

PILOT ACTION WORKPLAN "MADE in-Land"

Municipality of Riccia - PP 4

WP:4- DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING OF AN ACTION PLAN FOR INLAND AREAS

VALORISATION

Activity 4.1: Drafting of the Action plan 4.1.2 Deliverable: Communication Box

Partner in charge: PP1University of Camerino PPs Involved: PP4 – Municipality of Riccia

Status: Final Date: 30/12/2021



Summary

1.	Bas	eline review	3
	1.1	Regulatory and strategic framework	12
	1.2	Geographical and territorial framework	15
	1.3	Socio-economic framework	16
	1.4	Supply analysis:	17
	1.4.	1 Infrastructure, connections and accessibility analysis	18
	1.4.	2 Technological infrastructure analysis	18
	1.4.	3 Analysis of tourism infrastructures with economic effects	19
		cribe the several type of enterprise in the Pilot area, or with regard to the Pilot action Error nalibro non è definito.	e. Il
	1.5	Demand analysis: tourist flows and seasonality	20
	1.6	Stakeholders analysis	22
	1.7	S.W.O.T. Analysis	26
	1.8	Point of interest / Thematic itineraries	26
2.	Act	ion Plan	27
	2.1	Vision	27
	2.2	Objectives	28
	2.3	Functions or functionalities to activate	28
	2.4	Expected results of the Pilot Action	29
3.	Pilo	ot Action project	30
	3.1	Description of the place or area selected	30
	3.2	Technical project	32
	3.3	Project budget	37
	3.4	Project Implementation	40
	3.5	Stages of project	42



26	Proposal of indicators for avaluation project
5.0	Proposal of indicators for evaluation project



1. Baseline review

"Terr@ di Passo. In the courts of the De Capua family" is the name of the proposal initiative conceived for the Pilot Action that should be realized by PP4, the Municipality of Riccia within the context of the European project of the Italy - Croatia Program Made in-Land according to the objectives set in the Interreg which concern the cultural and natural heritage of the municipalities of the internal areas, rich in endogenous resources which however remain non adequately exploited and valued despite their considerable potential.

Made in-Land project wants to develop new solutions to make the hinterland truly accessible physically and virtually, through an integrated management of development processes intended as actions for the enhancement and conservation of natural and cultural heritage, but also designed for the creation and sharing of innovative models of management of identified assets.

For this reason, two operating areas are involved in the Pilot Action: the coastal one, chosen as access door to the inlands and the interland area which is otherwise characterized by "slow" dynamics. The intersection of these two territorial areas aims to create a new touristic sustainable model, able to create new channels of accessibility and knowledge of internal resources, which will impact the revitalization of local communities through a new economic and territorial development implemented through the conscious exploitation of natural resources and cultural heritage to be preserved, increasing their own value.

Following the guidelines proposed by Made in-Land project, the areas chosen for the development of the Piloct Action in the Molise Region are the coastal area around the city of Termoli in order to better meet, intercept and divert tourist flows and the hinterland in order to reduce human pressure on the coast and thus connect internal natural and cultural resources to larger tourist markets, and the internal area pertaining to the Municipality of Riccia that through Terr@ di Passo Pilot Action will enhance the so-called "unexplored territorial capital", with the aim of promoting physical and virtual connections between the two areas (the coasts and the inlands), which at the same time aims to revitalize local communities such as custodians and managers of natural and cultural heritages, also through the creation of new job and well-being opportunities for the local population.



The main expected result of Made in-Land is the improvement of development economic and territorial internal areas thanks to the diversification of the economy local, and the development of job opportunities, social inclusion services and containment of aging phenomena. Thanks to the cooperation processes, it will be possible to improve the well-being of the population, a precondition for the longterm conservation of natural and cultural heritage given the role played

by the local communities themselves in its management. In "Terr @ di passo" Pilot Action, after the definition of Area 1 and Area 2, are described the actions by which we intend to make the natural and cultural heritage, linked to the historical landscape by the De Capua family, the lever for one sustainable and more balanced territorial development. There will be several activities: the mapping of the main natural and cultural and intangible material, including the assessment of their state of conservation, fragility and accessibility conditions; the analysis of connections with coastal areas, of attraction and potential market; the analysis of policies, programs and practices planning for the management of inlands' natural and cultural heritage with evaluation of the investments made and the results achieved. From the floor of the knowledge, innovative models will be produced for the management and enhancement of internal landscapes, contributing to their conservation and protection, developing multisectoral strategies to increase the cultural and tourist offer of the territories included in Area 2, also through the creation and structuring of one digital platform accessible to the public of travellers and residents. With actions targeted to promotion, communication and integrated dissemination of the project and its products, it's possible to create the movement of travellers who, from the places of vacation and staying identified in Area 1, will want to discover and go towards Riccia and the other territories included in Area 2.

DEFINITION OF THE AREA 1:

As indicated by the guidelines of the Made in Land project, the Adriatic Coast around Termoli and Lesina has been defined as Area 1 as it corresponds to coastal territory more densely urbanized and populated. The total population of Area 1 is 64,355 inhabitants residing in the municipalities coastal Molise of Termoli, Campomarino, Guglionesi, Petacciato, Montenero, Portocannone, San Martino in Pensilis, as indicated in the demographic summary:

Termoli: 33,739 inhabitants Campomarino: 7.712 inhabitants



Montenero di Bisaccia: 6.538 inhabitants

Guglionesi:5,321 inhabitants

San Martino in Pensilis: 4,721 inhabitants

Petacciato: 3,848 inhabitants Portocannone: 2,476 inhabitants

Within the coastal area, the municipality of Termoli represents the administration of reference of the whole territory, from an economic, demographic and social point. The Municipality of Termoli is also the leader of the "Area of Termoli" including the administrations of Campomarino, Guglionesi and San Giacomo degli Schiavoni. The coastal territory, between Trigno and Fortore rivers, includes two different ecosystems, marine and terrestrial, constituting a zone of transaction between land and sea in where there are coastal dune systems and evergreen coastal forests, important ecological corridors towards the hinterland. The progressive anthropization led to the metamorphosis of the environment, urbanization and the construction of large companies'infrastructures have changed the original landscape that has taken on the current aspect. From an economic and social point of view, Termoli is the municipality of reference for the lower Molise area due to the available infrastructure and presence of the industrial area developed in the 60s and 70s acting as an attraction for the populations of neighboring municipalities. The analysis of population data confirms the demographic vitality of the city with respect to regional dynamics. Population data show that young people (0-14) do it accounts for 13.4% of the total, a percentage higher than the Molise average (11.7%), while the working-age class (15-64) is 66.3%, compared to a relative 64.7% to the whole region, a sign that the active resident population is in percentage higher than the regional average. The concerned area is the one most easily accessible from outside the region, in fact, the territory is the most equipped with infrastructure. As can also be seen from the data on mobility, the area can count on a good complex of service facilities consisting of train network, highway, energy channels and communication network selectronics, including the optic fiber connection. In this context, Termoli represents the main Molise station on the Adriatic route as well as one of the two entrances to the national highway line and this therefore configures itself as a sorting center for the flows coming from the areas adjoining and from the municipalities of the interland. The description of the transport infrastructure can be completed with the mention of the port of Termoli



and the tourist port of Montenero di Bisaccia, used for the connections to and from the archipelago of the Tremiti Islands, in particular during the summertime. As regards the tourist offer system, it must be said that this is identified as a widespread system, concentrated mostly on the coast (Montenero, Petacciato, Campomarino and Termoli), but too often unstructured and uneven, failing systemically to establish itself with a strong identity and recognizable within a national and supranational catchment area: a system therefore historically exposed to competition. However, as regards to the quantitative analysis of the tourist phenomenon in the area it should be noted that it is affected by the difficult availability of official data, especially in relation to the flows on Campomarino, Petacciato and Montenero, municipalities characterized by a very peculiar offer, often based on the second home system used directly by the owners or their family and friends. For example, based to a cadastral analysis provided by the Municipality of Campomarino (where the phenomenon of second case is greater than in the other two municipalities being analyzed) can be seen that about 70% of the 11,000 housing units in the municipal area is consisting of second homes or holiday homes. This situation together with the scarce presence of classic accommodation facilities (hotels, residences, B & Bs, etc.) does not facilitate the formulation of official statistics on arrivals and presences, although indirect estimates lead to hypothesize an increase in population on the municipality more than ten times in the months of July and August. Different speech should be made for Termoli, where the presence of classic accommodation facilities like hotels, B & Bs or residences, allows a more precise data about the its accommodation capacity, which according to recent data acquired, has a total offer of 1,840 seats bed. Even in the case of Termoli, however, must be specified that the official data only add numbers which are not statistically detected, relating to the use of houses holidays for rent or second houses representing one slice substantial of the tourist movement also in this location.

