



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
DI MILANO



"Heritage Greenways" protocol,

*for the development
of the "Heritage
Greenways" brand.*

*Guidelines, criteria
and requirements
check-list.*



©Ciclo vía-della-Valbrembana

www.greenwaysheritage.org

DISCLAIMER: "The content of this document represents the views of the author only and it is his/her sole responsibility: it cannot be considered to reflect the views of the Executive Agency of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises or any other body of the European Union. The European Commission and the Agency do not accept any responsibility for the use that may be made of the information it contains"



Co-funded by the COSME programme
of the European Union

This document is part of the [Greenways Heritage](#) project, co-funded by the EU COSME programme. Presented in a basic working edition, in PDF format, the document has been prepared by the project partner responsible for the deliverable for the purpose of communicating the project results to a broader audience. Your efforts to ensure the maximum dissemination of the document are therefore greatly appreciated.

Copyright: This document may be freely distributed and its contents reprinted, provided no fee is charged and the source is correctly attributed to the **Greenways Heritage project**.

Acronym GREENWAYS HERITAGE.

Title: Development and promotion of a transnational cultural tourism product linked to greenways and UNESCO cultural sites.

Action Title: "SUPPORTING THE PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSNATIONAL THEMATIC TOURISM PRODUCTS LINKED TO CULTURAL AND CREATIVE INDUSTRIES" COSME Work Programme [2017]

Lead partner/coordinator:

European Greenways Association (EGWA)

info@aevv-egwa.org

www.aevv-egwa.org

Partners:

Fundación de los Ferrocarriles Españoles (Spain)

Università degli Studi di Milano (Italy)

Latvijas Zāļu Celu Asociācija (Latvia)

Provincie Antwerp (Belgium)

Turismo Vivencial (Spain)

Stad Mechelen (Belgium)

Comunidade Intermunicipal do AVE (Portugal)

www.greenwaysheritage.org

Greenways and UNESCO Heritage in Europe: The high potential of their joint promotion.

Greenways are independent non-motorized routes, mainly using disused railways and canal towpaths. Safe, accessible and very attractive, they give easy access to areas of outstanding natural beauty (e.g. in mountainous areas, by way of tunnels and viaducts). (See Lille Declaration: <https://www.aevv-egwa.org/lille-declaration/>)

Greenways are a very appealing destination for active tourists who use non-motorized means of transports as their main way of exploring new territories, urban or rural. Especially for the later, greenways play a highly important role in the local economic development. Nowadays these sustainable itineraries increasingly expand all over the European continent.

They are undoubtedly, historic, cultural and natural assets with a huge tourist attractiveness. The future conversion of undeveloped disused railway lines into greenways represents a major growth potential; not to mention greenways based on canal towpaths, which exploit Europe's considerable hydraulic engineering heritage.

Cultural tourism linked to UNESCO World Heritage sites, is considered as a key asset for EU tourism. Many Greenways have UNESCO cultural heritage sites nearby although up until now there has been no joint promotional effort for these two important cultural resources to benefit from.

Therefore, the wealth and appeal of UNESCO sites and greenways as separate destinations could be multiplied if those destinations were to be combined. The two resources reflect the history of Europe, a shared identity, and the opportunity to reach a broader segment of tourists.

GREENWAYS HERITAGE:

Tourism product combining greenways and UNESCO sites

The aim of the project is the development and diversification of the European tourism offer by developing new tourism products combining UNESCO + Greenways as common destinations.

A particular emphasis on the use of Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI)-related technologies, linked to greenways and UNESCO sites, is foreseen to better inform the visitors and enhance their experience.

The "Heritage Greenways" protocol

1. Introduction

“Greenways are communication routes reserved exclusively for non-motorised journeys, developed in an integrated manner which enhances both the environment and quality of life of the surrounding area. These routes should meet satisfactory standards of width, gradient, and surface condition to ensure that they are both user-friendly and low-risk for users of all abilities. In this respect, canal towpaths and disused railway lines are a highly suitable resource for the development of greenways”. (Lille Declaration, 12 September 2000).

Many greenways have outstanding UNESCO heritage sites nearby, although actually there is no joint promotion effort from which the two significant cultural resources can benefit: the greenway tourists and cultural tourists are, in fact, separate.

The general objective of the Greenways Heritage project is the *“development and diversification of the European tourism offer by generating new tourism products related to heritage greenways and UNESCO cultural sites located nearby”*.

