

## D.3.3.1 Joint report of implemented pilot actions at project level



| DELIVERABLE SUMMARY                  |                                                                             |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| PROJECT INFORMATION                  |                                                                             |
| Project acronym                      | TESTEAT                                                                     |
| Project title                        | Enhance Eno gastronomy heritage to establish and expand sustainable tourism |
| Programme priority                   | Culture and tourism for sustainable development                             |
| Starting date                        | 1/2/2024                                                                    |
| Ending date                          | 31/7/2026                                                                   |
| Lead partner organisation            | Agency for rural development of Istria-AZRRI                                |
| Name of representative               | Igor Merlić                                                                 |
| Project manager                      | Jasenska Kapuralin                                                          |
| E-mail                               | jasenska.kapuralin@azrri.hr                                                 |
| Telephone number                     | +385 52 351 590                                                             |
| DELIVERABLE INFORMATION              |                                                                             |
| Title of the deliverable             | D.3.3.1 Joint report of implemented pilot actions at project level          |
| WP/activity/deliverable              | WP3 / A.3.3 / D.3.3.1                                                       |
| Type<br>(internal/restricted/public) | Internal                                                                    |
| WP leader                            | Dubrovnik Development Agency DURA                                           |
| Activity leader                      | Dubrovnik Development Agency DURA                                           |
| Participating partner(s)             | AZRRI, COV, UNIPU, UNIVE, STON, CIVIFORM, DURA, SCF                         |
| Authors                              | DURA                                                                        |
| Contact e-mail of team leader        | <a href="mailto:kvujanovic@dura.hr">kvujanovic@dura.hr</a>                  |
| Telephone number                     | +38520640562                                                                |
| DELIVERY DEADLINE                    |                                                                             |
| Date of the delivery                 | 26/2/2026                                                                   |



## Content

|                                                                                                |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Scope and sources.....                                                                      | 4  |
| 2. Methodology.....                                                                            | 4  |
| 3. Cross-partner synthesis (key findings).....                                                 | 5  |
| 3.1 Inclusive menu design and dietary needs.....                                               | 5  |
| 3.2 Cooperation with local producers and local value chains.....                               | 6  |
| 3.3 Sustainability and horizontal principles (environmental responsibility and inclusion)..... | 6  |
| 3.4 Communication, visibility and promotion.....                                               | 7  |
| 3.5 Visitor turnout and engagement.....                                                        | 7  |
| 3.6 Contribution to integrated tourism product development.....                                | 8  |
| 4. Partner snapshots (highlights).....                                                         | 9  |
| AZRRI.....                                                                                     | 9  |
| Civiform.....                                                                                  | 9  |
| CoV (City of Venice – SAOR Food Festival).....                                                 | 10 |
| DURA.....                                                                                      | 10 |
| Ston.....                                                                                      | 10 |
| 5. Recommendations for the common guidelines (based on partner feedback).....                  | 11 |
| 6. Project-Level Conclusions (Strategic and Policy Dimension).....                             | 11 |
| Annex 1. Quantitative highlights (as reported by partners).....                                | 13 |



## 1. Scope and sources

This synthesis consolidates partners' feedback on pilot event implementation and evaluation, with a focus on: event concept; menu inclusiveness; cooperation with local producers; applied sustainability and horizontal principles; communication and visibility; visitor engagement; and contribution to integrated tourism product development.

Partners covered in this synthesis: AZRRI, Civiform, CoV (City of Venice), DURA, and Ston.

## 2. Methodology

In order to position this document as a structured evaluation deliverable under WP3 and not merely a descriptive summary of implemented pilot activities, partner inputs were assessed through a common analytical framework aligned with the Programme Priority "Culture and tourism for sustainable development" and the strategic objectives of TESTEAT.

The evaluation framework was designed to ensure policy relevance, comparability across territories, and transferability of results at cross-border level.

- Effectiveness: Achievement of planned objectives; coherence between event concept and TESTEAT guidelines; quality of implementation; and contribution to testing the integrated tourism model.
- Sustainability: Application of environmental measures (waste reduction, circular practices, reduction of single-use plastics); use of local supply chains; and potential for long-term continuity beyond project funding.
- Inclusiveness: Adaptation to modern dietary needs; economic and physical accessibility; and contribution to social inclusion and community participation.



