EXPLORING THE CONCEPT OF
SMART TOURIST DESTINATION

Alfonso Vargas-Sánchez

University of Huelva (Spain)

vargas@uhu.es

ABSTRACT

The results of an exploratory research on the concept of Smart Tourist Destination (STD) are presented. It has been carried out using two panels of experts, trying to contribute to the definition of its still fuzzy profile, with a fragmented and very limited scientific literature.
In addition to the corresponding literature review, within which a particular emphasis has been made in the approach provided by the complexity theory, the content of this paper covers a number of features of a STD: key aspects; definition; dimensions; functions of the management entity; areas of activity or services to provide; technologies...

1. INTRODUCTION

The main aim of this paper is to contribute to the definition of a Smart Tourist Destination (STD) and its profiles, still fuzzy due to a fragmented literature in the professional side and still very scarce in academic means.

In general, smartness (or intelligence) is related to the ability to understand and solve problems using knowledge (based on data and information) in the best possible manner. Nevertheless, in practice this is still a confusing word often utilized in

178

political agendas and by tech companies to sell their solutions. Therefore, its conceptualization is essential, together with its implications on the tourism governance, once assumed that "despite these concerns, smart tourism is an incredibly promising scenario that results in more convenient, safe, exciting and sustainable living spaces for both residents and tourists, more personalized and therefore more relevant tourism experiences, and even greater opportunities for new services, business models and markets to emerge as a result of more flexible structures and different perspectives on value creation" (Gretzel, Sigala, Xiang & Koo, 2015). Or, more synthetically, "a strategic tool for tourism development" (Gretzel, Koo, Sigala & Xiang, 2015).

In this line, this work has been structured as follows:

-Firstly, a review of the literature published in scientific outlets on STD is presented, which is still scarce and very recent; a subsection is devoted to the complexity theory, particularly used in the strategic management field in spite of being rooted in hard sciences such as physics and biology. This theoretical approach is helpful for a better understanding of the functioning of a STD, which could be considered one of the innovative contributions of this paper.

-The methodology implemented in the empirical part of this research is presented next.

-The following epigraph is devoted to the findings gathered, with regard to key aspects of a STD, its definition, its dimensions, its managing body and the corresponding functions, a list of services and areas of activity in which a STD is expected to be involved, and for closing this section a mention to a number of technologies, which form its backdrop.

-Finally, the concluding section, followed by the full bibliographic references inserted in the text.

2. SMART TOURIST DESTINATIONS: LITERATURE REVIEW

"Smart" has become a new buzzword fuelled by technology developments, being wider and wider used by practitioners and researchers, but still poorly conceptualized ,that is, without an established understanding on its meaning. As stated by Gretzel, Sigala, Xiang & Koo (2015), "in practice 'smart' has become a very fuzzy concept often utilized to drive specific political agendas and to sell technological solutions.

179

This is especially true in the case of 'smart tourism', where it is frequently used in the context of open data initiatives or for rather trivial projects such as promoting free wifi or the development of mobile applications". From this starting point, in our opinion, and in agreement with Höjer & Wangel (2015), "it is not so much the individual technological advances but rather the interconnection, synchronization and concerted use of different technologies that constitutes smartness." Lazer et al. (2009) refer to new modalities of communication, new ways for data collection, analysis and exchanges, and thus, new opportunities for value creation and management.

For bridging this gap, López de Ávila (2015) has defined the smart destination as "an innovative tourist destination, built on an infrastructure of state-of-the-art technology guaranteeing the sustainable development of tourist areas, accessible to everyone, which facilitates the visitor's interaction with and integration into his or her surroundings, increases the quality of the experience at the destination, and improves residents' quality of life."

Another definition is provided by Gretzel, Sigala, Xiang & Koo (2015): "smart tourism is defined as tourism supported by integrated efforts at a destination to collect and aggregate/harness data derived from physical infrastructure, social connections, government/organizational sources and human bodies/minds in combination with the use of advanced technologies to transform that data into on-site experiences and business value-propositions with a clear focus on efficiency, sustainability and experience enrichment."

