola, E.-K. (2007). Cross-border regionalization and tourism development at the Swedish-Finnish border: "Destination Arctic Circle." *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(2): 120–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250701226022

Prokkola, E.-K. (2011). Regionalization, tourism development and partnership: The European Union's North Calotte sub-programme of INTERREG III A North. *Tourism Geographies*, 13(4): 507–530. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2011.570371

Rogerson, C. M. (2015). Tourism and regional development: The case of South Africa's distressed areas. *Development Southern Africa*, 32(3): 277–291. https://doi.org/10.1080/0376835X.2015.1010713

Saarinen, J. (2007). Tourism in peripheries: The role of tourism in regional development in northern Finland. In D. K. Müller & B. Jansson (Eds.), *Tourism in peripheries: Perspectives from the far north and south* (pp. 41–52). CAB International. https://doi.org/10.1079/9781845931773.0000

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

Saarinen, J., Rogerson, C. M., & Hall, C. M. (2017). Geographies of Tourism Development and Planning. *Tourism Geographies*, 19(3): 307–317. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2017.1307442

Saxena, G., & Ilbery, B. (2008). Integrated rural tourism: A border case study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(1): 233–254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2007.07.010

Shepherd, J., & Ioannides, D. (2020). Useful funds, disappointing framework: tourism stakeholder experiences of INTERREG. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, *online first*.

Sofield, T. H. B. (2006). Border Tourism and Border Communities: An Overview. *Tourism Geographies*, 8(2): 102–121. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616680600585489

Spierings, B., & van der Velde, M. (2013). Cross-Border Mobility, Unfamiliarity and Development Policy in Europe. *European Planning Studies*, 21(1): 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.716235

Stoffelen, A. (2017). *Borders, a blessing in disguise? A structural analysis of tourism and regional development processes in European borderlands*. Doctoral dissertation, KU Leuven - University of Leuven, Belgium.

Stoffelen, A. (2018). Tourism trails as tools for cross-border integration: A best practice case study of the Vennbahn cycling route. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 73: 91–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2018.09.008

Stoffelen, A., Adiyia, B., Vanneste, D., & Kotze, N. (2020). Post-apartheid local sustainable development through tourism: an analysis of policy perceptions among 'responsible' tourism stakeholders around Pilanesberg National Park, South Africa. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(3): 414–432.

Stoffelen, A., Ioannides, D., & Vanneste, D. (2017). Obstacles to achieving cross-border tourism governance: A multi-scalar approach focusing on the German-Czech borderlands. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 64: 126–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2017.03.003

Stoffelen, A., & Vanneste, D. (2016). Institutional (dis)integration and regional development implications of whisky tourism in Speyside, Scotland. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 16(1): 42–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2015.1062416

Preprint to the book chapter with the following reference:

Stoffelen, A. (2022). Planning and managing tourism in transborder areas. in: D.J. Timothy & A. Gelbman (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism* (pp. 341-352). Routledge http://doi.org/10.4324/9781003038993-30

Stoffelen, A., & Vanneste, D. (2017). Tourism and cross-border regional development: insights in European contexts. *European Planning Studies*, 25(6): 1013–1033. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2017.1291585

Stoffelen, A., & Vanneste, D. (2018). The role of history and identity discourses in cross-border tourism destination development: A Vogtland case study. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 8: 204–213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2017.04.003

Stoffelen, A., & Vanneste, D. (2019). Commodification of contested borderscapes for tourism development: Viability, community representation and equity of relic Iron Curtain and Sudetenland heritage tourism landscapes. In A. Paasi, E.-K. Prokkola, J. Saarinen, & K. Zimmerbauer (Eds.), *Borderless worlds for whom? Ethics, moralities and mobilities* (pp. 139–153). Routledge.

Stokke, K. B., & Haukeland, J. V. (2018). Balancing between tourism development and nature protection across national park borders – a case study of a coastal protected area in Norway. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 61(12): 2151–2165.

Timothy, D. J. (1995). Political boundaries and tourism: Borders as tourist attractions. *Tourism Management*, 16(7): 525–532. https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(95)00070-5

Timothy, D. J. (1998). Cooperative tourism planning in a developing destination. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 6(1): 52–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589808667301

Timothy, D. J. (1999). Cross-border partnership in tourism resource management: International parks along the US-Canada Border. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7(3–4): 182–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589908667336

Timothy, D. J. (2001). *Tourism and political boundaries*. Routledge.

Timothy, D. J., Saarinen, J., & Viken, A. (2016). Editorial: Tourism issues and international borders in the Nordic Region. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 16(Sup.1): 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2016.1244504

Tölle, A. (2013). National planning systems between convergence and incongruity: Implications for cross-border cooperation from the German–Polish perspective. *European Planning Studies*, 21(4): 615–630. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.722957

Trippl, M. (2010). Developing cross-border regional innovation systems: Key factors and

challenges. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 101(2): 150–160. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9663.2009.00522.x

Van Houtum, H. (2000). An overview of European geographical research on borders and border regions. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, XV(1): 57–83.

Vogel, B., & Field, J. (2020). (Re)constructing borders through the governance of tourism and trade in Ladakh, India. *Political Geography*, 82: 102226.

Weidenfeld, A. (2013). Tourism and cross border regional innovation systems. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 42: 191–213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2013.01.003

Woyo, E., & Slabbert, E. (2019). Cross-border destination marketing of attractions between borders: the case of Victoria Falls. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 2(2): 145–165.

Yodsuwan, C., Pianluprasidh, P., & Butcher, K. (2018). Against the flow: Challenges in tourism development for a small-border town in Thailand. In Y. Wang, A. Shakeela, A. Kwek, & C. Khoo-Lattimore (Eds.), *Managing Asian Destinations* (pp. 107–123). Springer.