

ENHANCING OUR HERITAGE TOOLKIT 2.0

Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places



Published in 2023 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France; the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), Via di San Michele 13, Rome, Italy, 00153; the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), 11 rue du Séminaire de Conflans, 94220 Charenton-le-Pont, France and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Rue Mauverney 28, 1196 Gland, Switzerland.

© UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN, 2023

ISBN 978-92-3-100623-4

<https://doi.org/10.58337/CFZO9650>



This publication is available in Open Access under the Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO (CC-BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO) licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/>). By using the content of this publication, the users accept to be bound by the terms of use of the UNESCO Open Access Repository (<https://www.unesco.org/en/open-access/cc-nc-sa>).

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS or IUCN concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors; they are not necessarily those of UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS or IUCN and do not commit the Organizations.

Publication coordinators: Laura Frank (UNESCO), Eugene Jo (ICCROM)

Content coordinators: Leticia Leitao (Heritage specialist), Carlo Ossola (Federal Office for the Environment)

Copyeditor: Julie Wickenden

Cover photo: Dance event in Tinajani, Puno, Peru
© Ministerio de Cultura del Perú, Qhapaq Ñan-Sede Nacional Perú

Graphic design: Guilder Design

Illustrations: Felipe Echeverri Velasco and Alberto José Moncayo

The source of all the figures in this manual is UNESCO/ICCROM/ICOMOS/IUCN. 2023. *Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0: Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places*. Paris, UNESCO.

With the financial support of the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment

Based on the *Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit (2008)* originally developed in partnership with the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas



SHORT SUMMARY

EoH 2.0 toolkit helps assess management effectiveness in World Heritage places

World Heritage properties are internationally recognized as places of Outstanding Universal Value that should benefit from the highest level of management effectiveness. Despite the best efforts to conserve these places for present and future generations, many are under threat from a range of factors. These include inappropriate development, mass tourism, pollution, resource extraction or climate change, to name but a few.

What can be done to better respond to factors negatively affecting World Heritage places? Do management processes influence conservation results? If so, how can critical management weaknesses be identified and improved?

The *Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0* offers a self-assessment methodology to evaluate management effectiveness in a World Heritage property or other heritage place. It contains 12 tools that can be used separately or collectively to understand in detail what is working well and what can be done better. To facilitate their use, the tools are accompanied by worksheets, in the form of either a template to help compile information in a systematic way or a questionnaire, both of which can be adapted to the specific needs of each heritage place.

The Toolkit supports managers in identifying ways to improve conservation practices, management processes and resource allocation – particularly if used before reviewing or updating management plans. While there is a focus on World Heritage, it can be applied to all heritage places, whether natural, cultural or combinations of both.

12
tools to assess
how well a
World Heritage
place is
managed

ENHANCING OUR HERITAGE TOOLKIT 2.0

Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places



ABOUT THE WORLD HERITAGE RESOURCE MANUAL SERIES

Since the World Heritage Convention was adopted in 1972, the World Heritage List has continually evolved and is growing steadily. With this growth, a critical need has emerged for providing guidance to States Parties on the implementation of the Convention. Various expert meetings and results of Periodic Reporting have identified the need for more focused training and capacity development in specific areas where States Parties and World Heritage site managers require greater support. The development of a series of World Heritage Resource Manuals is a response to this need.

The publication of the series is a joint undertaking by UNESCO as the Secretariat of the Convention and the three Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee (ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN). The World Heritage Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, Lithuania, July 2006) supported this initiative and requested that the Advisory Bodies and UNESCO proceed with the preparation and publication of a number of thematic Resource Manuals.

The Resource Manuals are intended to provide focused guidance on the implementation of the Convention to States Parties, heritage protection authorities, local governments, site managers and local communities linked to World Heritage sites, as well as other stakeholders in the identification and conservation process. They aim to provide knowledge and assistance in ensuring a representative and credible World Heritage List consisting of well-protected and effectively managed properties.

The manuals are being developed as user-friendly tools for capacity-building and awareness-raising on the World Heritage Convention. They can be used independently for self-guided learning as well as material in training workshops and should complement the basic provisions for understanding the text of the Convention itself and the Operational Guidelines for implementation.

