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Introduction
Post modern tendencies in mountain communities and other areas of high natural and cultural value have resulted in great mobility of goods, capitals and also people, who have chosen those areas as permanent or temporary residence. With post-modernism there is posttourism, a process of residential transition and reconversion of tourist destinations, which includes new residential strategies for both the active and retired. This double process of convergence of tourism and residential development is much more than a simple indicator of the reconversion of tourist or agricultural zones; it constitutes a deep re-composition of worldwide agreements built during the 20th century in relation to space, time and practices of the “here” - the city, daily life, work, and “there” - nature, non-daily life, leisure. CEPLADES-TURISMO has been researching mobility processes through amenity and lifestyle migration in Argentina since 2001, especially in the mountain areas of Northern Patagonia and in some tourist destinations on the Atlantic coast. The focus in this presentation is the interpretation of the role of the State in the processes of mountain and coastal territorial transformation in the post-tourism scenario in Argentina.

Post-Tourism in a wide sense implies a status change in regional spaces and in the tourist practices in a context of globalization and post-modernization. The acceptance of this new scenario highlights how transcendent it is to construct a vision that would modify the role of the State as principle promoter of local management and responsible for protecting the use of common goods for the enjoyment and well-being of communities facing private valorization.

Given that public value is intangible, it must be determined by the communities themselves.

Global capitalism has been emphatically active in real estate, which generates uneven geographical developments (Harvey, 2000). These developments present great obstacles for the convergence of multiple interests, in a context of expressing general interest. Conflict arises regarding local interests in accessing resources, moving to better life opportunities and acquiring basic forms of financial security. One of the main concerns expressed by the localborn- and-raised and earlier migrants in interviews carried out in different tourist destinations of Argentina is the “deepening loss” of access to public domain goods (lake and riversides, public roads), along with a loss of work opportunities. These new ways of contemporary capitalist manifestations make it interesting to interpret how the State faces the difficulties in convergence of multiple interests, which are connected to resources accessibility and to better life opportunities for the impacted communities.
The Context: Principles and a Glance at Territorial Development

In order to analyze the role of the State in local development processes in tourist destinations that experience amenity migration, it is necessary to point out certain conditions that have marked the processes of transformation of the Argentine State by the end of the 20th century.

It is possible that the most noticeable is the Structural Reform of the State carried out at the beginning of the 1990s, which included economy-stabilizing policies, decentralization and the 1994 institutional reform that reevaluated, among other things, municipal autonomy.

Decentralization has meant for the provinces, and then for the townships, having to abruptly adapt to new management conditions and responsibilities, needing to search for original formulas to confront adverse effects in every level of this restructuration, and to find ways to better utilize their own resources and potentials.\(^1\)

The Reform of the State and public policy decentralization processes have placed the regional (province) and local spheres (towns) in the spotlight, since the management and execution of new services and social competences have been delegated to them, forcing them to modify their administrative purpose and modality to incorporate technology, to develop innovative leadership, to rationalize government staff and to train their human resources.

Argentina is characterized by an extended geography and varied cosmopolitan centers, a combination of cultures and religions, a demanding and highly active to ask for their rights civil society, and more than a quarter of a century of democracy. However, there is “another” Argentina, which manifests itself, for example, through regional economic disparity and in a preoccupying increase of residential segregation.

Many tourist mountain and beach destinations in this country meet the conditions to generate, in the collective minds, the vision of a space where towns share certain common public values that offer better opportunities for human development.