Generally speaking (Gretzel, Koo, Sigala & Xiang, 2015), smart tourism aims to develop information and communication infrastructure and capabilities in order to: improve management/governance, facilitate service/product innovation, enhance the tourist experience, and, ultimately, improve the competitiveness of tourism firms and destinations.

The intensive use of that technological infrastructure should lead to the reinforcement of their consumer's perspective, enhancing the tourism experience of visitors in terms of its co-creation and customization, playing them the double role of consumers and producers of data/information. The implementation of technological advances is the backdrop of a smart tourism destination, but this is just the tip of the iceberg. In fact, its marketing rationale and its implications for its governance are

equally critical aspects. Without them, its technological dimension would not have any clear direction and would unable to provide sustainable competitive advantages.

In this line, Wang, Li & Li (2013) illustrate how the notion of smart destinations has changed the way some Chinese destinations support their processes of tourist experience creation, communication strategy with consumers and management of destination competitiveness, suggesting that service-dominant logic permeates this initiative. Collectively, the that service-dominant logic highlights customer-defined and co-created value, operant resources (knowledge and skills) as the fundamental source of competitive advantage, as well as two-way communication with customers and relationship management (Merz, He, & Vargo, 2009).

In fact, Governments in China and South Korea are heavily funding initiatives mostly focused on building the technological infrastructure that supports smart tourism (Hwang, Park & Hunter, 2015). In Europe, many of the smart tourism initiatives were born out of smart city projects, and their focus is more on innovation, competitiveness and developing smart end-user applications that support enriched tourism experiences (Lamsfus, Martín, Alzua-Sorzabal & Torres-Manzanera, 2015). In Australia, however, the emphasis is on smart governance and specifically open data (Gretzel, Sigala, Xiang & Koo, 2015).

From its managerial and governance perspective, a smart destination can empower destination management organizations, local institutions and tourism companies to make their decisions and take actions based upon the data produced in within the destination, gathered, managed and processed by means of the ICT infrastructure, encompassing intelligent systems, cloud computing, Linked Data, Social Networks, the Internet of Things and mobile applications (Lamsfus, Martín, Alzua-Sorzabal & Torres-Manzanera, 2015). Context-awareness of mobile systems has also been emphasized in connection with smart destinations (Lamsfus, Xiang, Alzua-Sorzabal & Martin, 2013).

Within this environment, stakeholders of tourism are to be dynamically interconnected through technological platforms to collect, create and exchange information that can be used to enrich tourism experiences in real-time (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2014). The sharing economy, for example, has boomed as a result of the availability of these platforms (Airbnb, Uber, etc.).

Recently Gretzel, Werthner, Koo & Lamsfus (2015) conceptualize the smart destination within the broader idea of a smart tourism ecosystem, formed, also and

jointly, by smart technologies and smart cities. That ecosystem nourishes new business models, new interaction paradigms and even new species of tourism businesses, making very hard the delineation of its boundaries. For instance, touristic consumers have resources and because of their ability to tap into the digital ecosystem can organize among themselves or mingle with the closely related residential consumer species and act like producers (a phenomenon often referred to as the sharing economy). In addition, tourism suppliers and/or other business-focused species (with lines among industries becoming increasingly blurred in an open system) can connect through smart technology and create new service offerings (in medical tourism, for example).

According to Gretzel, Werthner, Koo & Lamsfus (2015), it is important to recognize that a smart tourism ecosystem cannot be created, but the necessary technological foundations have to be available for the tourism ecosystem to become smart, such as mobile and wireless technologies, social media, location-based and sensor technologies… Definitely, intelligent systems are needed to support the complexity of interactions within the tourism ecosystem, which surpass human processing capacities (Gretzel, 2011). Another issue is the regulatory side of these ecosystems, being unclear till which extent governments have to interfere.