TYPE OF TOURIST:

The typical tourist who chooses the Molise coast as a destination is mainly Italian (90.3% of presences of resident customers out of the regional total) often resident in the neighboring regions (with the exception of the Lombards) and moves for holidays with the family. Generally, the choice of the Molise coast as a holiday destination is made almost exclusively based on suggestions and invitations from relatives and friends. This evidence shows that the information channels are



informal and like the coast, and more generally Molise, in fact excluded from the classic commercial channels. According to the numbers registered by the various regional tourist offices can easily be seen that tourist flows focus mainly on seaside tourism, so much so that the coast attracts the majority of travellers who choose Molise. Consequently, it is registered a high seasonality of demand which, as is known, produces environmental problem, social and economic sustainability. It is good to remember that four municipalities affected by the analysis, specifically those directly overlooking the sea (Montenero, Petacciato, Termoli and Campomarino) have created a tourism marketing project called "Costa dei Delfini" in order to push the whole concerned territory, at institutional and institutional entrepreneurial level, to propose a new strategy based on nature, on assets of the Molise coast, on the infrastructure and professionalism of the entrepreneurs who can count on the reception numbers such as 3marinas with nearly 1000 berths, around 150 restaurants, more than 100 hotels, B & Bs, campsites and farmhouse, 30 bathing beaches and hundreds of apartments from to rent. Some of the municipalities in Area 1 are characterized by the strong presence of wineries that over the years have marked both the natural environment and the local tourist activities. Some of the wineries in Area 1 are in fact organized for the tourist reception (both short and long term), host frequently national and international tourists looking for oenological and experiential tourism. A target of users focused on the quality of the travel proposal, available to experiences different from the classic tourist itineraries and able to appreciate the proposal visit of "Terr@ di passo".

Area 1 includes also locations that go beyond regional boundaries but remain however close for distance and cultural attendance to Area 2. The coast and the tourist places in the province of Foggia will surely have to enter the circuit communication of the "Terr@ di passo" project.

DEFINITION OF THE AREA 2

Area 2 corresponds to the territory falling in the less populated internal areas that are often disadvantaged and marginal with cultural and natural resources difficult to be reached and appreciated, not always known, often abandoned or in decline. As indicated by the Project, the Municipality of Riccia will represent the center of the Area 2 which includes the municipalities of the internal area of Fortore (Jelsi, Gambatesa, Macchia Valfortore, Sant'Elia a Pianisi, Pietracatella, Campolieto, Cercemaggiore, Gildone, Monacilioni, Toro, Tufara) and some other



administrations of the internal area of the Matese area (Sepino, Guardiaregia, San Giuliano, Cercepiccola, Bojano, Campochiaro) which for historical, cultural or naturalistic continuity have evident references with the Proposed assets.

The project area belonging to the Internal Area of Fortore in Molise and it extends into one hilly valley on the border with Puglia and Campania and is made up of 12 Municipalities (of which Jelsi is the Lead institution). It extends for a total area equal to 481.63 square kilometers and has 22,511 inhabitants, within which the larger centers and those with more services are represented by Riccia (5,403 inhabitants, peripheral municipality) and Cercemaggiore (3,927 inhabitants, intermediate municipality). The territory, characterized by rather fragmented settlements, is located in the lower part anthropization level one of its fundamental qualities. The well preserved natural characteristics, alternating with agricultural areas, make it an area of high quality landscape and environmental. In the area it is present, although not completely including inside, the reserve of the Lake of Occhito, an artificial barrier built along the Fortore River, which mainly affects the territory of Macchia Valfortore and for minor sections also those of Gambatesa and Sant'Elia a Pianisi. The small villages that characterize the area retain strong traditions and specifics community identities and, despite efforts to guarantee the most basic structure proximity services, from commerce to public businesses to health care, they still seem distant in guaranteeing the fundamental levels of care. The issues area is mainly related to the demographic structure; a significant population loss (27.2% since 1971) was recorded in all municipalities, with very high old age indices and with values higher than the regional and national average. The data show that in recent years the younger population groups left the area, with a lack of renovation for the inhabitants which are old aging. The main relational guidelines for economic activities are concentrated in direction of Campobasso for both work and leisure/cultural activities. With respect to the size of the work, approximately 27.9% of the population is employed in the secondary sector and 16.5% in that of commerce (data ISTAT- Census 2011), while 14.6% are employed in agriculture. These data help to outline citizens' behaviors and habits area. In fact, a large part of the population moves to reach the place of work because he decided to stay and live in his own country. Otherwise, people that live daily in their own town and are dedicated to agricultural activities. Other territorial dynamics explain the socio-economic relationships of the territory. In fact, despite a de facto sharing of moments of tradition, of essentials services provided in some centers in the area, school facilities, and in spite of this commitment to establishing a Union or joining the National Strategy Inland Areas, some more specific lines of collaboration have only recently mutual started between the different centers. This aspect makes the offer of "Ideas" and underlines the centrality and importance of a design process



that involve all the municipalities concerned. As far as mobility is concerned, it is clear that the territory concerned is crossed by the State Road 17 of the Abruzzese Apennines and Samnite Appulus, important communication axis between different Regions (today it connects Foggia, in Puglia, to the innermost Lazio of the Province of Rieti, passing through Molise and Abruzzo) and it represents the main infrastructural resource also for tourist flows. Along the stretch of State 17, in fact, the accesses to the main attractions are located of the area that they graft perpendicularly. In the absence of an intermodal exchange and displacement offer that meet effectively the needs of citizens, the mobility of the area makes wide reference to private vehicle. The road network is flanked by the Campobasso-Isernia railway line which cross the peripheral area of Pilot Action area ensuring connections with Naples and Rome but which, stopping exclusively in Bojano and Campobasso (municipalities closest to the area of interest), does not guarantee an arrival at the inland areas of the small urban centers and a main reference poles. Most of the small municipalities are not reached by railway. There are in fact, stations that have been abandoned in recent years. The existing infrastructure network of the area therefore needs to be enhanced and innovated with the provision of services more oriented towards flexibility, with the goal of creating a network that connects the main axis with the municipalities surrounding. Analyzing the territory, the history and culture of area 2, it emerges that the potential offers are used to a limited extent. The area can be defined as a transition area, for several reasons. It is the area that, bordering on Campania and Puglia, has always represented a connection point between the regions and, of consequently, a stopping point for shepherds and traders. At the same time, being a hilly area characterized by productive areas with fertile land practices alternate with unproductive areas with sterile soils and hydrogeological in stability farmers find it hard to establish themselves. The crops manually practiced in the past times, are nor repeatable nowdays or considered economically disadvantageous for mechanized agriculture. The consequences are a continuous increase in abandonment of agricultural areas, depopulation of environments rural but also urban, population aging and population decline. This involves the loss of manpower and interest in an area that does not enjoy the agricultural productivity of the Lower Molise and the tourist flow of the coastal area. Indeed, all the hydrogeological consequences with loss of agricultural area, advancement of wooded area, reduction of open spaces and impact on biodiversity, accentuated by climate change shall be added. The stage of abandonment is in most cases followed by a phase of degradation, with increased risk of fires and further impact on the environment and lifestyle of the inhabitants of these areas who risk becoming more and more in the abyss of the marginality. This position of "transition" limits the development of this area which needs to