This value is tied to the capacity to generate pleasure, delight or well-being. It arises from an adaptation between needs and desires and the opportunities that open up from the services that are provided. Public value is distinguishable from other types of value for being perceived by citizens in a collective way. Public preferences are necessarily in the heart of public value. Nonetheless, “the public” is not a mere aggregation of individual preferences, but rather a collective decision of what is valuable and important (and must be produced) for the social group. People bestow value on aspects that could very well transcend the simple generation of income or economic support for their families: having medical services that would allow them to enjoy a long, healthy life; good work conditions and gratifying leisure time; an agreeable and sustainable environment; higher safety levels, a feeling of belonging, active participation in their communities; all of these are dimensions that make up human development. In other words, the goods to which a person can have access to matter less that those to which that person makes or can make, be or can be, thanks to access to them.\(^2\)

These dimensions that make up human development are intimately linked with the factors that explain the post-tourism scenario and the territorializing tendencies it imposes.


\(^2\)
It is important to differentiate the concept of public value from the more limited tourist product. The latter allows for a partial analysis, but it is not convenient for a wider reflection. In general terms we can say that both residents and tourists enjoy the public value of their common place or space, however, not all the actions these people carry out improve the public value which they do or wish to enjoy. Therefore, it is important not only to establish which ones are the determining characteristics of public value, but also what affects it and what increases it. In fact, it is possible to establish public value in economic terms, thus the State should incentivize, or benefit those actions that consolidate and improve public value, and sanction those that diminish it.

In this case, it is crucial to think about how public value in mountain and beach amenity destinations is composed. Aspects such as the priority of the mountain, the forest, the scale of the township, the possibility of enjoying the sun at the beach throughout the day, the tranquility, the availability of natural views without human intervention can be part of the public value of these destinations.

Local public value is intangible and must be determined by the residents and sustained by the municipalities to establish their mission. In a systemic framework there are two essential elements that need to be defined to establish the municipal capacity of management: the mission, and its degree of knowledge and adherence; and the instruments that explain service production. Even though each municipality must define its own mission, the absence of this concept in most public administrations has lead some specialists to characterize such definition based on judicial bodies from different Latin American municipalities. It is possible to define the mission of the municipal organization as "... the power behind economic and territorial development and the main agent in the satisfaction of needs, in the improvement of quality of life and in the increase of opportunities to grow within the municipality.".

But it is valid to consider a local society as a singular and unique expression, inscribed in a structural reality whose working logic transcends local guidelines. Precisely, the local aspect sets out the challenge of maintaining an opening to universality from particularity, which means to insert itself in a universal level from its own reality. Local development, being understood as a process from the bottom to the top, sets the endogenous potential into action to construct territories with greater creation and mobility of its own capacities. The synergy between private and public agents among the different levels of the government, and between the local productive sectors and broader markets, are a key component to activate territorial development. Those efforts must be complemented with national efforts, which, through policies of decentralization and territorial assignment of resources, assist in boosting the development of lagging regions and cater to their most basic needs. The dialectic between mobilization from the regions themselves and the national territorial cohesion policies must create positive circles between social capital and public policy, strengthening the specific development abilities of the territories.

Territorial cohesion in those destinations with amenity migration is considered a meeting point for the promotion of regional and local development, from the top to the bottom, and coordination and articulation of traditionally separated sectorial and transversal policies.
Amenity Migration as the engine of the urban segregation processes.
The free market dynamic creates inequality in the cities worldwide, but in tourist destinations that have residential development those inequalities are even stronger and more noticeable, mainly due to a marked asymmetry in the infrastructure and equipment allocations. Those urban areas where the demand concentrates because of a dynamic economic activity, such as tourism, and to which the attention of families of higher income is drawn, the land acquires such a high real estate value that it prevents access to it, or it pushes less dynamic economic activities and lower income families away, promoting displacement. Initially this is physical, but then it also becomes economic, social and psychological.

Residential segregation implies different socioeconomic groups within the same city that live separately, with little to no cohabiting. In extreme cases, each residential space in the city presents a socioeconomic homogeneity and, at the same time, it completely differentiates itself from areas where other socioeconomic groups reside. This condition of social fragmentation is deepened by the growing segmentation of non-residential spaces for social gathering, the weakening of lower strata bonding with the work force and stigmatization of poor neighborhoods.