If smart tourism requires an ecosystem approach, and this calls for complex, adaptive systems supported by intensive technological endowments which interact in multiple ways and on multiple levels to create value and foster innovation, leading, supposedly, to smarter decisions, the foundations of the complexity theory could be applied for a better understanding of this phenomenon, as detailed in the following subsection. This approach can be presented as innovative, as no evidences have been found on the application of this theoretical framework to tourism destinations and its smartness.

To sum up, the smart destination remains an emerging topic in tourism research that requires the integration of knowledge from a number of relevant fields such as information systems, travel behavior, marketing, urban planning, destination management and governance, as well as the increasingly important data analytics and data sciences. Although it is a phenomenon of growing significance, scholarly work on it is lacking, both conceptually and empirically. Therefore, the establishment of a research agenda is critical to fill the many gaps still existing in this new field of study.

In this sense, and as "we are still only at the beginning of developing and understanding the full potential of smart tourism" (Werthner, Koo, Gretzel & Lamsfus, 2015), the contribution of Gretzel, Sigala, Xiang & Koo (2015) is worthy of note, with their proposal of a smart tourism research agenda. The main research areas identified by these authors are summarized in table 1, emphasizing the currently most overlooked gaps in understanding the potential of smart tourism and its possible drawbacks.

Smart Tourism Aspect	Research Topics
Consumption	Privacy concerns. Attitudes toward co-creation. Value derived. Physiological consequences of ubiquitous connectivity. Need/desire for escape from technology. Technology access.
Service Provision	Value of data/information. Exploitable technology-market combinations. Suitable business models. Innovation capacity. Human resources implications. Collaboration/coordination mechanisms. Market dynamics.
Facilitation	Information governance. Infrastructure requirements. Social and environmental cost. Artificial intelligence.

Table 1: Research agenda.
Source: Gretzel, Sigala, Xiang & Koo (2015).

As an addition to this list, recognized by its authors as a research agenda far from being comprehensive, and going beyond the mentioned topic of "information governance", the definition of the new roles to be played by the managing body of a destination with merits to be recognized as smart (usually named as Destination Management Organization, or DMO) is another outstanding challenge. In other words, what should a DMO do to encourage and push forward the smart character of a tourism destination? Or how should a DMO be reshaped to be consistent with the idea of smartness? The problem is, as stated by Gretzel, Werthner, Koo & Lamsfus (2015) that "smart tourism initiatives around the world are seeking to build viable smart tourism ecosystems, but the complexity of the sector makes it extremely difficult to go beyond very specific platform-, technology- or service-specific innovations." Sheehan, Vargas, Presenza & Abbate (in press) offer an organizing framework to clarify the DMO's role as an intelligent agent, based on its position as a boundary spanner between the internal destination environment and the external competitive environment, which requires higher capabilities in knowledge

management. More specifically, some prescriptions are proposed: managers must be adept at stakeholder identification; they must invest in stakeholder relationship management; they must ensure that they have the human and technological resources configured to gather data, analyze it, and create knowledge that supports strategic decision-making and sustainable actions; they must have effective communication collaboration-building capabilities to acquire and disseminate knowledge on both sides of the destination boundary; they must maintain organizational flexibility and be open to partnerships, networks and clusters that continually change; to maximize the intelligence of the DMO, a culture of learning must pervade the entire organization.

2.1. SMART TOURISM DESTINATION UNDER THE COMPLEXITY THEORY APPROACH

This Complexity theory emerged as scientists across a range of disciplines recognized that detailed research on isolated parts of complex systems (such as tourism destinations) could reveal only limited information about the behavior of the system as a whole. Attention to complex systems as holistic entities, influencing and being influenced by the surrounding environment, means that meta-level patterns of change could be observed.