rediscover its identity and enhance its territory. From the point of view of land use, the area has a remarkable vocation agricultural, with 68% of the surface and 14.6% of the employed, employed in agriculture. The forest area, characterized by 17 forest types, occupies about 25% of the area, most of which is privately owned. Except for a few tens of hectares of tall forest, the woods in the area are managed with the coppice form of government, with firewood as the main assortment, and in most cases they are subject to civic use. From a naturalistic and biodiversity conservation point of view, the area is characterized by the presence of 17 Natura 2000 sites, with a total area of 6500 ha. The landscape mosaic, characterized by the alternation of agricultural surfaces and forestry, while maintaining an adequate degree of conservation, continues evolution with not a few landslides and landslides. The changes are mainly due to the abandonment of agricultural and forestry practices of the plots more difficult to reach. The complexity of the landscape confers an appreciable aesthetic aspect to the area, despite not being highly valued and renowned. The activities undertaken over the years have led to punctual benefits(sporadic) and not significant, often of individuals and not of the area, with the result that the area, although fascinating, is not organized (or not efficient) to increase tourism development. A particular mention goes to the Matese territory, also partially affected by Area 2 through the territories of Sepino, Cercepiccola, San Giuliano del Sannio and Cercemaggiore. The area is characterized by a strong naturalistic connotation: 48% (200 Km2) of the territory is in fact currently subject to measures of storage. Furthermore, as an element of further specific value, it should be underlined which was approved (November 2016) in the Senate the Bill establishing the Matese National Park. Therefore, conservation and protection tools they can and must represent a driving force for territorial development. Cultural heritage, made up of infrastructural elements such as the "tratturo", the medieval castles, located in various historical centers, or immersed churches and farmhouses in rural spaces, the presence of traditional practices and activities, which are part of the popular culture of the area (from agricultural practices, to festivals-traditions and museums) and the rural landscape are the elements from which start to promote an active management of the territory and promoting local development and common well-being. The small villages that characterize the area retain strong traditions and specifics community identities and, despite efforts to guarantee the most basic structure of proximity services - from commerce, to public businesses, to health services -they still seem far from being able to guarantee fundamental levels of care.

In this analysis, a separate reading must be dedicated to the Altilia site in the municipal area of Sepino, which with its 3,000 years of history and the overlap of the different Roman-Samnite, Lombard and medieval and modern eras, still today



perfectly legible, it is an archaeological area of great historical interest but still underestimated based on the potential it could express. To complete these elements, and as a distinctive aspect of the territory protagonist of the current analysis, it should be noted that the area concerned retains and important heritage of artisan knowledge, which find its own peculiarity expression in the production of artistic artefacts and inspiration in local cultural heritage, especially in that associated with the popular traditions of the festivals.



1.1 Regulatory and strategic framework

The protection of the nature and cultural heritage in Italy can be traced to start 20th century, with the promulgation of the first laws "for the protection of things of artistic and historical interest" and "for the protection of the beauty of the landscape", both in 1939. The Italian landscape legislation was created with a specific attention to the aesthetic aspect of the assets. Only later, the awareness of the cultural and ecological value evolved.

However, the Landscape is protected by the Constitution, the highest Italian law, since its promulgation in 1948 (art. 9). The Landscape has been defined as the beloved face of the Homeland. Over the years, there have been a number of laws that have regulated other aspects about Natural and Cultural Heritage. Today, these laws have been collected in two Framework Laws:

- Law n. 42/2004, the "Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape"
- Law n. 394/1992, the "Framework Law on Protected Areas"

There are, in the territorial and administrative sense, three levels of Government in Italy, leaving out some articulations (i.e. Province, Metropolitan City, Mountains Communities...), jointed to Central and Regional level:

- The Central Government national level;
- The Regions (20) regional level;
- The Municipalities (almost 8.000) local level

The protection of the natural and cultural heritage is regulated by the three levels trough different degrees and competence (Figure 3):

- the Central Government, that promulgates the framework laws and is articulated in Central Ministry; in turn, the ministry is organized on territory trough Regional departments named Soprintendenze (for Cultural Heritage) and Management Authority of National Parks (for Natural Heritage);
- the Regions draft the Landscape Regional Plans (approved by Central Government);
- the Municipalities receives and deepen the indications of Landscape Regional Plans;

Management of the cultural heritage and its protection is rather complex and articulated, but directly or indirectly, under the jurisdiction of Ministry for Cultural



Heritage and Activities and for Tourism. The Ministry is responsible for all cultural assets on the national level.

In case of individual buildings, with artistic, cultural or historical interesting characters, the Regional Soprintendence (an articulation of Ministry) are approving building projects on the asset. Each Regional Superintendence approved the project of his regional territory. For each Region there is a Regional Superintendence, but organized in different areas: archaeological, artistic, architectural, archival ...).

In case of nearness to natural asset (sea, lakes, rivers, high mountains, or ancient village) the project of territory transformation is approved trough an "landscaping authorization", issued by Regional Superintendence. The natural and cultural assets (areas or individual asset) are individuated by Landscape Regional Plans. The Landscape Regional Plans are drafted by Region and approved by Ministry. The Regional Landscape Plans define the constituent categories of the landscape; they delimit the protected and unprotected areas, and their degree of possible transformation; they give guidelines for their transposition into the The Municipal Regulatory Plans.

The Municipal Regulatory Plans received the indications from Regional Landscape Plans and deepen them at local scale of territory, with more detail. But the Municipality has no power to approve interventions on any cultural or natural asset. The Municipal Regulatory Plans are approved by Regions.

Italian legislation is highly conservative, both in terms of natural and cultural assets. The Regional Plans define a System of "constraints" (vincoli) that indicate the areas of possible transformation and those subject to integral or partial protection. The laws tend to preserve the historical characteristics of the buildings, in particular public and ecclesiastic building.

In the making decision process, there are some external cultural bodies involved (often universities as scientific experts), but it is a process that intensely and mainly involves the three levels of government of the territory. Sometimes and increasingly often, the Associations are spokespersons for landscape characters that are more rooted in the culture and history of communities.

The system of protection of the boundary territory with "constrained areas" is certainly limited, because it does not guarantee the quality of the landscape transformation interventions. This conviction has increased even more since the approval of the European Landscape Convention, implemented by the Code of



Cultural Heritage and Landscape in 2006. In this sense, some Regions have started a new season of Landscape Plans, aimed not only to identifying the areas subject to protection and not, but also to defining objectives of landscape quality for regional policies and local actions.

The interventions in the historical villages are regulated by the Municipal Regulatory Plans and by the Detailed Plans of the historical villages. In the situation where a village is entirely identified as a "constrained area" subject to protection, the project must be approved by the Superintendence.

The protection and management of the natural heritage is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Environment and Protection of Land and Sea and of the Regions.



1.2 Geographical and territorial framework

The territory of the Pilot Area is located in Italy, in the southern part of the Molise Region.

The Adriatic coastal area, with strong tourist pressure, is mainly identified in the area of the city of Termoli. In any case, the areas of Vasto (north) and Lesina (south) also constitute poles of tourist attraction on the coast, with seaside tourism.

The inland area identified as the object of the Made in-Land program includes the "Upper Valley of the Fortore River" and the mountainous area of the "Matese". The area is located in the southernmost part of the Molise region, on the border with the Puglia region and the Campania region. This territory is characterized by a hilly valley with a high landscape quality, also due to the low impact caused by the territorial transformation process.

The settlement system, still well recognizable and preserved in its territorial layout, consists of the ancient medieval villages founded on the hills. Within the ancient urban fabric, the fortifications of the towers and castles stand out, offering spectacular views of Lake Occhito and the Valle del Fortore. However, in the innermost areas, there is a progressive abandonment of the cultivated spaces, the disappearance of skilled workers and the depopulation of urban centres. In this condition, the problems due to the hydrogeological instability and the devastation of the fires are accompanied. The area is strongly characterized by the signs left by the recurring presence of the "De Capua family" in the natural and cultural heritage. The "De Capua" was a noble Neapolitan family whose members have governed, in the period of maximum splendour (16th century), as feudal lords on over thirty countries, including Riccia, Campobasso, Termoli, Gambatesa, Sepino, Sant'Elia a Pianisi, Pietracatella, Monacilioni, Campolieto. A real "State" whose extension went from the Biferno River to the Fortore River, starting from the sea, and penetrating into the inland areas of the Molise, up to the Matese Mountains, lapping the Capitanata, along the lines of the "Regio Tratturi" (king's sheep trails). It was not only a political – military domain, but also an economic one that reflected its effects on a quarter of the population of Molise of that time and, indirectly on the entire County for the vast and dense system of established kinship and alliances