In mountain towns like San Martin de los Andes and Villa La Angostura, both located in the north of Patagonia Argentina, the main pressure on urban land is from real estate agents, who seek better locations based on main attractions or urban space nodules, such as the urban or commercial center. Sat the same time the development of isolated urban areas has been promoted by local administration, but those areas have almost no communication among them and their connections are with “The Mountain Village” or its city center. This situation, together with the clear segmentation among them, makes up an inarticulate urban plot, weakly sustained by a compartmentalized social plot, and additionally with negative effects on local development.

Real estate investors decide on their participation in such markets because these villages have promoted their public values through tourism, which have been developed with the efforts of the entire community. Therefore, the development of urban entrepreneurships, which is to a considerable extent for personal interest, should also be so for the community.

Far from this, the current rules of the game grant clear benefits for real estate businesses, considering that profitability of “high end” towns is sky-scrapping. This condition seems to be due to three key factors:
1. Prices are in reference to a selective market linked to the “ABC 1 segment” from Buenos Aires (the highest economic and social segment).
2. A public price is captured, the landscape; but none pays for this captured public value.
3. The municipality does not capture the values that it itself generates and promotes.

In other words, rural lands are worth what they can produce, whereas urban land is worth what can be built on them. The municipality is responsible for authorizing what is allowed to be built. Nonetheless, that capital gain from the value is captured by the urban entrepreneur when it should accrue; at least in part to the local government when thoroughly fulfill its mission.

In general, the recuperation of capital gain as a relevant initiative of urban policy is beginning to be analyzed by the local Latin American administrations due to the increasing rise in demands derived both from the urbanizing processes as well as from administrative decentralization. The need to face higher investments in public works, especially infrastructure is making local governments show more interest and have more
opportunities to think about obtaining additional resources generated by their own activities.

In Argentina, even though in the last 20 years there has been more attention to ideas associated with recovery of capital gain, there still is a lack of tradition and fiscal and ethical culture to support this. Until today, in most tourist centers, investments made by the municipal State, mainly as the urban equipment supplier (like gas, electricity and sewage), have not followed the intention of recovering capital gain because it does not have adequate tools for its training and subsequently distribution through compensatory policies from the local government. Therefore, capital gains generated through public works goes completely to private owners.

This demonstrates the need to put into place training mechanisms for such capital gains and their subsequent re-distributions. The problem is that most mechanisms run into inaction by, or even absence of the State, which means that the strategic answer is reconfiguring or restructuring it urban role. Additionally, there is a contradiction between the official pronouncements of agents in charge of tourist development in mountain destinations, who promote and foment - whenever possible - the incoming of new investments, and with them the appearance of new amenity migrants. They are pronounced positive aspects of the development, yet have crucial negative effects for target destinations in terms of their social and economic development -- being almost always hidden by the associated public policies and actions. “Growth is good” is the predominant thought in most tourist destinations. Each year there is a veiled competition among destinations for the highest growth in built square meters, the highest number of tourist beds offered, the most tourists received and the highest percentage of occupancy These are synonyms for positive growth and development.

This condition forces us to think about a change in the role of the State, from regulator to promoter of urban development. Obviously, the role of promoter must be based on intelligent intervention in the real estate market, and must have as a main objective the generation of a local economic dynamic that will promote equality and opportunities for the medium and lower income sectors. Also, that it will preserve living conditions for the place as well as for its people.

Just as in other cases analyzed in Northern Patagonia, the risk associated is that the tourist development discourse could transform into what we call “the shadow of tourism”, which hides and allows foreign actions and the transference of goods of public value to public private hands, promoting new territorial appropriation, symbolically and physically, regressive in terms of local development.

In the Argentine Corredor de los Lagos, the latest news denotes this latent risk: at the end of 2010 the Government of the Province of Neuquén promoted the Decree 2029/10, through the Program of Valuing Fiscal Lands, for the province’ economic development. Its aim is to organize, though the Board of Territorial Development, and in an organic and progressive way, investors interested in the development of productive, service, industrial, urban and tourist projects in public owned fiscal lands free of occupants. It created a Productive Lands Bank that includes all of the provincially owned lands free of dwellers at the time of launching the regulation.