In order to develop and promote this innovative tourism product, the project has provided the development of a **“Greenways Heritage Brand”**; to this end, a **protocol** containing guidelines, criteria and requirements check-list has been defined; the protocol will allow to identify the trails to which the “Greenways Heritage” brand will be granted, on the basis of a qualitative and quantitative evaluation. These trails will be promoted and recognized by the use of a specific “Greenways Heritage” logo, produced by the European Greenways Association (EGWA).

2. Greenways Heritage brand: objectives, targets and benefits

Greenways are a very appealing destination for active tourism and play a vital role in the local economic development of the territories through which they run. Many greenways have UNESCO cultural heritage sites nearby, although up until now there has been no joint tourism promotional effort for these two important cultural resources. The development of the “Greenways Heritage” brand will allow to fill this gap and to create a new synergy between greenways and UNESCO sites, by:

- promoting, with an identification brand, the greenways located in the vicinity of UNESCO sites that meet certain quality criteria, favouring their recognition as a tourism product;
- encouraging the creation of new greenways and the improvement of the existing ones, through the support to the management authorities in the implementation of interventions that meet high quality criteria;
- stimulating, through the development of new forms of "sustainable tourism", the valorisation of the territories crossed by the greenways, with their historical, cultural and natural resources.

The brand is addressed to the management authorities of the greenways (municipalities, provinces, mountain communities, park authorities, consortia, etc.) that want to enhance their trail and guarantee high quality standards to users, promoting at the same time their territories, resources and local economic activities. The brand is granted following a quali-quantitative evaluation on the basis of the evaluation grid developed by the University of Milan, in collaboration with the partnership.

The Greenways Heritage brand will **benefit**:

a) the greenways management authorities through:

- the use of the "Greenways Heritage" logo and specific signage designed to promote users comfort and safety,
- the inclusion of the trail in the "Greenways Heritage" GIS-Database, shared with tourists through a web-application,
- the development of specific tourism packages related to the trail, integrated within the "Greenways heritage" tourism offer,
- the development of communication and dissemination initiatives, addressed both to local and foreign tourists, aimed to promote the greenway and the surrounding territory,
- the participation in the European greenways network;

b) the UNESCO sites management authorities through:

- the use of the "Greenways Heritage" web-GIS application and CCI-related technologies in promoting the UNESCO sites and enhancing visitor's experience,
- the development of specific tourism packages related to the UNESCO sites, integrated within the "Greenways heritage" tourism offer,
- the promotion of the UNESCO sites through the "Greenways Heritage" project initiatives;

c) the local services and equipment providers (accommodation, food and user assistance services) and the natural and cultural resources management authorities, through:

- their inclusion in the "Greenways Heritage" GIS-Database, shared with tourists through a web-application,
- their inclusion in the "Greenways Heritage" tourism packages,
- their promotion through the "Greenways Heritage" project initiatives;

d) the tourists through:

- the guarantee of the "quality" level (comfort, safety and pleasure) along the greenway,
- the easy availability of practical and exhaustive information on the greenway, the surrounding natural and cultural resources, and the tourism services providers (accommodations, food services, transport services, and user assistance services).

3. The evaluation process

The assignment of the "Greenways Heritage" brand is conditioned upon a qualitative evaluation of the greenway.

- EGWA will include the "Heritage greenways" protocol in the web site, as a concrete result of the Greenway Heritage project and, jointly with the Project partners, will encourage its use by eligible greenways.
- The interested greenways managers will be able to complete the information required. It will be up to the greenways candidacies to demonstrate their eligibility and the veracity of the information provided.
- Depending on the experience, a specific methodology for evaluation can be developed in the future, which may include on-site evaluation by EGWA experts and local experts.

4. The evaluation grid

The evaluation grid consists of 55 criteria, organized into 3 main themes and 9 subthemes, that consider the most relevant greenway qualitative characteristics for the users (Tab. 1). The three main themes are the following.

- A. Greenway: these criteria (29) evaluate the overall quality of the greenway, based on its general conditions (5 criteria), safety (7 criteria), comfort (6 criteria), maintenance level (4 criteria) and the presence of signage for the users (7 criteria).
- B. Tourism services: these criteria (12) evaluate the greenway accessibility with different means of transport (intermodality, 5 criteria) and the presence of accommodations, food services and other services for users (7 criteria).
- C. Heritage: these criteria (14) evaluate the presence of UNESCO sites (7 criteria) and other resources (cultural, historical and natural, 7 criteria) near the greenway, based on their accessibility and the availability of information.