1.3 Socio-economic framework

Referring to the socio-economic framework, it should be noted that the area involved in the Pilot action can be defined as a transition area, for several reasons. It is the area that, bordering on Campania and Puglia, has always represented a connection point between the regions and, of consequently, a stopping point for shepherds and traders. At the same time, being a hilly area characterized by productive areas with fertile land practices alternate with unproductive areas with sterile soils and hydrogeological in stability farmers find it hard to establish themselves. The crops manually practiced in the past times, are nor repeatable nowdays or considered economically disadvantageous for mechanized agriculture. The consequences are a continuous increase in abandonment of agricultural areas, depopulation of environments rural but also urban, population aging and population decline. This involves the loss of manpower and interest in an area that does not enjoy the agricultural productivity of the Lower Molise and the tourist flow of the coastal area. Indeed, all the hydrogeological consequences with loss of agricultural area, advancement of wooded area, reduction of open spaces and impact on biodiversity, accentuated by climate change shall be added. The stage of abandonment is in most cases followed by a phase of degradation, with increased risk of fires and further impact on the environment and lifestyle of the inhabitants of these areas who risk becoming more and more in the abyss of the marginality. This position of "transition" limits the development of this area which needs to rediscover its identity and enhance its territory. From the point of view of land use, the area has a remarkable vocation agricultural, with 68% of the surface and 14.6% of the employed, employed in agriculture. The forest area, characterized by 17 forest types, occupies about 25% of the area, most of which is privately owned. Except for a few tens of hectares of tall forest, the woods in the area are managed with the coppice form of government, with firewood as the main assortment, and in most cases they are subject to civic use. From a naturalistic and biodiversity conservation point of view, the area is characterized by the presence of 17 Natura 2000 sites, with a total area of 6500 ha. The landscape mosaic, characterized by the alternation of agricultural surfaces and forestry, while maintaining an adequate degree of conservation, continues evolution with not a few landslides and landslides. The changes are mainly due to the abandonment of agricultural and



forestry practices of the plots more difficult to reach. The complexity of the landscape confers an appreciable aesthetic aspect to the area, despite not being highly valued and renowned. The activities undertaken over the years have led to punctual benefits(sporadic) and not significant, often of individuals and not of the area, with the result that the area, although fascinating, is not organized (or not efficient) to increase tourism development.

1.4 Supply analysis:

The main territorial connection between the coastal area and the inland areas is the valley director of the Fortore River.

On a functional and logistical level, city of Campobasso is the hub that appears central in the connections between the coast and the hinterland. The hinterland Municipalities of the pilot area gravitate towards the centrality of Campobasso for services, work and production, as a place of closest importance. From Campobasso, the main infrastructure routes branch off towards the coast: the SS647 Fondo Valle del Biferno, up to Termoli. Another potential route, albeit more peripheral towards the northern coastal area, is the SS 650 of the Valle del Trigno, which connects to the SS 16 Adriatica near Marina di San Salvo.

In the environmental connection between the coast and the hinterland, the Valle del Fortore constitutes a privileged corridor. The valley, located on the border between the Regions of Puglia and Molise, is characterized by limited and scarcely widespread urbanization, which has left ample cultivated spaces. It connects the southern area of the Molise Region and the northern area of the Puglia Region, with the district of the municipality of Riccia. The artificial basin of Lake Occhito was created along the course of the Fortore River in the mid-1900s, to address the drought problems in the area. The lake has generated a fascinating naturalistic context, with the presence of favourable habitats for fauna and flora, also interesting in terms of sustainable tourism and environmental education. For biodiversity, the protected areas of the internal area of the Matese are particularly important and constitute an important node in the Apennine ecological system: Guardiaregia and Campochiaro Oasis and the Matese Regional Park. An interesting role could play the "transhumance routes" system: the ancient sheep tracks (gli antichi tratturi).



Their routes intersect transversely (with north-west, south-east direction) the east-west system of the road routes that connect the inland areas to the coast. The sheep tracks, also called as "green highways" are grassy paths, having an exact width of 111 meters, which allowed the movement of the animals on a seasonal basis, from the mountain areas to the plains. Today they are regaining interest as slow mobility itineraries, for the rediscovery of the territory, even if some of their original characteristics are partially lost.

1.4.1 Infrastructure, connections and accessibility analysis

The physical accessibility to the tangible cultural and natural heritage of the Area is diversifies according to the individual assets. However, we can find some common trends to most of the resources identified. The activities are well connected to the viability of the main connection, with an accessibility time not exceeding 15-20 minutes from the main road. The provision of parking lots seems to be the appropriate to the accommodation capacity of the area. At the opposite, the system of cycle paths connecting to individual assets does not seem structured.

1.4.2 Technological infrastructure analysis

The virtual accessibility to the tangible cultural and natural heritage of the Area reflects the marginalized but potentially rich context. The degree of virtual accessibility is in fact generally low, with sufficient visibility only on online channels. However, there are some relevant exceptions: the archaeological site of Sepino, an excellence at national level; the Capua castle in Gambatesa which is a regional museum centre; the sheep tracks, to which even recent literature has paid considerable attention. These three properties, among other things, contain much of the historical identity of the pilot area.

The intangible heritage of the area is particularly rich and diverse. However, its virtual accessibility is of a medium-low level, i.e. with a modest presence on the information channels. In particular, visibility in the national media is almost absent. There is an average normal visibility on local media.



1.4.3 Analysis of tourism infrastructures with economic effects

The protection of historical and cultural heritage must first of all involve restoration or completion of the property in conditions of degradation and abandonment. Furthermore, to avoid their non-use, it is necessary to identify compatible modality of use, available for a large number of potential interested visitors. The natural and cultural heritage valorisation can be carried out by a project articulated on the identity of the De Capua family, as a key image to promote it on a tourism level. For naturalistic areas, it appears necessary to reverse the trend towards environmental degradation in the area of Lake Occchito, identify areas of ecological protection, where conditions exist, and organize arrangements for the sustainable use of natural resources.

It also appears necessary to involve the part of the communities that still live a strong sense of belonging and rootedness towards the territory, assigning it an active role in the management of the resource.

Despite numerous historical researches and public attentions, there seems to be no organic plan for the re-development of the route system, which may be necessary for their real tourist enhancement. It may be useful to imagine a plan for enhancing the Tratturi and the Paths, connected to the use of naturalistic

and cultural resources by them intercepted. Starting from this network, it appears necessary to connect and integrate the cycle-pedestrian mobility paths at regional level. It may be advisable to check for any extensions of the routes along the course of the Biferno or Fortore, towards the coast. It is also necessary that the use of the Assets along the thematic itineraries is supported by a system of welcome and accommodation. It is not just a matter of redesigning new routes, but of allowing tourists to make a slow exploration of the territory, in order to appreciate it in its historical, cultural and naturalistic dimension, in an adequately prolonged period of stay.

The distance between the internal area and the coast is significant. The closest landing points seem to be Lake Occhito and some villages. It may be useful to check the tourist use of Lake Occhito, even with any cycle routes along the Fortore River. In general, an integrated plan for tourist mobility could build an integration between the articulated system of the Paths (Cammini), which has a superregional level, the historical cultural and naturalistic assets identified by the Made in Land project, and



the places of coastal tourism. The goal could be to integrate cultural and natural resources through multiple and diversified tourist itineraries.

The historical and cultural identity of the internal area, despite its strong marginalization process, has a very recognizable image, which is still alive in the community, and is highly visible in the intangible heritage. The first common actions with coastal areas, for sustainable tourism enhancement, could concern the promotion of intangible assets. The existent historical re-enactments, linked to the products of the land, or to the Saints, or to the typical traditions, are very characteristic and very participated also by tourists. The enhancement of these opportunities, in terms of media communication and product promotion, could raise attention to other resources in the internal area and find synergies with other similar initiatives in coastal areas.