This land bank includes lots in mountain destinations that have advanced amenity migration processes, like Villa La Angostura, or places that due to their location and their basic attractiveness, like the artificial lakes Mari Menuco and Alicura, means the State will promote the transference of its real property to private hands. Given the supposedly “productive” usage, a deepening of incompatibilities with public use registered in most mountain destinations within the lake region can be foreseen.
The incompatibilities observed between public use and productive uses are generated when the latter abuses its rights and, exclusively, takes over the benefits derived from public goods. In those areas where the natural patrimony has scenic value, the appropriation of riverbeds and lakebeds, public roads, landscape constitutes an abuse of rights which effects are correlative complementary: on the one side it excludes the rest of the society from its benefit, while on the other hand it values the patrimony of the property, without taxing, integrating the benefits of exclusivity to the owner of private property.11
This phenomenon is particularly frequent in urban growth produced by the amenity migrants12, and especially by a kind of real estate business that during the last few years has reached a strong impulse: water-front living. With it real estate investors have found a new destination for urban appreciation. Even though it is a business that had already achieved certain importance in the past, now it has a magnitude and intensity never seen before, giving way to a phenomenon that is materializing with critical dynamism and at very high environmental cost.13
If this tendency is to be reversed it is necessary to be innovative with the rules of the game for management of urban lands; where the State will assume not only a regulatory role, but also it will focus on the protection of common goods through means of planning and administration with citizen participation. Instruments are needed that will “capture and distribute capital gains by the value regarding secondary income, meaning those that are generated by the society and not the owner or the developer”14. In addition, increased transparency in public administration is a supporting necessity.

The role of the State when facing competitiveness challenges in tourist destinations

Competitiveness is one of the concepts more commonly used in economic theory in recent decades. But it is also one of the most controversial, especially in tourism where it still needs to find definition and application. The authors that have defined competitiveness in such spaces more precisely and more generally are Geoffrey Crouch and Brent Ritchie (2000). They refer to it as the “capacity of a country to create added value and increase, in this way, national well-being through the management of advantages and processes, attractions, aggressiveness and proximity, integrating the relationships among them in a economic and social model” (Crouch et al, 2000). The definition, which is centered in the achievement of well-being conditions for the local inhabitants, becomes operative in a model that has a basic nucleus constituted by the natural resources of the correlating attraction factors. Competitiveness will depend mainly on two types of factors, those of attraction and those of support and resourcefulness. To these must added the existence of a direction for the destination and bear in mind the restrictions it will face.
This section attempts to report on the role of the State in some aspects that are crucial in our context for the competitiveness of destinations that have had amenity migration. The approach is based on support factors, public instruments of finance and investment incentive, and innovation processes for product and processes.
In Argentina the efforts to promote competitive conditions in tourist destinations are only recent. The founding point of a group of initiatives is constituted by the Federal Strategic Plan for Sustainable Tourism (2004)15, and developed by the National Board of Tourism (currently, National Ministry of Tourism) in collaboration with the provinces. Among its
primary premises is to foster economic development and social inclusion through tourist development and the preservation of historical, cultural and environmental patrimony. Within this framework, the Program for Improvement of Competitiveness in the Tourism Sector (2004) is a milestone in tourism public policy, being the first integrated approach by a national public policy aiming at tourist competitiveness matters. The program identifies two main priority areas: the Lakes Corridor and the Iguazú Corridor in Misiones.

Moreover, the Plan for Tourist Competitiveness in the Corridor of the Lakes (2010) is presented as a tool that poses concrete strategies, objectives and actions for the short, medium and long terms. The plan is based on six premises: institutionalization, sustainability, tourist area development, incentive systems for development and community sensibility, information systems and quality of tourist services.