Significantly, complex theory challenges both the source and characteristics of order in complex systems, traditionally associated with linear relationships and incremental progression governed by globally optimized decision making. Instead, complexity theory argues that adaptive strategies not dependent on rational choice or full information hold sway. The consequences are emergent changes or self-organization as a result of localized decisions by operating agents in the system, which deny the traditional prediction capacity, since in complex adaptive systems "small inputs can lead to dramatically large consequences and very slight differences in initial conditions produce very different outcomes" (Lewin, 1993). This is the so-called "butterfly effect", which basically means that small causes can have large effects. As an example, a simple comment made by a very popular personality about a particular place can generate an unexpected and unusual curiosity in many people for visiting that place, boosting massively the tourist inflow.

Therefore, complexity theory challenges modes of governance based on the assumption of predictability and controllability, such as 'command and control',

"predict and plan", or comprehensive rational approaches. Governing complex adaptive systems requires awareness of and attention to "non-linear dynamics, threshold effects and limited predictability" (Duit & Galez, 2008). This means that the outcome of policy interventions cannot be known in advance as policy effects are themselves emergent properties (Wagenaar, 2007).

Planning in general is a process that is concerned with shaping the future trajectories of complex systems, which are systems with emergent properties. In other words, we cannot generate an understanding of the nature of the system and its past, present, and potential future trajectories by an analytical process in which we reduce the system conceptually to its elements and model it in terms of those elements. More important than these elements in themselves are the interactions among them. This phenomenon can be clearly watched in a STD, where interactions, facilitated and magnified by its tech endowment, are critical as a source of new opportunities.

In a nutshell, complexity theory is concerned with complex adaptive systems (CAS) governed by non-linear causality that have "the ability to adapt and co-evolve as they organize through time" (Urry, 2005). More specifically, these CAS meet the following requirements, which fully fit the profile of a tourism destination (Stacey, 2003): they consist of numerous interconnecting parts (tourism agents); each agent (both private and public) acts on its own ideas (schemata) and rules, and on its local context; and the interactions among the parts generate novel properties that cannot be predicted by a simple sum from those of individual parts. For example, interactions among complementary companies able to produce a new tourist offer; or the interaction among government agencies, business associations and knowledge agents (such as researchers in universities) have the potential for the creation of a new meaning and direction for the whole destination (coined as the triple helix concept).

According to the literature (Palmberg, 2009), complex adaptive systems have unique properties, among them:

*Co-evolution. In the complex systems context, co-evolution is referred if interactions influence the dynamics of the individual systems, leading to irreversible patterns of change within each of the interacting system. Therefore, co-evolution means that a complex system co-evolves with its environment, as happens in the tourism ecosystem: its individual systems are interdependent and co-evolve.

185

*Emergence. This feature has been defined as the generation of novel and coherent structures, patterns and properties during the process of self-organization in complex systems.

*Self-organization. It refers to the ability to develop a new system structure as a result of the system's internal constitution and not as a result of external management (Prigogine & Stengers, 1984). In essence, self-organization refers to systems that organize themselves without external direction or control. Therefore, in CAS emergence and self-organization occur together. If so, and with specific regard to tourism destinations, a new question mark raises: is the existence of a DMO relevant, or even necessary?

Following Chiva-Gómez (2003), a CAS is defined as a system "…composed of interacting 'agents' following rules, exchanging influence with their local and global environments and altering the very environment they are responding to by virtue of their simple action."

As a result, it is worth to be emphasized that complex adaptive systems have the capacity to change and learn from experience, an obvious evidence of smartness. In other words, they are able to respond to and adjust themselves to changes in their environment, constantly adapting nonlinear relationships. Ecosystems are typical examples of CAS, and, as indicated, destinations have been characterized as a smart tourism ecosystem.

Management, in the context of complexity theory, means influencing the process of change of a CAS from one state to another, through anticipation and adaptation. Being more specific about these two dimensions, adaptive management consists of adjustments while the structure of a system is changing; while anticipative management means directing and guiding while taking the possible future behavior of the system into account (Van der Brugge & Van Raak, 2007). Transition management is based on this conceptualization of "governance of complexity" (Loorbach, 2010).