1.5 Demand analysis: tourist flows and seasonality

As regards the tourist offer system, it must be said that this is identified as a widespread system, concentrated mostly on the coast (Montenero, Petacciato, Campomarino and Termoli), but too often unstructured and uneven, failing systemically to establish itself with a strong identity e recognizable within a national and supranational catchment area: a system therefore historically exposed to competition. As regards, however, the quantitative analysis of the tourist phenomenon in the area it should be noted that it is affected by the difficult availability of official data, especially in relation to the flows on Campomarino, Petacciato and Montenero, characterized municipalities from a very peculiar offer, often based on the second home system used directly by the owners or their family and friends. For example, based to a cadastral analysis provided by the Municipality of Campomarino (where the phenomenon of second case is greater than in the other two municipalities being analyzed) can be seent hat about 70% of the 11,000 housing units in the municipal area is consisting of second homes or holiday homes. This situation together with the scarce presence of classic accommodation facilities (hotels, residences, B & Bs, etc.) does not facilitate the formulation of official statistics on arrivals and presences, although indirect estimates lead to hypothesize an increase in population on the municipality more than ten times in the months of July and August. Different speech should be made for Termoli, where the presence



of classic accommodation facilities like hotels, B & Bs or residences, allows a more precise data about t its accommodation capacity, which according to recent data acquired, has a total offer of 1,840 seats bed. Even in the case of Termoli, however, must be specified that the official data only add numbers which are not statistically detected, relating to the use of holidays houses for rent or second-houses representing one slice substantial of the tourist floet also in this location.

TYPE OF TOURIST:

The typical tourist who chooses the Molise coast as a destination is mainly Italian (90.3% of presences of resident customers out of the regional total) often resident in the neighboring regions (with the exception of the Lombards) and moves for holidays with the family. Generally, the choice of the Molise coast as a holiday destination is made almost exclusively based on suggestions and invitations from relatives and friends. This evidence shows that the information channels are informal and like the coast, and more generally Molise, in fact excluded from the classic commercial channels. According to the numbers registered by the various regional tourist offices can easily be seen that tourist flows focus mainly on seaside tourism, so much so that the coast attracts the majority of travellers who choose Molise. Consequently, it is registered a high seasonality of demand which, as is known, produces environmental problems, social and economic sustainability. It is good to remember that four municipalities affected by the analysis, specifically those directly overlooking the sea (Montenero, Petacciato, Termoli and Campomarino) have created a tourism marketing project called "Costa dei Delfini" to push the whole territory concerned, at institutional and institutional entrepreneurial level, to propose a new strategy based on nature, on assets of the Molise coast, on the infrastructure and professionalism of the entrepreneurs who they can, in an effective network, count on the reception numbers such as 3marinas with nearly 1000 berths, around 150 restaurants, more than 100 hotels, B & Bs, campsites and farmhouses, 30 bathing beaches and hundreds of apartments from to rent.



1.6 Stakeholders analysis

Category of Actors	Name of the organisation	Type of the organisation
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Baranello	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Boiano	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Busso	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Campobasso	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Campochiaro	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Campodipietra	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Cantalupo nel Sannio	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Campolieto	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Casalciprano	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Castelbottaccio	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Castellino del Biferno	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Castelmauro	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Castropignano	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Cercemaggiore	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Civitacampomarano	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Cercepiccola	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Colle D'Anchise	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Duronia	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Ferrazzano	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Fossalto	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Gambatesa	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Gildone	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Guardialfiera	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Guardiaregia	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Jelsi	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Limosano	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Lucito	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Macchia Valfortore	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Matrice	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Mirabello Sannitico	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Molise	Local autority



1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Montagano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Montagano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Morrone del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Oratino Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Petrella Tifernina Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Pietracatella Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Pietracupa Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Provvidenti Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Riccia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Riccia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Riccia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Roccamandolfi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Roccavivara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Salcito Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Biase Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Polo Matese Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Polo Matese Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spino Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Local autority			
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 2. Comune di Oratino 3. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 3. Comune di Petrella Tifernina 4. Local autority 5. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 5. Comune di Petrella Tifernina 6. Local autority 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Pietracatella 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 8. Comune di Pietracupa 8. Local autority 8. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 9. Comune di Provvidenti 9. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 2. Comune di Riccia 3. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 3. Comune di Ripalimosani 4. Local autority 6. Local autority 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Roccavivara 8. Local autority 8. Local autority 8. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 8. Comune di Roccavivara 8. Local autority 9. Local autority	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Monacilioni	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 2. Comune di Petrella Tifernina 3. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 3. Comune di Pietracatella 4. Local autority 5. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 5. Comune di Pietracupa 6. Local autority 7. Local autority 7. Local autority 8. Local autority 9. Local autority 9. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 9. Comune di Provvidenti 9. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 9. Comune di Riccia 1. Local autority 1. Local autorit	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Montagano	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 2. Comune di Pietracatella 3. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 3. Comune di Pietracupa 4. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 5. Comune di Provvidenti 6. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 6. Comune di Provvidenti 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Riccia 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 8. Comune di Riccia 8. Local autority 9. Local autority 9. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 9. Comune di Ripalimosani 9. Local autority 9. Local autority 9. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 9. Comune di Roccavivara 9. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 9. Comune di Roccavivara 9. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 9. Comune di San Biase 9. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 9. Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 9. Comune di San Giuliano del Sannio 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 2. Comune di Trivento 3. Local autority 4. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 5. Comune di Tufara 5. Local autority 6. Local autority 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 6. Comune di Tufara 6. Local autority 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Gravina in Puglia 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Frosolone 7. Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Morrone del Sannio	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 2. Comune di Pietracupa 3. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 3. Comune di Provvidenti 4. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 5. Comune di Riccia 6. Local autority 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Ripalimosani 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Ripalimosani 8. Local autority 9. Local autority 9. Local autority 9. Local autority 9. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 9. Comune di Roccavivara 9. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 9. Comune di Salcito 9. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 2. Comune di San Biase 3. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 3. Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo 4. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 4. Comune di San Massimo 5. Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 5. Comune di San Polo Matese 6. Local autority 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano 7. Local autority 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Spinete 7. Local autority 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Spinete 7. Local autority 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Spinete 7. Local autority 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Torolla del Sannio 7. Local autority 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Torolla del Sannio 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Trivento 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Tufara 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Tufara 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Tufara 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Gravina in Puglia 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di Frosolone 7. KEY STAKEHOLDERS 7. Comune di	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Oratino	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Pietracupa Local autority Local auto	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Petrella Tifernina	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Provvidenti Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Riccia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Roccamandolfi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Roccawivara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Roccavivara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Salcito Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Biase Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giuliano del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Massimo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Polo Matese Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Santa Maria del Molise 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinot Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinot Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinot Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torol Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Pietracatella	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Riccia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Ripalimosani Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Roccamandolfi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Roccavivara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Salcito Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Biase Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giuliano del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Massimo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Polo Matese Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spino Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinete Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Pietracupa	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Ripalimosani Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Roccamandolfi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Roccavivara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Salcito Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Biase Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giuliano del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Massimo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Polo Matese Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Santa Maria del Molise 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinot Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinete Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torol Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torol Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torol Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Provvidenti	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Roccamandolfi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Roccavivara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Salcito Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Biase Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giuliano del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Massimo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Polo Matese Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Santa Maria del Molise Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spino Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Riccia	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Roccavivara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Salcito Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Biase Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giuliano del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Massimo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Polo Matese Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Santa Maria del Molise Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinete Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Ripalimosani	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Salcito Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Biase Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giuliano del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Massimo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant Maria del Molise Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sepino Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Fr	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Roccamandolfi	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Biase Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giuliano del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Massimo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Polo Matese Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Santa Maria del Molise Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sepino Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinete Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Roccavivara	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giuliano del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Polo Matese Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Santa Maria del Molise Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sepino Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinete Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Salcito	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Giuliano del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Massimo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Polo Matese Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Santa Maria del Molise Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sepino Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinete Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Vinchiaturo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di San Biase	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Massimo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Santa Maria del Molise Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Santa Maria del Molise Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sepino Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinete Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Vinchiaturo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di San Giovanni in Galdo	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di San Polo Matese Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Santa Maria del Molise Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sepino Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinete Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Vinchiaturo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di San Giuliano del Sannio	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Santa Maria del Molise Local autority Local autorit	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di San Massimo	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano Local autority Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo Local autority Sviluppo Italia Molise Local autority Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di San Polo Matese	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinete Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Spinete Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Vinchiaturo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Santa Maria del Molise	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Sepino Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Torella del Sannio Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Vinchiaturo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Sant'Angelo Limosano	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di SpineteLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di Torella del SannioLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di ToroLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di TriventoLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di TufaraLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di VinchiaturoLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di Gravina in PugliaLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di FrosoloneLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSSviluppo Italia MoliseAgenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSSviluppo Italia MoliseAgenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Sant'Elia a Pianisi	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di Torella del SannioLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di ToroLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di TriventoLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di TufaraLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di Gravina in PugliaLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di FrosoloneLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSComune di FrosoloneLocal autority1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSSviluppo Italia MoliseAgenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo1. KEY STAKEHOLDERSSviluppo Italia MoliseAgenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Sepino	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Toro Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Vinchiaturo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Spinete	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Trivento Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Torella del Sannio	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Tufara Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Vinchiaturo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo Sviluppo Sviluppo Sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Toro	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Vinchiaturo Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Trivento	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Gravina in Puglia Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Tufara	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Comune di Frosolone Local autority 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo 1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Vinchiaturo	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Gravina in Puglia	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo sviluppo Sviluppo Italia Molise	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Comune di Frosolone	Local autority
1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo Agenzia Regionale per lo Sviluppo Italia Molise Sviluppo	1 KEY STAKEHOLDERS		
Sviluppo Italia Molise sviluppo	I. KET STAKENSEDENS	Sviluppo Italia Molise	• •
Sviluppo Italia Molise sviluppo	1. KEY STAKEHOLDERS		
4. COLLECTIVE STAKEHOLDERS Il bene comune Publishing house			
	4. COLLECTIVE STAKEHOLDERS	Il bene comune	Publishing house