The evaluation grid is reported at the end of this document (Tab. 5).

For each criterion, the evaluator can assign:

- 2 points, if the greenway presents the ideal condition,
- 1 point, if the greenway presents the acceptable condition,
- 0 points, if the greenway presents an inadequate condition.

Tab. 1 - Evaluation grid: Themes, subthemes and n° criteria		
Theme	Subtheme	N° of criteria
A. Greenway	A1. General conditions	5
	A2. Safety	7
	A3. Comfort	6
	A4. Maintenance	4
	A5. Signage along the greenway	7
	Greenway Total	29
B. Tourism services	B1. Intermodality	5
	B2. Accommodations and other services	7
	Tourism services Total	12
C. Heritage	C1. UNESCO heritage	7
	C2. Other resources (natural, historical and cultural)	7
	Heritage Total	14
Total		55

A weight is assigned to each criterion, based on its contribution and importance to the overall greenway quality; the weight can have a value of 0.5, 1, 2 or 3. The criterion score is obtained multiplying the assigned points by its weight.

The assignment of the "Greenways Heritage" brand is subject to compliance with 5 mandatory criteria, defined as General Conditions (Subtheme A1); for each of these criteria it is necessary to obtain at least one point (Tab. 2).

Tab. 2 - General conditions (Subtheme A1)				
N.	Criterion	POINTS		
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)
A.1.1	Presence of UNESCO sites within 10 km from the greenway	≥2	1	0
A.1.2	Greenway realized through the recovery of disused railways, towpaths or rural roads, with the preservation of heritage elements that witness to the past of the route. (e.g.: tunnels, viaducts, bridges, stations, progressive mileage signs, hydraulic engineering works, mills, etc.)	Yes, most sections are realized through the recovery of disused railways, towpaths or rural roads	Yes, only some sections are realized through the recovery of disused railways, towpaths or rural roads	No
A.1.3	Access allowed to different users (pedestrians, cyclists, rollers, horse riders etc.)	cyclists and pedestrians and others	only cyclists and pedestrians	No, only one category of users
A.1.4	Slope of the greenway <4%	Yes, for all the greenway	Yes except for short sections	No, for long sections
A.1.5	Signalization of the intersections with ordinary roads and shared sections	Most intersections are adequately regulated	At least half of the intersections are adequately regulated	Less than half of the intersections are adequately regulated

The overall greenway quality is assessed by comparing the achieved score (ranging from 0 to 109) with the maximum possible score (109); in this way, the final score is scaled to a 0-100 scale. The same scaling procedure can be applied to the scores related to each theme (greenway, tourism services and heritage) (Tab. 3).

Tab. 3 - Final score calculation		
Theme	Score Max (Point Max X Weight)	Final score (0-100)
Greenway (GW)	57	$\left(\frac{\sum Score\ GW_{[0-57]}}{57}\right) \times 100$
Tourism services (TS)	23	$\left(\frac{\sum Score\ TS_{[0-23]}}{23}\right) \times 100$
Heritage (HE)	29	$\left(\frac{\sum Score\ HE_{[0-29]}}{29}\right) \times 100$
Overall quality (OQ)	109	$\left(\frac{\sum Score\ OQ_{[0-109]}}{109}\right) \times 100$

Finally, the greenways are classified into 5 classes, based on the final score obtained. The classification allows to assign to the greenways a number of “Quality Stars” as shown in Tab. 4.

Tab. 4 - The “Quality Stars System”		
Final Score	Quality class	Quality Stars

(0-100)		
0-20	Sufficient	★
21-40	Discrete	★★
41-60	Good	★★★
61-80	Very good	★★★★
81-100	Excellent	★★★★★

5. The “Greenways Heritage” logo

The use of the logo will be granted to those greenways that satisfy the established quality criteria. The logo will therefore allow users to easily recognize those greenways that stand out for their quality, regarding both the tourism services efficiency and natural and cultural heritage value.