In CAS, governance systems have been characterized by five elements:

1.-An adaptive system embraces an undefined set of interrelated agents or elements. These agents influence each other in mutual and multiple ways. At the same time, all agents are assumed to have relative autonomy. This means that each agent is capable to respond to external events and pressure in an individual way (Eldelson, 1997; Chiva-Gómez, 2003).

2.-Complex adaptive systems are nested, in the sense they have a hierarchy of embedded layers, which are, however, hard to define. The layers and subsystems co-evolve with each other.

3.-The external context can be of great importance for the evolution process. Adaptive system development depends upon the interaction between the composing agents and their surrounding systems. The interaction between a nested governance system and its context can be visualized as a set of negative and positive feedback loops.

4.-A complex system will normally develop in a non-linear pattern. The interactions between agents will be changing over time and this will create a whimsical pattern. It is almost impossible to predict the dynamics in interaction, because each agent can decide to change course.

5.-The course of development of complex systems depends upon the initial conditions of each new step of action. Relatively small changes in those conditions may generate a significant system leaps.

If we assume that these characteristics can be applied to any tourism destination, its smart character would lead to a type of governance according to these features, in which the reinforcement and continuous update of its technological base is essential, but by no means the only factor to consider.

In this sense, applying complex adaptive system theory to governance not only will have consequences for the analysis of stability and change, but also for the view on leadership. Traditionally, leadership is about one person and one single actor in charge. In CAS, leadership in a multifocal way can be incorporated. However, when the focus is on system change, the concept of leadership will become more multiple. McKelvey (2008) describes how leadership can build adaptive tension into a social system that moves it to the edge of chaos, even a specific edge, with the precise aim of proactive adaptation and harmonic co-evolution with the environment. He argues, like Ulh Bien, Marion & McKelvey (2007), that leadership in complex systems necessarily must be shared in the form of distributed intelligence. Thereby, in tourism destinations, only by way of distributed intelligence adequate assessments of external and internal change can be made.

As a conclusion, for a tourism destination become smart, the governance system should be perceived as a living organism and not as a mere instrument that should be made suitable for business climate adaptation. Below, as a result of the

exploratory findings of this empirical research, we will see how the experts conceive this issue.

3. METHODOLOGY

The results presented here, from this exploratory study, have been gathered after carrying out a survey to two panels of experts: the first one consisting of 15 Spanish and Portuguese researchers on tourism, belonging to 8 higher education institutions; the second made up by 15 Spanish professionals at senior management level of tourism companies and organizations.

The questionnaire was developed by the author in successive iterations, debugging its contents through its contrast to elements in the limited existing literature (of a nature more professional than academic) and the personal experience. Finally, it was formed by a mix of open questions and a number of items (corresponding to a list of selected services and areas of activity) to be valued in a five-points semantic differential scale in order to prioritize their relevance in a STD. Nevertheless, this a priori defined list was presented as an open-ended question, as the informant was allowed to propose and value new items. This process extended from August to November 2013.

The academic panel was the first to be explored. The questionnaires were administered via email during the period between November and December 2013. The processing of data obtained was done in January 2014.

The second round was carried out with the collaboration of Spanish professionals to senior management level in: travel agencies; hotel and restaurant associations; areas of professional studies and of research in sectorial associations; areas of tourism in public institutions; consortia of tourist towns; corporations / centers / technological institutes connected to tourism; hotels; Spanish offices of tourism abroad; convention bureaux.

After sending an explanatory letter with the objectives pursued and a commitment of confidentiality, the questionnaires to this group of experts was administered by the same procedure (via email) between May and July 2014, being August devoted to the corresponding statistical treatment, in the same line as in the case of the academic panel, using the SPSS software.

4. FINDINGS

They have been organized in six blocks: key aspects; definition; dimensions; the managing body and its functions; services and areas of activity; technologies. In this manner a better understanding of a STD is tried to be presented.