- Stakeholder Integration: Level of cooperation with local producers and territorial actors; activation of HUB structures; cross-sector collaboration (education, tourism, public authorities, SMEs).
- Communication and Outreach: Visibility and dissemination capacity; reach of communication channels; ability to attract diversified audiences and strengthen territorial branding.

This structured approach enables policy-level interpretation of pilot actions, highlighting their contribution to sustainable tourism governance, local economic activation, and cross-border cooperation.

Inputs were reviewed and aggregated thematically, mirroring the logic of the questionnaires. Where quantitative data were provided (e.g., visitor numbers, satisfaction scores), they are reported; where partners noted limitations (e.g., disaggregated visitor profiles not available), this is stated explicitly.

### 3. Cross-partner synthesis (key findings)

#### 3.1 Inclusive menu design and dietary needs

- All partners addressed inclusiveness through at least some dietary adaptations (gluten-free, lactose-free, reduced sugar, vegetarian/vegan), with varied depth of documentation.
- AZRRI implemented multiple adaptations (e.g., gluten-free flour/pasta; vegan risotto) and used boards to communicate dietary needs on-site.
- Civiform documented detailed ingredient substitutions across many dishes (gluten-free flours/breadcrumbs; lactose-free dairy substitutes) and offered a broad range of options.
- DURA highlighted the need to collect information on participants' health needs in advance (allergies/intolerances/diabetes/celiac) to better tailor menus.
- CoV (SAOR Food Festival) noted that, due to the very large and distributed format (111 events), granular recipe-level information was not feasible; it recommended a 'universal design' approach (inclusive options as standard for all).



- Ston listed adapted items but noted limited information from caterers regarding actual preparation for specific dietary restrictions, indicating a need for stronger operational control and data capture.

### 3.2 Cooperation with local producers and local value chains

- Local product inclusion was a strong and consistent feature across partners, supporting short supply chains and territorial authenticity.
- AZRRI included a wide range of local products (olive oil, wine/spirits, honey, cheese, meat, vegetables, micro plants) through direct contact with producers.
- Civiform relied on direct relationships and an established territorial network (Distretto di Corte Natisonis / local associations) to identify relevant producers and ensure sustainability/seasonality criteria.
- Ston used local products (fish, oysters, olive oil, salt) and reported formal agreements with producers; traceability was ensured through cooperation with verified local producers and transparent presentation of origins.
- CoV reported very high stakeholder involvement (over 60 producers/restaurateurs/associations/museums) and conducted a post-festival survey to assess perceived impact and improvements.
- DURA's evaluation highlighted a gap: no specific cooperation with local producers was recorded for the purposes of its pilot event activities.

### 3.3 Sustainability and horizontal principles (environmental responsibility and inclusion)

- Environmental measures reported include reducing single-use plastics, using recyclable/biodegradable materials, waste separation, and food waste minimization through portion planning.
- AZRRI reported using ceramic plates and non-plastic glasses, involving organic/local suppliers, and serving mini portions to reduce waste.
- Civiform reported recyclable/biodegradable catering items, waste sorting, plastic reduction, collaboration with local/eco-friendly suppliers, and food waste minimization; it also stated the entire programme was suitable for people with physical disabilities.
- Ston reported biodegradable/recyclable materials, reduction of plastic, food waste reduction and free entry; evaluation emphasized inclusive access and opportunities for women, youth and local SMEs.



- DURA reported no plastic materials were used in the pilot event, thus implementing the principle of reducing waste and encouraging sustainable practices.
- Across partners, free-of-charge access was frequently used as a measure to support socioeconomic accessibility and community participation.

### 3.4 Communication, visibility and promotion

- Partners used a mix of digital channels (social media, web portals, mailing lists) and, in some cases, traditional media (TV/radio/print) to ensure reach.
- Civiform reported effective visibility materials (signage, brochures, roll-ups, flyers) and digital promotion. All workshops were fully booked; it suggested more 'catchy and interactive' promotion in external areas.
- DURA used local radio, interviews/press releases, local web portals and institutional pages, plus coordinated social media with partners; direct invitations were also used.
- Ston used broad outreach including national/local media (national TV and radio, print) and social media via tourist boards and local outlets.
- AZRRI relied on social media promotion and direct mailing; visibility included banners/roll-ups and dietary-needs boards.
- CoV disseminated via targeted mailing lists; given the distributed format, engagement measurement was described qualitatively rather than quantitatively.