The “Greenways Heritage” logo (Fig. 2) has been created by EGWA, “in continuity” with the European Greenways logo, in order to maintain the “European greenways identity image”, but integrating new elements related to Heritage:

- a historic old city (or fortress) with an ensemble of towers, suggesting cultural/historical buildings or towers;
- a coal mine, due the great footprint of mining and numerous examples of industrial heritage in Europe; there are many examples of UNESCO sites linked to former mining activity;
- a Greek temple associated with cultural heritage.



Fig. 1 - The "Greenways Heritage" logo

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Weight
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)	
A. Greenway					
A1. General conditions (At least 1 Point for each criterion to obtain the "Greenways Heritage" brand)					
A.1.1	Presence of UNESCO sites within 10 km from the greenway	≥2	1	0	1
A.1.2	Greenway realized through the recovery of disused railways, towpaths or rural roads, with the preservation of heritage elements that witness to the past of the route. (e.g.: tunnels, viaducts, bridges, stations, progressive mileage signs, hydraulic engineering works, mills, etc.)	Yes, most sections are realized through the recovery of disused railways, towpaths or rural roads	Yes, only some sections are realized through the recovery of disused railways, towpaths or rural roads	No	1
A.1.3	Access allowed to different users (pedestrians, cyclists, rollers, horse raiders etc.)	cyclists and pedestrians and others	only cyclists and pedestrians	No, only one category of users	1
A.1.4	Slope of the greenway <4%	Yes, for all the greenway	Yes except for short sections	No, for long sections	1
A.1.5	Signalization of the intersections with ordinary roads and shared sections	Most intersections are adequately regulated	At least half of the intersections are adequately regulated	Less than half of the intersections are adequately regulated	1
A2. Safety					
A.2.1	Presence of parapets along bridges and exposed sections of the greenway	Most bridge and exposed sections are with parapets	At least half of the bridge and exposed sections are with parapets	Less than half of the bridge and exposed sections are with parapets	1
A.2.2	Signalization of dangerous points	Most dangerous points are adequately signalized	At least half of the dangerous points are adequately signalized	Less than half of the dangerous points are adequately signalized	1
A.2.3	Presence of lighting systems in the tunnels not sufficiently illuminated	In most sections	In at least half of the sections	In less than half of the sections	1
A.2.4	Presence of lighting systems in urban sections	Yes	Only in some sections	No	1
A.2.5	Presence of bollards to prevent the access of motorized vehicles	In most access points	In at least half of the access points	In less than half of the access points	0,5
A.2.6	Presence of barriers protecting the greenway users at the intersections with the ordinary roads	Most intersections are protected	At least half of the intersections are protected	Less than half of the intersections are protected	0,5
A.2.7	Accessibility to authorized motorized vehicles (residents, farmers, other)	No, for all the sections	Only for short sections	For long sections	1

Tab. 5 -The evaluation grid criteria

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Weight
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)	
A3. Comfort					
A.3.1	Presence of rainwater drainage systems, that prevent water stagnation along the route	Adequate for most sections	Adequate for at least half of the sections	Adequate less than half of the sections	1
A.3.2	Presence of elements (signs, pavement, progressive mileage signs, etc.) that allow the recognisability of the greenway continuity	Yes	Yes, partially	No	1
A.3.3	Presence of toilets along the greenway	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	1
A.3.4	Presence of equipment for resting along the greenway (e.g.: benches, tables, resting areas, etc.)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	1
A.3.5	Presence of drinking water supply points along the greenway	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	1
A.3.6	Presence of litter bins along the greenway	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	0,5
A4. Maintenance					
A.4.1	Level of the greenway maintenance (pavements, signs, barriers, protections, illumination system)	Good	Moderate	Poor	1
A.4.2	Level of the equipment maintenance (benches, tables, resting areas, toilettes, drinking water supply points)	Good	Moderate	Poor	1
A.4.3	Level of the landscape maintenance that ensures the safe use of the greenway (e.g.: cutting of the trees and shrubs that invade the trail, removing of the foliage that makes the trail slippery etc.)	Good	Moderate	Poor	1
A.4.4	Level of the greenway cleanliness (absence of litter along the trail and parking areas, emptying litter bins, cleanliness of the toilettes)	Good	Moderate	Poor	1
A5. Signage along the greenway					
A.5.1	Signalization of the rules of conduct for the users	Completely adequate	Not completely adequate	No	0,5
A.5.2	Signalization of the main directions and distances	Completely adequate	Not completely adequate	No	1
A.5.3	Presence of information panels with an overall map of the greenway and the connected resources (natural, historical and cultural)	Completely adequate	Not completely adequate	No	1
A.5.4	Presence of direction and/or informative signs related to the connected UNESCO sites	Related to all the UNESCO sites	Related to only some UNESCO sites	No	1
A.5.5	Presence of direction and/or informative signs related to the connected resources (natural, historical and cultural)	Related to most resources	Related to only some resources	No	1