4.1. KEY ASPECTS

A number of key aspects have been underlined by the experts questioned:

-The new technologies. At this point, the professionals emphasize the need for an integrated management of systems and platforms; that is, the creation of an advanced digital space through the integration of data.

-A more effective and efficient accessibility to products / services, adding value through customization. This promotes tourist's interaction (before, during and after the visit) with the destination and his/her integration in it. In short a better marketing and management for the destination.

-Economic, social and environmental sustainability of the destination. This means that the beneficiaries are not tourists only, but also residents in the local community.

-Generation of new knowledge, innovation and differentiation.

-To the previous items, the academics add the importance of the existence of a shared vision, if possible through a consensus among the main actors in the destination. In other words, what we look for with the use of cutting edge technologies, where we want or need to go, which kind of customer we aim to attract, etc.; what is our tourism model, in short.

4.2. DEFINITION

Once all these key aspects have been put together, the following definition was raised:

A STD is one that, from a shared vision by the actors involved in it, is based on an extensive use of cutting edge technologies in order to create an advanced digital space through an integrated network of management systems, platforms and, in short, of all kind of data (on mobility, energy consumption, etc.) in order to improve the whole management of the destination and, therefore, its differentiation and competitiveness. This will enable a more effective and efficient accessibility to products / services that make up the offer, adding value through their customization

and promoting tourist's interaction (before, during and after the visit) with the destination and his/her integration in it. A STD is built on the values of innovation and sustainability, working to improve the tourist's experience and enhance the quality of life of local communities (residents).

4.3. DIMENSIONS

As technology alone is not a carrier of sustainable competitive advantages, which is broadly supported by the scientific literature, a number of complementary dimensions were identified both by academics and professionals.

It is worth to underline here the professional approach, which was based on the following dimensions:

-Strategic: it refers to the commitment of governments, private entities and residents to give priority to the tourist vocation of the place into consideration. This public-private commitment is to ensure a sustainable destination management (economic, social and environmental) and the enhancement of what defines and differentiates it (branding management).

-Operational: it includes the specific functions of each agent involved in the destination. For example, institutional support to carry out a task of communication/dissemination within the local society (among citizens, SMEs and institutions) to bridge the technological gap in the digital age.

-Technological: it includes design, integration and implementation of the diverse technologies able to add value and maximize customer satisfaction.

-Accessibility to and management of information, which in turn has two facets: with regard to that provided to tourists in the full cycle of consumption, so that the interaction of tourists with the technological tools (web, apps, social networks ...) occurs in the most natural way (without "technological stress ") and securely; the storage, management and exploitation of which is obtained through the above mentioned cycle (CRM, Open/Big Data, etc.) to determine demand profiles and needs, offering innovations, new business models, etc.

The academic group proposed four dimensions as well, but using dissimilar denominations. Nevertheless, as stated in Vargas (2015), both are interrelated and could be integrated.

4.4. THE MANAGING BODY AND ITS FUNCTIONS

This section is devoted to the governance system and the implications inducted by the intended implementation of a STD.

As defined by the World Tourism Organization (WTO, 2010), "Tourist governance is a practice of government capable to be measured, oriented towards efficiently direct the tourism sector at its various levels of government, through forms of coordination and cooperation between them in order to achieve the goals shared by networks of actors involved in the industry, aiming to achieve opportunities and solutions based on agreements sustained in the recognition of interdependences and shared responsibilities".

The academic panel structured the functions of a STD's managing body rather neatly, into three sections: those related to demand; those related to supply and the alignment or coupling between supply and demand.

-Functions from the point of view of demand include: understanding the incoming markets; studies of tourists' behavior and satisfaction (research): monitoring and analysis of demand (particularly the new technological and more informed tourist); market segmentation.

-Functions from the point of view of supply would be: exhaustive knowledge of resources and products; coordination and internal communication among destination' stakeholders (fostering networking and cooperation); public leadership; development and innovation of products/tourism experiences; training and awareness (quality).