As it can be perceived from the previous discussion, the coverage of topics making up competitiveness is, theoretically, wide. The plan refers, at least in formal terms, to integrative questions, such as the destination’s level of performance, compatibility in conservation of natural and cultural resources, strengthening of distributive equity and the need for integrated and decentralized planning. It also includes a key aspects such as, the promotion for strengthening of emerging destinations. This is the aspect where most of the advancement has occurred, beginning with the Program for Strengthening and Stimulus for Emerging Destinations (2008). This has been in place for over four years in pilot cases in different emerging destinations throughout the country.

But other topics related to competitiveness are merely discursive and the application of the plan’s premises to national, regional and local public policies that consider critical competitiveness questions are still taking time to come into effect. The vision of tourist competitiveness is based mainly on support factors with a certain level of attention to specific attraction factors, and little attention is paid to other relevant fields in tourist competitiveness, such as the destination’s strategic direction, restrictive factors, elements of the competitive surroundings, and global markets. The investment incentives have been centered mostly principally in public investment in infrastructure and equipment development: improvement in public access, development and maintenance of trails, anoramic points, dock, visitors centers, tourist information offices’ equipment, etc.

However, the development of financing instrument that fosters private investment is still a pending issue in the development of tourist micro-entrepreneurship, which represents more than 90% of the businesses of the sector. This means a serious constraint for Lakes Corridor mountain destinations which are experiencing amenity migration processes, since, tourism investment are tied to real estate speculation interests; thus incentive mechanisms for small and medium size investments are lacking. A critical analysis of the public financing instruments for the sector, permits to discover that even though the National and Provincial State should support the private sector with tools that would launch the insertion of small and medium size businesses, current financial instruments present a series of deficiencies that make them inefficient and ineffective. First of all, many are just “paper financing instruments, since most of them were formulated without funds, and political decision to implement them. Nowadays, the only reliable and available public credit is the Credit for Productive Reactivation (2002), of the Federal Council of Investments. Nevertheless, even the existing financing instruments cannot be adapted to the needs of the average small or medium size investor. The barriers to financing access are mainly of three types: economic, technical and external. Among the first one we can find certain types of requisites as
the level of debt, liquidity index (own financing), longterm passives and the net patrimony of the requestor. These can be summarized in a phrase commonly mentioned by entrepreneurs, “In order to get a loan, one must have money”. Technical barriers are set generally by the prerequisite of ownership of land and formulation of a project, as well as the filling out of guides and charts for application. External barriers refer to expected requisites - necessary warranties in correlation to the amount applied for (real, pledge, bonds, several, co-debtor, satisfaction to financial agent, among others), amount of financing (since for the most part current credit lines do not finance 100% of the project, as well as the previous experience of the enterprise. Among other barriers, the maximum amounts for loans, return rates and grace periods can be also mentioned.

The addition of these barriers to loans make the time when the requestor can meet all the conditions very exceptional. The State, in its action and in the role of generator of tools for financial support, formulates credit lines mixing those characteristics mentioned above, without reaching the flexibility needed for more beneficiaries and entrepreneurs to develop their projects. It is necessary to link these concepts with the real needs of each geographical areas, each developing zone, bearing in mind their own limits, since the action of generating tools ends up turning into inaction visible in the negative results of all applications.

Product and process innovation is another key problem for destination competitiveness in the Corridor of the Lakes. It is a topic that not only has been approached systemically, but also has never been included in the agenda for public policies for tourist development.

The Northern Patagonia mountain destinations in general and the ones of Corridor of the Lakes in particular are going through an unprecedented profitability crisis, which threatens the economic dimension of its sustainable competitiveness. There is a paradox because even thought there are records of continuous growth in the number of tourists arriving and the number of stay-over, there still is a decrease in profitability in tourism businesses. This is the result of a progressive diminishing of occupancy percentages in hotel and other type of lodgings. The over-dimensioning of the supply versus the tourist demand, resulting from an “exogenous growth bubble”, attracted investments oriented to the construction of hotels that nowadays are not profitable, generate low employment and are seasonal and family owned.