Tab. 5 -The evaluation grid criteria (continued)

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Weight
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)	
A.5.6	Presence of informative signs along the greenway in different languages	Most informative signs are in different languages	At least half of the informative signs are in different languages	Less than half of the informative signs are in different languages	3
A.5.7	Presence of informative signs containing indication and contacts of the greenway managing authority (name of the managing authority, address, web page, phone, email, logo of the promoters)	Yes		No	0,5
B. Tourism services					
B1. Intermodality					
B.1.1	Presence of car parking close to the greenway access points	In most access points	Only in some access points	No	1
B.1.2	Presence of public transport stops close to the greenway access points (buses, trains, etc.)	In most access points	Only in some access points	No	1
B.1.3	Presence of direction and informative signs related to the greenway at the main public transport stations and stops and along the main roads	In most cases	Only in some cases	No	1
B.1.4	Presence of other greenways and/or soft mobility routes close to the greenway	Yes, continuous connection	Yes, not continuous connection	No	0,5
B.1.5	Presence of other transport services for the greenway users (e.g.: public or private transfer services)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	1
B2. Accommodations and other services					
B.2.1	Presence of food services along or close to the greenway (bar, restaurants, etc.)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	1
B.2.2	Presence of accommodations along or close to the greenway (hotels, hostels, camping sites, etc.)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	0,5
B.2.3	Presence of cycle-friendly accommodations along or close to the greenway (hotels, hostels, camping sites, etc.)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	1
B.2.4	Presence of user assistance services along or close to the greenway (bicycle workshop, bike rental, etc.)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	1

Tab. 5 -The evaluation grid criteria (continued)

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Weight
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)	
B.2.5	Possibility to drop off the rented equipment	Most equipment suppliers offers this possibility	Only some equipment suppliers offer this possibility	No	1
B.2.6	Presence of website, app, brochures, guides and cartography dedicated to the greenway and containing information on UNESCO sites and other heritage resources (natural and cultural-historical)	Information in different languages	Information only in the local language	No	0,5
B.2.7	Services for users with disability (car park reserved, accessibility to accommodations, accessible toilet, specific transport services, hand bike rental, etc.)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	2
C. Heritage					
C1. UNESCO heritage					
C.1.1	Presence of specific tourist packages that combine UNESCO sites and the greenway	Yes		No	1
C.1.2	Presence of a cycle-pedestrian path to reach the UNESCO site from the greenway	Physically separated from the ordinary roads	Not physically separated from the ordinary roads	No	1
C.1.3	Presence of safe bike storage services at the UNESCO sites	Yes		No	1
C.1.4	Presence of transport services between the greenway and the UNESCO site (public transport and/or transfer services)	Yes, adequately	Yes, but not adequately	No	1
C.1.5	Presence at the UNESCO sites of direction and/or informative signs related to the greenway	Yes, at all the UNESCO sites	Yes, at only some UNESCO sites	No	1
C.1.6	Presence of informative signs at the UNESCO sites related to the greenway and the transport services that connect them in different languages	Most informative signs are in different languages	At least half of the informative signs are in different languages	Less than half of the informative signs are in different languages	2
C.1.7	Presence of information related to the greenway on the website, app, brochures and guides of the UNESCO site	Information in different languages	Information only in the local language	No	1
C2. Other resources (natural, historical and cultural)					
C.2.1	Presence of natural, historical and cultural resources along or close to the greenway	Yes, at most locations	Yes, at only some locations	No	1
C.2.2	Presence of soft mobility routes between the greenway and the resources	Most of the resources can be reached directly from the greenway	Only some resources can be reached directly from the greenway	No	0,5

Tab. 5 -The evaluation grid criteria (continued)