-Functions from the point of view of the interaction between both: knowledge and abilities for the implementation of technological tools (social networks, big data, etc.); marketing (promotion, communication, etc.); maintaining balance between industry changes and changes of the tourism model desired by the local community (residents); information system: measurement through indicators (scorecard); improvement plans.

Complementarily, professionals see the need to go beyond, attributing direct competence in the development and implementation of the strategic plan of the destination (including urban development of the territory and its infrastructure), covering its management in all its aspects, with an integrated and systemic capacity able to generate synergies and resolve contradictions. This means that it should perform an extensive coordination effort among the various players that make up the tourist mesh of the corresponding territory.

4.5. SERVICES AND AREAS OF ACTIVITY

Thanks to the contributions of both panels, eight blocks were identified: safety and environment; mobility / transport infrastructures; co-creating products with tourists; servicing; information management at the destination; tourist information before traveling; tourist information while traveling; tourist information after the trip.

After providing priorities, both panels agreed in the top three:

*The management of information at the destination, which includes aspects such as internal management (integrated planning of information by the managing body of the destination, scorecard, etc.); external management (on tourism operators in the destination); availability of public information (open data) for companies and other recipients; and management of social platforms/networks.

*The tourist information before traveling: information on products / attractions; booking systems (for hotels, restaurants, shows, etc.).

*The co-creation of products / services together with tourists: routes, complementary supply, destination marketing.

In addition, as less important in both panels, aspects relating to "safety and environment" and "mobility/transport infrastructure" emerged.

4.6. TECHNOLOGIES

Concerning the bunch of technologies implemented by a STD, the panel of professionals classified them into three areas: Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs), Energy, and Mobility. In addition, many tools were mentioned, among others and in alphabetical order: big data; business analytics; business intelligence; data visualization software; fast data; machine learning; interactive devices with the destination (apps, augmented reality); open data; semantic information discovery; system dynamics models.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The light shedding by this exploratory research shows us that a new look of tourism governance is necessary, based on four elements: managing body, technological capital (ICTs), human capital and values.

With regard to the managing body, in the transition from a traditional tourism destination into a STD, its Destination Management Organization (or DMO), which is in charge of the governing system, should pay attention to a number of changes, identified in Sheehan, Vargas, Presenza & Abbate (in press).

Not very much to say about the importance of the Technological Capital, but more emphasis should be paid to the core values of a destination (what it means for potential tourists), and on its human side. In this venue:

-The traditional competencies of planning and coordination are seen reinforced by strategic leadership skills aimed at creating meanings and the network of relationships / connections (at all levels) most suitable for the objectives of the destination.

-Not so much to control it as to bring about change in it from the proactivity that allows access to information, taking innovation and sustainability as core values that should be injected into his work and that of destination actors.

References

Buhalis, D. & Amaranggana, A. (2014). Smart tourism destinations. In Z. Xiang & I. Tussyadiah (Eds.), Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2014, 553–564. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

Chiva-Gomez, R. (2003).The facilitating factors for organizational learning: bringing ideas from complex adaptive systems. Knowledge and Process Management, 10(2), 99-114.

Duit, A. & Galaz, V. (2008). Governance and Complexity. Emerging Issues for Governance Theory. Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, 21 (3), 311-335.

Eldelson, R. (1997). Complex Adaptive Systems in the Behavioral and Social Sciences. Review of General Psychology, 1 (1), 42-71.

Gretzel, U. (2011). Intelligent systems in tourism: A social science perspective. Annals of Tourism Research, 38(3), 757-779.

Gretzel, U., Koo, C., Sigala, M. & Xiang, Z. (2015). Special issue on smart tourism: convergence of information technologies, experiences, and theories. Electronic Markets, 25(3), 175-177.

Gretzel, U., Sigala, M., Xiang, Z. & Koo, C. (2015). Smart tourism: foundations and developments. Electronic Markets, 25(3), 179-188.