There is a need to find through business and process innovation a way out of this dilemma - in product and in destination management.

The lack of innovation has repercussions in the economic competitiveness of destinations with amenity migrants because the demand is not repetitive, and they typically only visit the destination in high season where there is a lack of recreational services supply. The destination is perceived as “expensive and boring” (Otero, et al. 2009: 5). The volume of tourists that arrive at the destination is not increasing, influencing directly in the profitability of the investments made. Additionally, work is seasonal and conditions are precarious, and therefore there is no incentive for training to improve visitors’ assistance or the generation of quality service. Visitors are more and more informed and demanding, require and need dynamic activities, making them feel involved in the activity generating different sensations that will allow them to remember the destination and their visit at the same time, as an unrepeatable experience.

Innovation of products, processes and also the way to organize the destination development strategy are pillars to the competitive advantages management. Innovation linked to changes in the product and/or service “alludes to the potential to break old routines with the aim to confront competence, react to new stimuli creating or
recreating competitive advantages” (Boscherini y Yoguel, 2000:133). From this perspective it is considered that breaking old routines is connected to creating meaningful experiences, which means not only providing only goods and services but also experiences resulting from rich sensations instilled in the customer.

The municipal and provincial State must first become aware of this need, and then begin the execution reliably, promoting changes in the traditional forms in which the products of these destinations are designed and supplied. The vision must go from one anchored in supplies and based on factorial resources, and therefore seeking to develop comparative advantages, to one supported by the promotion of competitive advantages based in the generation of memorable experiences that are the basis for product innovation.

In such transformation it is crucial to consider a necessary learning process, given that the implementation of innovation processes as generator of competitive advantages does not happen from one moment to the next one, it is necessary to consider that such learning is achieved through modifications in the way concepts and ways of doing things are internalized, where it is valid to capitalize different situations lived and planned in the past, to define what needs to be innovated as a competitive advantage and what is expected from the future.

A competitive destination is that which satisfies demand and maintains an influx of communication and collaboration among the different actors that intervene with the destination: local businessmen, population and government. This is achieved by considering the basic principles of sustainability, such as the short and long term benefits that are under control by the State, coordinating activities among those actors to achieve quality in tourist services in that destination, taking as an action plan adequate preservation of attractions, local inhabitants’ awareness of their manners to visitors and a promoting plan for the destination that will reflect the vision built for itself, including training, communication and innovation as guiding aspects. These include business cooperative work, receiving community and the State. The key element for the formulation and starting up of competitive strategies will have to be, in the first place, dialogue and in the second place, the promotion of institutions that generate a cooperative culture and institutional development as the foundation of the pyramid that results in the improvement of competitive factors.

A diversity of tourist destinations, with common problems
This section makes a brief summary of the issues related to land use planning and sustainable competitiveness challenges studied by CEPLADES-TURISMO in recent years in Argentina, due to the lack of an appropriate State intervention in tourist destinations with amenity migration processes:

- The significant population increase, along with the inefficient planning and land management has raised a number of problems that these tourist villages are facing.
  One of the most important ones relates to the provision of infrastructure and services that are not accompanied by population growth, which threatens conservation of the environment by the extraction of firewood, the discharge of untreated liquid waste, etc. The risk of contaminating water and soil directly affects the ecological balance and scenic quality.
- Lack of compliance and enforcement of sanctions monitoring. In the destinations analyzed, the economic importance of investments - both tourist and complementary investments, and the dependence of the destinations on such investments, increasingly undermine the municipalities controlling and sanctioning capacity, allowing for the
generation of quite harmful scenarios in the medium and long term: unsuitable land use, loss of native forest, unlimited use of water and energy, real estate speculation.