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Weight
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)	
C.2.3	Presence of transport services between the greenway and the resources (public transport and/or transfer services)	The transport services connect most of the resources	The transport services connect only some resources	No	0,5
C.2.4	Presence at the resource sites of direction and/or informative signs related to the greenway	At the most part of the resources	Only at some resources	No	1
C.2.5	Presence of information panels at the single heritage resources	At the most part of the resources	Only at some resources	No	0,5
C.2.6	Presence of information signs at the single resources in different languages	Most informative signs are in different languages	At least half of the informative signs are in different languages	Less than half of the informative signs are in different languages	2
C.2.7	Presence of "detractors" along or close to the greenway (e.g. unpleasant areas, infrastructures, etc.)	No	Yes, only in some sections	Yes	1

Tab. 5 -The evaluation grid criteria (continued)

Example: val_brembana greenway

A. Greenway

A1. General conditions (At least 1 Point for each criterion to obtain the "Greenways Heritage" brand)

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Points	Weight	Score (Points X Weight)	Score Max (Point Max X Weight)
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)				
A.1.1	Presence of UNESCO sites within 10 km from the greenway	≥2	1	0	1	1	1	2
A.1.2	Access allowed to different users (pedestrians, cyclists, rollers, horse raiders etc.)	cyclists and pedestrians and others	only cyclists and pedestrians	No, only one category of users	1	1	1	2
A.1.3	Greenway realized through the recovery of disused railways, towpaths or rural roads, with the preservation of heritage elements that witness to the past of the route. (e.g.: tunnels, viaducts, bridges, stations, progressive mileage signs, hydraulic engineering works, mills, etc.)	Yes, most sections are realized through the recovery of disused railways, towpaths or rural roads	Yes, only some sections are realized through the recovery of disused railways, towpaths or rural roads	No	1	1	1	2
A.1.4	Slope of the greenway <4%	Yes, for all the greenway	Yes except for short sections	No, for long sections	2	1	2	2
A.1.5	Signalization of the intersections with ordinary roads and shared sections	Most intersections are adequately regulated	At least half of the intersections are adequately regulated	Less than half of the intersections are adequately regulated	2	1	2	2
Total							7	10

A2. Safety

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Points	Weight	Score (Points X Weight)	Score Max (Point Max X Weight)
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)				
A.2.1	Presence of parapets along bridges and exposed sections of the greenway	Most bridge and exposed sections are with parapets	At least half of the bridge and exposed sections are with parapets	Less than half of the bridge and exposed sections are with parapets	2	1	2	2
A.2.2	Signalization of dangerous points	Most dangerous points are adequately signalized	At least half of the dangerous points are adequately signalized	Less than half of the dangerous points are adequately signalized	1	1	1	2
A.2.3	Presence of lighting systems in the tunnels not sufficiently illuminated	In most sections	In at least half of the sections	In less than half of the sections	2	1	2	2
A.2.4	Presence of lighting systems in urban sections	Yes	Only in some sections	No	1	1	1	2
A.2.5	Presence of bollards to prevent the access of motorized vehicles	In most access points	In at least half of the access points	In less than half of the access points	1	0,5	0,5	1
A.2.6	Presence of barriers protecting the greenway users at the intersections with the ordinary roads	Most intersections are protected	At least half of the intersections are protected	Less than half of the intersections are protected	1	0,5	0,5	1
A.2.7	Accessibility to authorized motorized vehicles (residents, farmers, other)	No, for all the sections	Only for short sections	For long sections	1	1	1	2
Total							8	12

A3. Comfort

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Points	Weight	Score (Points X Weight)	Score Max (Point Max X Weight)
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)				
A.3.1	Presence of rainwater drainage systems, that prevent water stagnation along the route	Adequate for most sections	Adequate for at least half of the sections	Adequate less than half of the sections	2	1	2	2
A.3.2	Presence of elements (signs, pavement, progressive mileage signs, etc.) that allow the recognizability of the greenway continuity	Yes	Yes, partially	No	1	1	1	2
A.3.3	Presence of toilets along the greenway	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	0	1	0	2
A.3.4	Presence of equipment for resting along the greenway (e.g.: benches, tables, resting areas, etc.)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	2	1	2	2
A.3.5	Presence of drinking water supply points along the greenway	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	1	1	1	2
A.3.6	Presence of litter bins along the greenway	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	1	0,5	0,5	1
Total							6,5	11