Gretzel, U., Werthner, H., Koo, C. & Lamsfus, C. (2015). Conceptual foundations for understanding smart tourism ecosystems. Computers in Human Behavior, 50, 558-563.

Höjer, M. &Wangel, J. (2015). Smart Sustainable Cities: Definition and Challenges. In L.M. Hilty & B. Aebischer (Eds.), ICT Innovations for Sustainability, Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, 333-349. New York: Springer.

Lamsfus, C., Martin, D., Alzua-Sorzabal, A. & Torres-Manzanera, E. (2015). Smart tourism destinations: An extended conception of smart cities focusing on human mobility. In I. Tussyadiah & A. Inversini (Eds.), Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2015, 363–375. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

Lamsfus, C., Xiang, Z., Alzua-Sorzabal, A. & Martin, D. (2013). Conceptualizing context in an intelligent mobile environment in travel and tourism. In L. Cantoni & Z. Xiang (Eds.), Information and Communication Technology in Tourism 2013, 1-11. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

Lazer, D., Pentland, A. S., Adamic, L., Aral, S., Barabasi, A. L., Brewer, D., & Van Alstyne, M. (2009). Life in the network: the coming age of computational social science. Science. New York, 323 (5915), 721.

Lewin, R. (1993). Complexity: life at the edge of chaos. New York: Collier Books.

Loorbach, D.A. (2010). Transition Management for Sustainable Development: A Prescriptive, Complexity-Based Governance Framework. New Mode of Governance for Sustainable Management. Governance – An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, 23 (1), 161-183.

López de Ávila, A. (2015). Smart destinations: XXI century tourism. Presented at the ENTER2015 Conference on Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism, Lugano, Switzerland, February 4-6.

McKelvey, B. (2008). Emergent strategy via complexity leadership; using complexity science and adaptive tensions to build distributed intelligence. In: M. Ulh-Bien & R. Marion (Eds.). Complexity Leadership. Charlotte: IAP, 225-268.

Merz, M.A., He,Y. & Vargo, S.L. (2009). The evolving brand logic: a service-dominant logic perspective. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 37(3), 328–344.

Palmberg, K. (2009). Complex adaptive systems as metaphors for organizational management. Learning Organization, 16(6), 483-498.

Prigogine, I. & Stengers, I. (1984). Order out of chaos: Man's new dialogue with nature. New York: Bantam Books.

Sheehan L., Vargas, A., Presenza, A. & Abbate, T. (in press). The use of intelligence in tourism destination management: an emerging role for DMOs. International Journal of Tourism Research.

Stacey, R.D. (2003). Strategic Management and Organizational Dynamics: the Challenge of Complexity. Essex: Prentice Hall.

Ulh-Bien, M.; Marion, R. & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory; shifting knowledge from the industrial to the knowledge era. The Leadership Quarterly, vol. 18 (4), 298-318.

Urry, J. (2005). The Complexity Turn. Theory, Culture & Society, 22(5), 1-14.

Van der Brugge, R. & Van Raak, R. (2007). Facing the adaptive management challenge: insights from transition management. Ecology and Society, 12(2) [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol12/iss2/art33/

Vargas, A. (2015). Anexo. Encuesta a expertos académicos y profesionales del turismo. In J. Blanco. Libro Blanco de los Destinos Turísticos Inteligentes (pp. 102-109). Madrid: LID Editorial Empresarial.

Wagenaar, H. (2007). Governance, complexity, and democratic participation: How citizens and public officials harness the complexities of neighborhood decline. The American Review of Public Administration, 37 (17), 17-50.

Wang, D., Li, R. & Li, Y. (2013). China's ''smart tourism destination'' initiative: A taste of the service-dominant logic. Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 2 (2), 59-61.

Werthner, H., Koo, C., Gretzel, U. & Lamsfus, C. (2015). Special issue on smart tourism: convergence of information technologies, business models, and experiences. Computers in Human Behavior, 50, 556-557.