3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	Just Mò	Cooperative enterprise
4. COLLECTIVE STAKEHOLDERS	Excursio tour/Kosmos scarl	Web newpaper
4. COLLECTIVE STAKEHOLDERS	Excursio tour/Kosmos scarl	Web newpaper
4. COLLECTIVE STAKEHOLDERS	Excursio tour/Kosmos scarl	Web newpaper
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	DI Paola Viaggi	Travel agency
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	Santilli Viaggi	Travel agency
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	Santilli Viaggi	Travel agency
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	Tripmetoo	Accessibility tourism enterprise
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	Tripmetoo	Accessibility tourism enterprise
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	Tripmetoo	Accessibility tourism enterprise
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	G.E.F.IM sas	advertising company
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	Gisco Group Cooperativa sociale	Cooperative enterprise
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	Molise Explorer	Tourism enterprise
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	CGIL Molise	Labor Union
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	CONFESERCENTI CB	Business association
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	CIA Molise	Agricultural business association
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	CIA Molise	Agricultural business association
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	CIA Molise	Agricultural business association
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	Associazione MuSE aps	Social promotion association
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	Associazione MuSE aps	Social promotion association
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	ACLI	Business association
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	ACLI	Business association
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	Me.Mo Cantieri culturali aps	Cultural association
		Cultural and tourism
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	Associazione InForesta	association
3. TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	LEGAMBIENTE MOLISE	Environmental association
4. COLLECTIVE STAKEHOLDERS	ESCOOP	NGO





1.7 S.W.O.T. Analysis

Strengths	Weakness
1.slow elite tourism	1. leak of infrastructures
2.targeted tourism	2. leak of visibility
3. cultural tourism	3. internal mountain area
4. natural landscape and cultural heritage	4. cold temperatures
Threats	Opportunities
1. rural isolation	1. un-massive tourism
2. rural abandonment	2.selective tourism
3. old age inhabitants	3. natural and cultural turism

1.8 Point of interest / Thematic itineraries

Natural and cultural itineraries – De Capua's Court Noble family belonging from Naple, whose exponents ruled during the 16th century;

Feudal lords of many places in Molise:

- Riccia, Campobasso,
- Termoli, Gambatesa, Sepino, Sant'Elia a Pianisi, Pietracatella,
- Monacilioni, Campolieto, ecc.
- RICCIA is the most ancient feud of the De Capua family.

Natural and cultural itineraries – Cattle-trackts:

- 1: Pescasseroli-Candela,
- 2: Castel Di Sangro-Lucera
- 3: Celano-Foggia,
- 4: Ateleta-Biferno
- 5: Centurelle Montesecco
- 6: L'Aquila-Foggia
- Food and wine itineraries



2. Action Plan

2.1 Vision

The contemporary era is strongly characterized by a tension between global and local, in which both dimensions influence and are influenced by each other. Even in the challenge that has been launched for the development of the inland areas, it is necessary to consider both dimensions. Indeed, it is reasonable to think that one of the keys to the success of their enhancement lies precisely in the way in which the opportunities offered by the global dimension can be seized and guide the new ways of using local resources. It is a challenge in which it is required to connect new meanings to ancient places and ancient signs, through more effective communication strategies and involvement of local actors. If, from a scientific point of view, natural and environmental values, cultural heritages, historical testimonies and traditions are widely recognized as assets to be protected and valued, greater difficulty is found in transforming the attractive potential of these assets to support conscious tourism slow and not seasonal, which can activate virtuous circuits capable of generating micro-economies for the territory. In this sense, it seems necessary to build a common vision for the enhancement of inland areas based on the integration of landscape resources, enhancement policies and mobility on the one hand; and on the reorganization of the communication tools and of the subjects responsible for promoting tourism on the other. With this premise, it is possible to direct the strategic process through a common vision that makes the natural and cultural heritage its main nucleus. Two strategic objectives can be outlined, aimed at the recognition and enhancement of landscape resources, as well as the innovation of the territorial fruition methods, towards which the two countries (and pilot areas) can aim: a.1 Valorisation of the natural and cultural system: interaction with the context a.2 Development of new way of use of the assets

For this reason, the territory of the pilot area of the Molise Region can be interpreted starting from reading the traces of history. The major places of identity, recognized by the communities, pass through time: the Roman archaeological areas (Sepino, Altilla), the ancient paths of the transhumance (I Tratturi), the fortified medieval villages from the De Capua dynasty, the naturalistic areas still today subject to new method of use (Bosco Mazzocca and Lago di Occhito). The



imprint of the De Capua dynasty, which led to an economic and cultural revolution in the whole valley, governing the territory for centuries, highlights even more clearly how the historical and cultural context has shaped the open spaces and places of nature. The 14 European Regional Development Fund www.italy-croatia.eu/madein-land intangible assets, in particular the heartfelt historical reenactments, make evident the desire of the community to keep alive the link between the places and their history. The enhancement of the natural and cultural heritage of the pilot area can be achieved through interventions capable of using, in a sustainable way, the traces of nature and history to give the territory new opportunities for evolution.

2.2 Objectives

The main objectives of the project referring to the creation of a sinergies between the inland areas of our territory and the seaside, including the valorization of our cultural and natural heritage and patrimony.

The Pilot Action concern the realization of the Virtual Eco-Museo of the De-Capua state called «Terr@ di passo, A Virtual Eco-museum for the area of Fortore» and will be declined as following:

- Development of an online center in the shape of a virtual ecomuseum: creation of an exhibition hall that offers potential visitors the opportunity to access digital content before / during / after the visit in a series of digital "meetings". The contents must be linked not only to the "Terr @ di passo, nella Corti dei De Capua" project, but also to the data coming from the analysis of WP3 (whose material is available on request) to improve web marketing and the promotion of the target areas;
- Development of a software / hardware system with an online database of information for intuitive navigation. Natural and cultural assets must be linked through physical and geo-referenced indicators to the database within a virtual and augmented reality system;
- Development of promotional activities for the Virtual Eco Museum through social network platforms and additional digital tools capable of ensuring effective promotion of the natural and cultural assets of the Virtual Eco Museum also at an international level.



2.3 Functions or functionalities to activate

FUNCTIONS/FUNCTIONALITIES TO ACTIVE:

- augmented reality,
- exhibition web room (first floor of the tower of Riccia),
- digital and printed community maps, pictures.

The main functions to active:

- augmented reality,
- exhibition web room (first floor of the tower of Riccia),
- digital and printed community maps, pictures, community maps.

2.4 Expected results of the Pilot Action

The specific result of the Pilot action is the creation of a visual Eco-Museum of the inland lands whose fil rouge is the history of the De Capua family, feudal lord from the Kingdom of Naples settled in many places of Molise.

In this way we can enhance our territorial brand and our touristic strategy.



3. Pilot Action project

3.1 Description of the place or area selected

The eco musem will be set up in the Riccia Tower's castle. The Castle, recently restored in the sections that are still visible today and which represented the parts for military use, stands on the edge of a rocky overhang. Almost twenty meters high, it has a cylindrical plan and a crowning of stone corbels on the top. The entrance portal, clearly visible, still bears the inscription with the name of Bartholomew on the upper plate and the two coats of arms, although partially illegible.