A4. Maintenance

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Points	Weight	Score (Points X Weight)	Score Max (Point Max X Weight)
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)				
A.4.1	Level of the greenway maintenance (pavements, signs, barriers, protections, illumination system)	Good	Moderate	Poor	1	1	1	2
A.4.2	Level of the equipment maintenance (benches, tables, resting areas, toilettes, drinking water supply points)	Good	Moderate	Poor	1	1	1	2
A.4.3	Level of the landscape maintenance that ensures the safe use of the greenway (e.g.: cutting of the trees and shrubs that invade the trail, removing of the foliage that makes the trail slippery etc.)	Good	Moderate	Poor	2	1	2	2
A.4.4	Level of the greenway cleanliness (absence of litter along the trail and parking areas, emptying litter bins, cleanliness of the toilettes)	Good	Moderate	Poor	2	1	2	2
Total							6	8

A5. Signage along the greenway

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Points	Weight	Score (Points X Weight)	Score Max (Point Max X Weight)
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)				
A.5.1	Signalization of the rules of conduct for the users	Completely adequate	Not completely adequate	No	0	0,5	0	1
A.5.2	Signalization of the main directions and distances	Completely adequate	Not completely adequate	No	2	1	2	2
A.5.3	Presence of information panels with an overall map of the greenway and the connected resources (natural, historical and cultural)	Completely adequate	Not completely adequate	No	2	1	2	2
A.5.4	Presence of direction and/or informative signs related to the connected UNESCO sites	Related to all the UNESCO sites	Related to only some UNESCO sites	No	0	1	0	2
A.5.5	Presence of direction and/or informative signs related to the connected resources (natural, historical and cultural)	Related to most resources	Related to only some resources	No	1	1	1	2
A.5.6	Presence of informative signs along the greenway in different languages	Most informative signs are in different languages	At least half of the informative signs are in different languages	Less than half of the informative signs are in different languages	0	3	0	6
A.5.7	Presence of indication and contacts of the greenway managing authority	Yes		No	0	0,5	0	1
Total							5	16

B. Tourism services

B1. Intermodality

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Points	Weight	Score (Points X Weight)	Score Max (Point Max X Weight)
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)				
B.1.1	Presence of car parkings close to the greenway access points	In most access points	Only in some access points	No	2	1	2	2
B.1.2	Presence of public transport stops close to the greenway access points (buses, trains, etc.)	In most access points	Only in some access points	No	2	1	2	2
B.1.3	Presence of direction and informative signs related to the greenway at the main public transport stations and stops and along the main roads	In most cases	Only in some cases	No	0	1	0	2
B.1.4	Presence of other greenways and/or soft mobility routes close to the greenway	Yes, continuous connection	Yes, not continuous connection	No	0	0,5	0	1
B.1.5	Presence of other transport services for the greenway users (e.g.: public or private transfer services)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	0	1	0	2
Total							4	9

B2. Accommodations and other services

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Points	Weight	Score (Points X Weight)	Score Max (Point Max X Weight)
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)				
B.2.1	Presence of food services along or close to the greenway (bar, restaurants, etc.)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	2	1	2	2
B.2.2	Presence of accommodations along or close to the greenway (hotels, hostels, camping sites, etc.)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	2	0,5	1	1
B.2.3	Presence of cycle-friendly accommodations along or close to the greenway (hotels, hostels, camping sites, etc.)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	0	1	0	2
B.2.4	Presence of user assistance services along or close to the greenway (bicycle workshop, bike rental, etc.)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	1	1	1	2
B.2.5	Possibility to drop off the rented equipment	Most equipment suppliers offers this possibility	Only some equipment suppliers offer this possibility	No	1	1	1	2
B.2.6	Presence of website, brochures, guides and cartography dedicated to the greenway and containing information on UNESCO sites and other heritage resources (natural and cultural historical)	Information in different languages	Information only in the local language	No	2	0,5	1	1
B.2.7	Services for users with disability (car park reserved, accessibility to accommodations, specific transport services, hand bike rental, etc.)	Yes, frequently	Yes, but rarely	No	0	2	0	4
Total							6	14

C. Heritage

C1. UNESCO heritage

N.	Criterion	POINTS			Points	Weight	Score (Points X Weight)	Score Max (Point Max X Weight)
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)				
C.1.1	Presence of specific tourist packages that combine UNESCO sites and the greenway	Yes		No	0	1	0	2
C.1.2	Presence of a cycle-pedestrian path to reach the UNESCO site from the greenway	Physically separated from the ordinary roads	Not physically separated from the ordinary roads	No	0	1	0	2
C.1.3	Presence of safe bike storage services at the UNESCO sites	Yes		No	0	1	0	2
C.1.4	Presence of transport services between the greenway and the UNESCO site (public transport and/or transfer services)	Yes, adequately	Yes, but not adequately	No	1	1	1	2