### 3.5 Visitor turnout and engagement

- Reported visitor numbers and engagement vary widely due to different formats and capacities.
- CoV estimated 10,900 visitors across the festival, based on organisers' evaluations; overall satisfaction averaged 4.49/5 and audience participation/interest 4.69/5.
- DURA reported a mixed audience including general public and children at workshops; estimated engagement: 25 passive and 102 active participants.
- AZRRI estimated 40 active participants in tastings/workshops/discussions and recorded stakeholder presence across several categories (tourist boards, educational institutions, etc.).
- Civiform reached nearly 70 participants across event activities and hosted a HUB meeting with 10 key stakeholders; visitors were described as actively engaged.
- Ston reported 200 passive and 100 active participants; evaluation described most visitors as active, with recommendations to strengthen signage and structured feedback collection.



### 3.5.1 Interpretation of Participation Models

The pilot actions differed substantially in scale, format, and institutional capacity. These differences reflect deliberate territorial adaptation rather than inconsistency in implementation.

The City of Venice implemented a large-scale distributed urban festival model, prioritising visibility, stakeholder mobilisation, and wide public outreach. Other partners (Civiform, AZRRI, DURA) implemented workshop-based or educational formats with smaller but more intensively engaged participant groups. Ston applied a hybrid model combining local festival dynamics with structured experiential components.

For policy interpretation purposes, visitor numbers should therefore be understood in relation to impact pathways rather than as directly comparable indicators.

- Large-scale distributed festival model → territorial branding, network mobilisation, high visibility impact.
- Educational and workshop model → deeper engagement, skills transfer, controlled testing of inclusive gastronomy practices.
- Hybrid community-based festival model → local economic activation combined with experiential learning.

All formats contribute to Programme objectives, though through different strategic mechanisms. This diversity demonstrates the adaptability of the integrated tourism model across varying territorial contexts.

### 3.6 Contribution to integrated tourism product development

- Across partners, pilot events contributed to integrated tourism offers by combining food heritage, local production, education and community-based experiences.
- AZRRI emphasized accessibility (dietary adaptations), local producer involvement and cooperation with the local catering school as factors strengthening the regional tourism-gastronomy ecosystem.
- Civiform emphasized territorial networking (producers, farmers, artisans, hospitality operators and cultural stakeholders) and positioning the event as a coordinated, experience-based promotion tool.
- CoV emphasized a place-based, multi-location 'curated itinerary' approach integrating food, culture and landscape; it also highlighted inclusive culinary practices and storytelling (including food waste reduction).



- DURA highlighted skills development and mainstreaming inclusive culinary practices through the involvement of Tourism and Hospitality School students.
- Ston stressed strengthening local producers/value chains, inclusive community participation, and reinforcing the region's cultural tourism profile with educational and interactive experiences.

## 4. Partner snapshots (highlights)

### AZRRI

- Local products included (examples): gluten-free flour/pasta, olive oil, wine/spirits, honey, cheese, meat, beer, vegetables and micro plants; traceability ensured via direct producer contact.
- Sustainability measures: ceramic plates and non-plastic glasses; organic/local suppliers; mini portions to reduce waste.
- Promotion: organic social media and direct mailing; on-site visibility included banner/roll-up and dietary-needs boards.
- Engagement: estimated 40 active participants; stakeholder presence included educational institutions and tourist boards.

### Civiform

- Strong documentation of dietary adaptations and ingredient substitutions across a wide menu.
- Horizontal principles: recyclable/biodegradable materials, waste sorting, plastic reduction, collaboration with local/eco-friendly suppliers, food-waste minimization; programme accessible for people with physical disabilities.
- Promotion and visibility: signage, roll-ups, flyers and digital channels; workshops fully booked; nearly 70 participants, plus a HUB meeting with 10 key stakeholders.
- Integrated offer: collaboration with Corte Natisonis / territorial associations supported networking and coherent territorial promotion.

### CoV (City of Venice – SAOR Food Festival)

- Large-scale distributed format (111 events) limited recipe-level reporting; recommendation to adopt 'universal design' inclusiveness (inclusive options as standard).



- Stakeholder engagement and cooperation considered very strong; post-festival survey reported high satisfaction (avg 4.49/5) and high audience participation/interest (avg 4.69/5).
- Attendance estimated at 10,900 visitors across the festival; engagement described qualitatively due to distributed nature.
- Integrated offer: connected food, culture and landscape through curated itineraries and storytelling, including responsible practices (e.g., food waste reduction).