Inside three rooms overlap, today connected by spiral staircases, each with a quadrangular window. The entrance, on the other hand, can be reached via a short iron staircase. Particular is the reservoir for the water, dug entirely in the rock under the tower, in the deepest part of which the remains of the prisons are preserved with relative torture chambers. Next to the main tower there is also a secondary tower, to defend the entrance and the drawbridge.

The main tower had the function of a lookout, given its dominant position over the whole valley, and was the main keep of the castle that belonged to the di Capua.

We do not have certain dates on the construction of the Riccia castle, but almost certainly the building dates back to the Lombard period, like many other Molise defensive settlements. The first works carried out on the fortress date back to 1285 and were commissioned by Bartolomeo di Capua, an Angevin feudal lord; in 1515, however, the castle was renovated by Prince Bartolomeo III of Capua.

The residential areas have been the most looted since the nineteenth century, in order to reuse various architectural elements in the nearby houses of the town. The residence of the princes had to be very comfortable and extensively decorated especially after the Renaissance period. A rich library, frescoed rooms, valuable furniture and period ceramics. All embellished with expensive fabrics, valuable paintings and fireplaces with local carved stone slabs.

Another element that testifies to the great accuracy in the definition of the details, among other things unusual in the context of a building intended for military use, is the throne that opens towards Piano della Corte, in the southern tower, refined by



the decoration present in the two ashlars which constitute the lateral jambs. The reconstruction of the interior is provided to us by the historian Amorosa, since the castle was the object of the destructive hatred of the population of Riccia in 1799, without being rebuilt anymore.

The main tower will become a virtual Eco Museum, a hall as a museum of stories, events and places closely linked to the lives of the characters. It will be based on community maps and multimedia narratives, in which storytelling plays a key role. Visiting the Virtual Eco Museum means meeting face to face with the most famous people who interacted with Riccia and with the areas of Fortore and Matese identified by the "Terr @ di passo, in the Courts of De Capua" project idea. Infact, the creation of the Virtual Eco Museum must be configured as a participatory action.



3.2 Technical project



"Terr@ di passo" is our virtual ecomuseum.

This project core is the creation of a web / app platform with textual, photographic, video and cartographic contents relating to the territory of Riccia and the municipalities included in the project, in Italian and English, structured on a GIS basis and by thematic layers. The platform is structured to offer at the visitor of the Ecomuseum the opportunity to access contents relating to the cultural and naturalistic heritage of the identified area organized by themes. The contents are available on a cartographic basis (completely redesigned original maps) and can be chosen and

"turned on" by the visitor starting from indications entered on the basis of their preferences: "STATE AND FAMILY" map, "RICCIA AND ITS HISTORY" community map (tourist map of the city + tourist reception network), Map of Riccia for children "KIDS", "LAND AND WATER" map (naturalistic heritage + fountains of the Riccia area), "TALES AND TRADITIONS" map (intangible heritage of the municipalities concerned from the project).

The visitor can access the web platform, which represents the virtual access door to the Riccia Ecomuseum, both directly from personal devices (smartphones, tablets) and using the hardware equipment owned by the municipality of Riccia (touchscreen) positioned inside the "Tower".

Accompanying the visitor on the virtual journey of the Ecomuseum are four characters who tell the territory of Riccia and the history of the De Capua: Costanza Di Chiaromonte; Bartolomeo De Capua; the Storyteller; the Hedgehog. The stories of the 4 characters, made in audiovisual format, are available on the web platform, but the visitor can access them directly by framing the visual activators positioned in about twenty most significant places of the journey with their smartphone. To create the contents, a Knowledge Plan was prepared, based on three fundamental elements:

- 1. Historical research: carried out taking into account two decisive factors: analysis of the sources and evaluation of the research results.
- 2. Study of the territory: an in-depth study in all the Municipalities identified by Terr @ di passo, of the suggested Assets relating to the cultural, tangible and intangible heritage, and to the



naturalistic heritage. Specifically, in the municipality of Riccia, the study was aimed at identifying all the physical places that had stylistic and cultural influences linked to the De Capua. A data collection form was produced for each site, structured specifically for the project.

3. Intangible Heritage. The research on intangible heritage has collected specific information on the traditions, ritual calendar, festivals, gastronomy, ritual practices of the project area.

Community involvement work has been carried out and is still in progress using the Community Map tool with which the inhabitants of a territory have the opportunity to represent the tangible and intangible cultural heritage in which they identify their community. A cultural process is implemented through a collective path of participation and involvement of the inhabitants of the citizens called to participate in informal meetings. Citizens were accompanied to think together on the importance of the De Capua theme, on the conservation of this heritage, on the memories and values linked to the places, on the peculiarities of their territory and on the perception that one has of it, always with an eye on to the future. Texts, photos and community interviews have been produced which will be used on the maps.

In collaboration with the Municipality of Riccia, a physical space was identified for an exhibition that tells the story of the Terr @ di Passo Virtual Ecomuseum.

The contents (texts / photos / videos / graphics) of the panels present were then produced (n $^{\circ}$ 8 panels 100x200cm + 10 panels 30x40cm), the set-up was designed, and the reconstruction of the noble coats of arms (n $^{\circ}$ 14) printed in the window sticker was created.

The eco-museum logo was created, the entire graphic visual was created, and the reference pages were opened on the Youtube, Facebook and Instagram channels.

The design of Gamification services was started, involving local schools, to date we have received 221 responses to our google modules.

More in detail, the eco-museum has been set up as followed:

- Development of an online center in the shape of a virtual ecomuseum: creation of an exhibition hall that offers potential visitors the opportunity to access digital content before / during / after the visit in a series of digital "meetings". The contents must be linked not only to the "Terr @ di passo, nella Corti dei De Capua" project, but also to the data coming from the analysis of WP3 (whose material is available on request) to improve web marketing and the promotion of the target areas;
- Development of a software / hardware system with an online database of information for intuitive navigation. Natural and cultural assets must be



linked through physical and geo-referenced indicators to the database within a virtual and augmented reality system;

- Development of promotional activities for the Virtual Eco Museum through social network platforms and additional digital tools capable of ensuring effective promotion of the natural and cultural assets of the Virtual Eco Museum also at an international level;
- Interactive digital platform in which an integrated project of knowledge of the territory will have to converge which has the Municipality of Riccia as its fulcrum and the entire area of Fortore and Matese as a branch in accordance with the assets identified by the project "Terr@ di passo, in Courts of the De Capua". The natural and cultural heritage linked to the historical landscape of the De Capua family will have to be mapped;
- The Virtual Eco Museum must involve assets related to the following Molise municipalities: the Municipality of Riccia which will also play the role of leader of the Virtual Eco Museum, the municipalities of the internal area of Fortore (Jelsi, Gambatesa, Macchia Valfortore, Sant 'Elia in Pianisi, Pietracatella, Campolieto, Cercemaggiore, Gildone, Monacilioni, Toro, Tufara) and some administrations of the internal Matese area (Sepino, Guardiaregia, San Giuliano, Cercepiccola, Bojano, Campochiaro);
- The digitization of the territory and the creation of thematic maps on river and road routes, ancient and modern, also in reference connection with the Area1 identified by the "Terr@ di passo, in the Corti dei De Capua" project;
- The digitization of the sixteenth-century cultural landscape linked to the socio-economic cultural organization promoted by the De Capua family, as defined in the assets identified in the "Terr@ di passo, in the Corti dei De Capua" project;
- Creation of an Area2 GIS (the area was identified in the "Terr@ di passo, in the Corti dei De Capua" project), which will have to acquire geographical, historical, anthropological and anthropological data and which will allow on the one hand to have a technical digital archive through which to analyze, manage and monitor the information data collected, on the other hand the processing of geographic data in friendly graphic mode, to allow the information to be transmitted to non-professionals (local population, tourists, travelers) recipient of the intervention. The GIS system must be



equipped with a user friendly interface in order to attract a heterogeneous public (internal and external to the communities concerned) and in order to be easily accessible, with participatory processes aimed at the production of knowledge actions;