- The effects of Amenity Migration are compounded by other phenomena usually easily found in rural areas: **Irregularities in land transference process, non registered transactions and land registrations**, or directly without deeds title, the lack of regional criteria in regulations, allow for the existence of environmentally inappropriate land uses, just transposed municipal boundaries; social lots located in flood-risk land, inefficiencies in the management of solid waste and concentration of aggressive odors, poor availability of risks maps. Without organization and community cooperation, chances for community and public control are minimal.

- **Difficulties in implementing policies to limit the destination growth.** The increasing demand and allocation of lots for tourist investment projects in certain cases produce that no more land is available within the city limits, and thus a stronger pressure from private sector to invest in the destination. This sets a conflict of interests between public and private; there are some people that agree with the expansion of urban suburbs, while others express the need to limit growth, arguing the fact that these places are gateways to high heritage value areas. Another unwanted consequence of this lack of growth management is that in certain places, as in the case of Villa LaAngostura, more than 50% of the population lives in areas of environmental risk.

- **The vision of competitiveness - and hence the bias of public policies related to the competitiveness of tourism** is generally limited to supportive factors and only some attention is given to attraction factors, without paying the relevant attention to the dimensions concerning the destination management - profitability, marketing, advocacy, organization, information, and even restrictive determinants of competitiveness. Moreover, attraction factors are considered merely from a comparative advantage point of view, exclusively based on factor endowments given by the presence of natural and cultural tourist attractions. Then, efforts are primarily focused on the development of infrastructure and equipment - and not in terms of the competitive advantages that could eventually bring innovation as key destinations competitive factors.

### Conclusions

The State has a clear role in managing amenity migration processes so as to stimulate local development conditions for the communities involved. In doing this, its role as a provider of public goods and social development mechanisms, as well as creator of institutional conditions for a more inclusive and equitable human development should not be dismissed.

In order to address an effective adoption and implementation of these policies, a series of considerations are proposed to set up an agenda for development management of tourist destinations with amenity migration in Argentina are proposed.

The first step is to begin defining an agenda to establish the topics concerning amenity migration among local administrators and officials, with decision at both regional and national scale. The objective is to begin to understand the implications of the government decisions in terms of economic competitiveness as well as promotion and management policies.

Policies should be directed primarily to the development of growth management strategies at local level, involving all local actors, and paying particular attention to the needs of the population and the preservation of local heritage. The State should be in charge of opening formal channels for participation, since public participation exercise may allow residents to generate the need for institutional change, not only of a procedural type but also in terms of evaluative aspects. It is important that governments
ensure that growth conditions can be positive for the community as a whole and not just to benefit a minority in terms of economic capital. The State, in its role as facilitator of local development has the responsibility to create a favorable environment to promote sustainable tourism through the implementation of strategies and procedures to improve the quality of public policies aimed at generating meaningful tourist experiences, based on collaborative work with micro-entrepreneurs that offer a diversification of activities and memorable experiences in these destinations. Start thinking about a change process and review of those factors to develop and promote competitiveness, means innovative ways of thinking that contribute to the competitiveness of the destination. Innovation should be understood as a transversal process that integrates the destination management, embodying the central resources and the destinations attractions, changing from the perspective of "offering goods and services", to a new perspective focused on the “Economy of Experience". Land use policies should be revised to discipline real estate speculation and achieve sustainable expansion of these towns, then preserving the common resources. Therefore, the implementation of management policies in tourist destinations with amenity migration processes requires strong leadership to allow a shift in the concept and vision of the role of the State. Many of the problems reported here have a common denominator: the lack of economic and social management’s long-term vision, the lack of ethical values in public service and lack of training of decision makers that prevents them from appreciating the comprehensive and complex vision needed when facing local development issues. Promoting capacity building for local leaders in economic and social management, as well as creation of networks for collaborative work, will make greater levels of self-limiting corruption levels possible and will allow new paths for the solution of local development problems with a strong dose of community consensus to be found.
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