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Part 1 Expectations are not always correct

- The results of studies show no systematic positive impacts of HSR on tourism even in cities with tourism assets

- Evolution is different according to places and tourism
  
  - No growth of tourists in **ski stations** in France (Bonnafous, 1987) but a growth of tourism in Echigo Yuzawa in Japan (Mizohata, 1995)
  
  - No growth in **rural tourism** in France (Bazin et al., 2006), but an impact on the hinterland in Japan (Okabe, 1980)
  
  - No systematic growth of **urban tourism** in cities in France, Germany and Spain (DB International GmbH, 2011, in Germany, Netherlands and Great-Britain (SEEDA, 2008) but

    - Growth of **urban tourism** in some **big cities** in Taiwan (Cheng, 2009), in China (Wuhan (reported by Wang et al., 2012), Qufu ((People’s Republic of China, 2014), Ningbo, Zhao, 2014), in Spain in Zaragoza (Alonso and Bellet, 2009, Urena et al., 2009), in Japan in Hiroshima, Fukuoka (Okabe, 1980), in Tokyo, Osaka and Kobe (reported by Albalate and Bel, 2010), in UK in London (Sen, 2004) and a growth of business tourism in France in Lyon, Grenoble (Mannone, 1995), and in Lille (Urena et al., 2009)
Part 1 Expectations are not always correct

- The results of studies conducted all around the world show
  - Growth of **urban tourism and business tourism** in **Medium sized** cities
    - In France (Le Mans, Reims or Tours) (Bazin *et al.* 2011) but no growth in other medium-sized cities as Dijon (Mannone, 1995); a growth in the short run in Metz but not in the long run (Bazin *et al.*, 2014)
    - In Japan (for instance in Mihara or Tsuyazaki) (Okabe (1979)
    - In Spain in Lleida (Todorovitch *et al.*, 2011), in Cordoba (Urena *et al.*, 2009)
    - But no growth in Tarragona (Todorovitch *et al.*, 2011)
  - A growth in some **small sized cities**
    - in France near Lyon (Beaune, Montbard) (Mannone, 1995) and in Toledo in Spain (Guirao, 2009), in Amagi in Japan (Okabe 1980)
    - But no growth in France in **small sized cities** on the North, Atlantic and Eastern Europe HSR, even in cities with a cultural heritage (Bazin *et al.*, 2013)
Part 1 Expectations are not always correct

- **No systematic impact on destination choice**
  - An impact in Paris, in Disneyland Paris (Delaplace et al., 2014, Delaplace et al., 2015) but no impact in Roma (Valeri et al., 2012), in Madrid (Pagliara et al., 2014) or in Futuroscope near Poitiers in France (Delaplace et al., 2015)

- **But in several cases a decrease of the average length stay**
  - In France (Lyon, Dijon, Valence (Bonafous, 1987), Le Mans ((Amiard, 1997), Metz, Nancy, Reims (Bazin et al., 2014, INSEE 2009, AUDRR))
  - In Japan (Tokyo and Osaka (Okabe, 1979, Kamada, 1980, Plaud reported by Albalate and Bel, 2010), Fukuoka and Soeda (Okabe 1980))
  - In China (People's Republic of China, 2014)
  - In Spain (Ciudad Real and Cordoba), (Bellet, 2000)

- **Linked to hotel construction and/or a growth of hotel rooms => decrease of the hotel occupancy rates**
Part 2: Why such an heterogeneity?

- A HSR service can play a role in boosting tourism
  - Only in cities characterized by given assets (heritage, gastronomy, cultural events, etc.)
  - In a favorable economic climate

- But even in this case, the question is to know how HSR can increase the attractiveness of the destination
  - A- Making cities more accessible and in a more environmentally friendly manner
  - B- Improving the image of cities
  - C- Using it by local stakeholders as a coordination tool in the destination
Part 2: Why such an heterogeneity?

A- HSR can induce an improvement in accessibility

HSR can reduce generalized transport costs

- HSR can induce a decrease of travel time
- HSR can avoid the fatigue of driving, congestion and parking difficulties in city centers

- HSR can enlarge the market area of the destination

- Beyond accessibility, HSR offers advantages due to the growing concern for sustainable development

- But accessibility improvement is different according to city size and moreover is not sufficient
Part 2: Why such an heterogeneity?

B- HSR as a potential vector to renewing the image

- An improvement of the city’ image: HSR adds a semiotic characteristic to the city

- An image effect amplified by
  - Important communication policies of the cities during the commissioning of the HSR service producing a localization effect.
  - Urban policies launched at the arrival of HSR service
  - In France, by a "club" effect for the cities served
  - Tourism valorization policies

But an effect difficult to measure and depending on different kind of cities (city size, heritage, proximity to other touristic destinations,...)
Part 2: Why such an heterogeneity?

C- HSR as a potential coordination tool

A coordination tool which allows collective strategies

- Diagnoses concerning city’s future
- Collective communication by different actors (city development agency, department, region, tourist offices, etc..) to sell the destination
- Production of packages incorporating HSR ticket (depending on the city size)

=> New coordination between local stakeholders

- Encouraging tourists to visit other places on a larger territory => cooperation in a larger area
- New forms of coordination specifically between transport and tourism in the city
Part 3 Conclusions and policy recommendations

- Expectations are not always met even in cities with specific assets
  - 4 major issues: economic situation, accessibility, renewed image, coordination tool
  - Tourism: the need to combine private and public goods in a destination
    - To produce and renew the destination
    - To attract repeaters and new travelers…

=> The need for collaborative strategies between tourism stakeholders
  - Tourism private stakeholders themselves
  - Tourism public stakeholders themselves
  - Public and private tourism stakeholders
Part 3 Conclusions and policy recommendations

=> The need for collaborative strategies between transportation stakeholders (rail manager and other ones (regional, interurban, urban) to deal with intermodality

- Airports and HSR stations
- Stations and places to be visited in the city and outside the city (taxi, bus, pedestrian circuit, and so on)
- Mainly visited cities and secondarily visited cities

The need for collaborative strategies between transportation operators and tourism stakeholders

- Packages
- Events in train linked to events in places
New issues in experience economy: Travel as an experience

“To appreciate the difference between services and experiences, recall the episode of the old television show Taxi in which Iggy, a cab driver, decided to become the best taxi driver in the world. He served sandwiches and drinks, conducted tours of the city, and even sang Frank Sinatra tunes. By engaging passengers in a way that turned an ordinary cab ride into a memorable event, Iggy created something else entirely- a distinct economic offering. The experience of riding in his cab was more valuable to his customers than the service of being transported by the cab. The service Iggy provided -taxi transportation- was simply the stage for the experience that he was really selling” (Pine and Gilmore, 1998)

- Experiences issues onboard for the mind and/or for the body
- Which can be linked to the destination

High-speed rail travel: a travel experience, part of the touristic experience
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