- Creation of a digital community map in which the inhabitants will have the opportunity to represent the heritage, the landscape, the knowledge in which local citizens recognize themselves and which they wish to transmit. The map will have to be characterized by a dedicated graphic development for the dynamic visualization of the stories detected and produced by the community itself, contributions that will be able to approach external users who will perceive themselves as part of the new community encountered;
- The Virtual Eco Museum platform will have to make the mapping of the public fountains present in area 2 available to potential tourists (for the definition of area 2 see the project "Terr @ di passo, in the Corti dei De Capua") where refill water bottles, so as to ensure ecologically sustainable tourism; as well as the mapping of energy stops for recharging devices located in places of particular interest and transit for travelers in area 1 (for the definition of area 1 see the "Terr @ di passo, in the Corti dei De Capua" project; as well as the mapping of the places and shops of the "Terr @ di Passo" Hospitality Network;
- Realization of the storytelling of the territory, which will have to be configured as a community map that brings out the cultural and social values unanimously recognized, and specifically it will have to foresee the realization of interviews and questionnaires for the local population and neighboring territories; the planning of mediated meetings with rural communities, also through the involvement of local actors such as associations, proloco and active and proactive circles in the reference context; the detection and monitoring of experiences of temporary citizenship; the development of community maps in collaboration with local inhabitants, associative structures and schools;
- Creation of an interactive app using augmented reality in which 4 characters guide the user, involving him in their stories, towards the discovery of assets, also through local people and the material and intangible characteristics of the local culture. The 4 characters are the following: 1)



Costanza di Chiaromonte (compulsory character), 2) Bartolomeo De Capua (Compulsory), 3) a character who has interacted with Riccia (the choice of character is free); 4) a contemporary character (the choice of character is free). These last two characters may also be fictional characters, and not necessarily have human features.

- The 2 characters defined as "mandatory" i.e. Costanza Di Chiaromonte and Bartolomeo De Capua must necessarily be contained in the proposal, under penalty of exclusion from the proposal itself. Characters 3 and 4 must also be included in the proposal, but their identity will instead be chosen by the proposer. The choices related to these last two characters will be adequately motivated.
- The characters will present themselves to the visitor in the most realistic way possible, at real height, with the known features and costumes of the time;
- The 4 characters must be reproduced with 3D holographic technologies and will interact with visitors with smart speaker technologies (voice assistants) integrated with multimedia content using, if deemed useful, virtual and augmented reality technologies. The interaction can take place in at least 3 languages (Italian, English, and one of your choice);
- It is assumed, for each character, a maximum time of interaction with visitors of about 10 15 minutes. During this interval the characters present: their time, in order to frame them historically; the interaction with Riccia and with the asset areas; Riccia and other places related to the assets of their time;
- The "contemporary" character will also be able to illustrate the assets as they are present in the current reality, the surrounding area, the specialties, its artisans and its attractions, where and how to discover or taste them or where to stay;
- The Virtual Eco Museum must pay particular attention to the youth and school target, for which we expect specific proposals for visits and interaction with the territory, for example with the youth groups of residents, also with proposals for visits in the form of gamification;



- In order to enhance public accessibility, the interactive activities of the Virtual Eco Museum must be translated into English and another language chosen by the proponent.

3.3 Project budget

The defined budget for the realization of the eco museum is € 123.700,00 VAT included. It is divided as follow.

Timetable: from September 2020 to June 2021

Coordination

Professional staff	Percentage	
1. Anthropologist	20%	
2. Archaeologist	20%	
3. Art historian	20%	
4. Historical Designer	20%	
5. Commercial adviser	20%	
Total	€ 48.500,00	

Study and research

Identification of the territory of the ecomuseum and definition of the indicators that contribute to the

determination of the identity of the landscape.

Collection, inventory of the elements of the territory and indications for the construction of the census of places and knowledge.

Creation of the contents of the community heritage for the platform

Professional staff	Percentage
1. Anthropologist	15%
2. Archaeologist	10%
3. Art historian	15%



4. Historical Designer	10%
5. Association	50%
Total budget	€ 40.000,00

Participation and promotion

Organization of the census of places and knowledge related to the landscape and application of methods

of participation.

Study and activation of training courses and organization of training workshops on assets.

Professional staff	Percentage
1. Anthropologist	20%
2. Archaeologist	20%
3. Art historian	20%
4. Commercial adviser	20%
5. Association	20%
Total	€ 31.500,00

Hardware

Total	€ 30.500,00

Communication activities

Organization and management of meetings.

Promotion and communication activities

Professional staff	Percentage
1. Anthropologist	30%
2. Archaeologist	30%



3. Art historian	30%
4. Commercial advisor	10%
Total	€ 28.850,00

Services	Budget
Coordination activity	39.750,00
Study and research	32.800,00
Participation and promotion	25.800,00
Communication	23.650,00
Total	122.000,00
Supplies	
Platform and supplies + equipment	25.000,00
Total services and supplies	147.000,00
IVA 22%	32.340,00
Total + VAT 22%	179.340,00
Tender expenditure	225,00
Tender expenditure	1.000,00
General expenditure + RUP	2.939,00
Unexpected	322,00
TOTAL	183.827,00



3.4 Project Implementation

The Municipality of Riccia is finalizing the realization of the Eco-museum.

The virtual eco-museum is on-line. Its website is under construction (the link is: https://www.terradipasso.it/)

and it is presented on the principal social media networks such as Instagram and Facebook.

The eco-museum logo was created, the entire graphic visual was created, and the reference pages were opened on the Youtube, Facebook and Instagram channels.



The physical exhibition room, located at the 1st level of

the tower of Riccia is on work. In collaboration with the Municipality of Riccia, infact, a physical space was identified for an exhibition that tells the story of the Terr @ di Passo Virtual Ecomuseum. The contents (texts / photos / videos / graphics) of the panels present were then produced (n $^{\circ}$ 8 panels 100x200cm + 10 panels 30x40cm), the set-up was designed, and the reconstruction of the noble coats of arms (n $^{\circ}$ 14) printed in the window sticker was created.

The design of Gamification services was started, involving local schools, to date we have received



221 responses to our google modules.











3.5 Stages of project

The creation of the Virtual Eco Museum must be configured as a participatory action. - The creation of the Virtual Eco Museum must be configured as a participatory action. It is in the Administration's interest to ensure that the population of the Fortore and Matese area and the stakeholders are involved in the implementation phase of the Virtual Eco Museum.

3.6 Proposal of indicators for evaluation project

The purpose of the Virtual Eco Museum is to stimulate visitors to discover for themselves the cultural and naturalistic resources and the territory of the Municipality of Riccia and the municipalities of the air of Fortore and Matese involved in the initiative as indicated in the project "Terr @ step by step, in the Courts of the De Capua";

The territory of interest of the Virtual Eco Museum is primarily that of Riccia, Jelsi, Gambatesa, Macchia Valfortore, Sant'Elia a Pianisi, Pietracatella, Campolieto, Cercemaggiore, Gildone, Monacilioni, Toro, Tufara, Sepino, Guardiaregia, San Giuliano, Cercepiccola, Bojano, Campochiaro;

The key themes of the Virtual Eco Museum are two:

- The history of the noble De Capua family and its interactions with the historical, artistic and cultural resources of the territories of the municipalities involved in the project, with a view to reevaluating them in the present time;
- The historical, cultural and naturalistic heritage of the territories identified by the assets indicated in the "Terr @ di passo, in the Corti dei De Capua" project. From these resources, visit itineraries will be suggested and the interactions between history and nature will be highlighted;
- The creation of the Virtual Eco Museum will also be an opportunity to rearrange and enhance the cultural resources present in the following municipalities: Riccia, Jelsi, Gambatesa, Macchia Valfortore, Sant'Elia a Pianisi, Pietracatella, Campolieto, Cercemaggiore, Gildone, Monacilioni, Toro, Tufara, Sepino, Guardiaregia, San Giuliano, Cercepiccola, Bojano, Campochiaro.

In this contest, some indicators for a final evaluation of the Pilot Action could be:

- Monitoring of visitor flow

The proposal of Eco Virtual Museum must also include a visitor monitoring system. The aim of the system is to generate reports, at the request of the manager, in which, alongside the general



flow data, there will also be information about the attractiveness performance of the various characters and the interaction formulas preferred by visitors.

Consider that the monitoring system will have to guide the updating of the contents of the Virtual Eco Museum over the years.

- Creation of a website of the Virtual Eco Museum

The creation of the Virtual Eco Museum website, the complete hosting service, the proposal of the domain name, the management of the domain itself and the annual maintenance for at least 3 years after the publication of the Site.

It essentially means information and commercial promotion of the Virtual Eco Museum.

The website must integrate a Content Management System platform.