C.1.5	Presence at the UNESCO sites of direction and/or informative signs related to the greenway	Yes, at all the UNESCO sites	Yes, at only some UNESCO sites	No	0	1	0	2
C.1.6	Presence of informative signs at the UNESCO sites related to the greenway and the transport services that connect them in different languages	Most informative signs are in different languages	At least half of the informative signs are in different languages	Less than half of the informative signs are in different languages	0	2	0	4
C.1.7	Presence of information related to the greenway on the website, brochures and guides of the UNESCO site	Information in different languages	Information only in the local language	No	2	1	2	2
Total							3	16

C2. Other resources (natural, historical and cultural)								
N.	Criterion	POINTS			Points	Weight	Score (Points X Weight)	Score Max (Point Max X Weight)
		Answer A (2 points)	Answer B (1 point)	Answer C (0 points)				
C.2.1	Presence of natural, historical and cultural resources along or close to the greenway	Yes, at most locations	Yes, at only some locations	No	2	1	2	2
C.2.2	Presence of soft mobility routes between the greenway and the resources	Most of the resources can be reached directly from the greenway	Only some resources can be reached directly from the greenway	No	1	0,5	0,5	1
C.2.3	Presence of transport services between the greenway and the resources (public transport and/or transfer services)	The transport services connect most of the resources	The transport services connect only some resources	No	0	0,5	0	1
C.2.4	Presence at the resource sites of direction and/or informative signs related to the greenway	At the most part of the resources	Only at some resources	No	0	1	0	2
C.2.5	Presence of information panels at the single heritage resources	At the most part of the resources	Only at some resources	No	2	0,5	1	1
C.2.6	Presence of information signs at the single resources in different languages	Most informative signs are in different languages	At least half of the informative signs are in different languages	Less than half of the informative signs are in different languages	0	2	0	4
C.2.7	Presence of "detractors" along or close to the greenway (e.g. unpleasant areas, infrastructures, etc.)	No	Yes, only in some sections	Yes	1	1	1	2
Total							4,5	13

Greenway Assessment					
Theme	Subtheme	Score (Points X Weight)	Score Max (Point Max X Weight)	% of maximum Score (Score/Score Max X 100)	Quality Stars
A. Greenway	A.1. General conditions (At least 1 Point for each criterion to obtain the "Greenways Heritage" brand)	7,0	10	70	
	A.2. Safety	8,0	12	67	
	A.3. Comfort	6,5	11	59	
	A.4 Maintenance	6,0	8	75	
	A.5. Signage along the greenway	5,0	16	31	
	Total Greenway	32,5	57	57	
B. Tourism services	B.1. Intermodality	4,0	9	44	
	B.2. Accommodations and other services	6,0	14	43	
	Total tourism services	10,0	23	43	
C. Heritage	C.1. UNESCO heritage	3,0	16	19	
	C.2. Other resources (natural, historical and cultural)	4,5	13	35	
	Total heritage	7,5	29	26	
Total		50,0	109	46	★★★

Quality Stars System					
% of maximum Score (Score/Score Max X 100)	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100
Quality Stars	★	★★	★★★	★★★★	★★★★★

Project partner responsible:

Università degli Studi di Milano (Italy)



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
DI MILANO

Greenways **HERITAGE**

Lead partner/coordinator:

European Greenways Association (EGWA)

info@aevv-egwa.org

www.aevv-egwa.org

Partners:

Fundación de los Ferrocarriles Españoles (Spain)

Università degli Studi di Milano (Italy)

Latvijas Zāļu Celu Asociācija (Latvia)

Provincie Antwerp (Belgium)

Turismo Vivencial (Spain)

Stad Mechelen (Belgium)

Comunidade Intermunicipal do AVE (Portugal)



ASSOCIATION EUROPÉENNE DES VOIES VERTES
EUROPEAN GREENWAYS ASSOCIATION
ASOCIACIÓN EUROPEA DE VÍAS VERDES



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
DI MILANO



Provincie
Antwerpen



MECHELEN



Comunidade
Intermunicipal
do AVE