## DURA

- Menu included multiple traditional items with adaptations; recommendation to collect dietary and health needs in advance for better planning (allergies, intolerances, diabetes, celiac).
- Promotion: local radio and interviews, press releases, local web portals and institutional websites; coordinated social media across participating actors; direct invitations.
- Engagement: estimated 25 passive and 102 active participants; included general public and children at workshops.
- Integrated offer: emphasized inclusive culinary practice development and involvement of Tourism and Hospitality School students to mainstream skills into the labour market.
- Improvement point: local producer cooperation not recorded for the purposes of the pilot event activities.

## Ston

- Local products and traceability: fish, oysters, olive oil and salt; formal agreements with producers; origin transparency emphasized.
- Sustainability measures: recyclable/biodegradable materials, reduced plastic, food waste reduction; free entry as an inclusion measure.
- Promotion: traditional and digital media mix (TV/radio/print + social media via tourist boards/local outlets).
- Engagement: estimated 200 passive and 100 active; evaluation described majority as active participants.
- Recommendations: stronger visitor guidance/signage; stronger digital outreach; more structured visitor feedback collection; deepen collaboration with local producers.

## 5. Recommendations for the common guidelines (based on partner feedback)



- Standardize data collection: minimum dataset for each pilot (visitor numbers, profile where feasible, engagement proxy, satisfaction, stakeholder categories).
- Pre-event intake for dietary/health needs: simple registration questions to support safe and inclusive menu planning.
- Operationalize 'universal design' for food: design a baseline offer where inclusive options are mainstreamed rather than treated as exceptions.
- Strengthen producer cooperation protocols: lightweight templates for collaboration, traceability notes and visibility of local origin.
- Visibility and wayfinding: ensure consistent signage and guidance on-site; test visitor journey and navigation.
- Communication mix: combine partner networks and mailing lists with targeted social media campaigns and, where relevant, local media; tailor scope to capacity.
- Sustainability checklist: reusable/recyclable materials, plastic reduction, waste sorting, and food waste mitigation; document measures consistently.

## 6. Project-Level Conclusions (Strategic and Policy Dimension)

The TESTEAT pilot phase confirms that enogastronomy heritage can serve as a strategic instrument for sustainable territorial development, strengthening cultural identity while promoting inclusive and environmentally responsible tourism models.

### Key Structural Strengths

- Strong territorial anchoring and valorisation of local identity.
- Operationalisation of sustainability principles within event-based tourism models.
- Integration of inclusive gastronomy practices aligned with contemporary consumption patterns.
- Activation of local value chains and short supply networks.
- Engagement of vocational education institutions and future workforce.

### Systemic Challenges Identified

- Variability in documentation depth and data collection practices.
- Limited pre-event structured collection of dietary and accessibility data.



- Due to the differing implementation models of the pilot activities, the systematic monitoring of implementation processes and the satisfaction of visitors and organisers was more complex and challenging to standardise across partners.

### **Strategic Added Value for Programme and Cross-Border Governance**

The pilot phase generated tested models that integrate food heritage, sustainability, inclusive practices, and territorial storytelling. It demonstrated practical mechanisms for strengthening local ecosystems while contributing to cross-border policy alignment.

### **Transferability and Continuity**

The diversity of implementation formats confirms the scalability and adaptability of the TESTEAT model.

Overall, the pilot phase substantiates TESTEAT as a replicable integrated tourism model grounded in sustainability, inclusiveness, and territorial valorisation, with potential relevance beyond the immediate project area.



## Annex 1. Quantitative highlights (as reported by partners)

| Partner  | Visitor turnout / participants                    | Engagement (if reported) | Notes                                                       |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| CoV      | 10,900 (estimated)                                | Not quantified           | Satisfaction 4.49/5; audience participation/interest 4.69/5 |
| DURA     | General public 30; children 45 (among categories) | 25 passive / 102 active  | Local media + web + social promotion                        |
| AZRRI    | Not reported as total                             | 40 active                | Stakeholder presence recorded by category                   |
| Civiform | 70 participants                                   | Active engagement        | Workshops fully booked; HUB meeting 10 stakeholders         |
| Ston     | Not reported as total                             | 200 passive / 100 active | Mostly active; strong promotion mix                         |