The titles in this series are produced as PDF online documents which can be downloaded at <https://whc.unesco.org/en/resourcemanuals/>.

FOREWORD BY THE DIRECTOR OF WORLD HERITAGE

This updated edition of the *Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit* is the result of more than 20 years of site-based ‘learning by doing’. It is the fruit of significant cooperation between the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, the three Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee (IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM) and many other partners. The first version of this Toolkit was developed in the early 2000s by a small team of specialists, with the active participation of World Heritage site managers from nine properties around the world. Drawing from the experiences of this group, the Toolkit was rooted in the day-to-day realities and requirements of the intended users: it aimed to help World Heritage site managers and other stakeholders involved in the management of exceptional protected areas improve their capacities and reach their management objectives for the benefit of the global community.

World Heritage properties and other heritage sites face many challenges that can, if not addressed, erode the heritage values for which they were inscribed on the World Heritage List or recognised as significant places to be preserved and protected. Those responsible for the conservation and management of such exceptional heritage, including heritage protection authorities, local governments, site managers and local communities, have the complex task of anticipating and dealing with these challenges, most often in the face of limited financial and organisational capacity. Under these circumstances, it is incumbent upon them to invest in the most critical areas, ensuring that available resources are applied to their maximum effectiveness.

The initial *Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit* was inspired by various management effectiveness methodologies developed since the 1980s, such as the “Framework for Assessing the Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas” of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas. Designed primarily for natural World Heritage properties, its potential use for cultural properties was acknowledged from the outset, and this adaptability has been further expanded and reinforced in the present revised edition. The Toolkit 2.0 is the result of efforts to design a management effectiveness toolkit widely applicable to all World Heritage properties and other heritage places. It offers an adaptable framework that can be applied to the specific needs of each heritage place, remains linked to many other tools and methodologies, and reflect the latest developments of the World Heritage system and the global field of heritage conservation.

The *Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0* contains twelve practical tools, each intending to help those responsible for the conservation of exceptional heritage sites connect the different elements of a comprehensive management framework. Designed as a series of separate exercises, the Toolkit is user-friendly, flexible, and adaptable to local realities, aiming to raise capacity and awareness. The revised version focuses on critical elements of the management system, rather than assessing it in every detail, and engages with a wide range of actors. At the core of the Toolkit lie two processes designed to be low-technology and low-cost, and therefore widely usable worldwide: information gathering and analysis. Overall, the Toolkit is oriented towards practical actions to be taken at the site level and beyond.

The first edition of the Toolkit proved a great success from early on, as two of the nine pilot sites were removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger by the time the pilot activities were completed. In the intervening 12 years since its publication, the Toolkit has been widely used at many properties and helped States Parties manage their heritage of Outstanding Universal Value. The revised Toolkit was piloted at eight World Heritage properties, representing a range of cultural, natural and mixed sites across the different regions of the world, and the lessons learnt were reflected in the revised edition.

With this updated and expanded approach, teachings from the last two decades have been incorporated to provide World Heritage stakeholders with the best Toolkit to manage their exceptional heritage.

As the Convention concerning the *Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* recently celebrated its 50th anniversary under the theme of ‘World Heritage as a source of resilience, humanity and innovation’, it is more important than ever to strengthen capacity-building and training activities to ensure better protection and management for our precious World Heritage properties and their transmission to future generations. This intention is also echoed in the historic MONDIACULT Declaration adopted by 150 States in September 2022 in Mexico, which affirms the role of culture – and therefore heritage – as a “global public good” and sets out a joint roadmap to strengthen public policies in this field.

Before inviting you to explore and use this Toolkit, I especially wish to thank the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee for their support in revising this essential tool for World Heritage properties, and especially the World Heritage Leadership Programme, which results from a partnership between ICCROM and IUCN working in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS and has played a crucial, leading role in the revision process thanks to support from the Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment, along with targeted support for this Toolkit from the Swiss Federal Office for Environment.

In closing, on behalf of the entire UNESCO World Heritage Centre, I wholeheartedly welcome the *Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0*, which will doubtlessly become a crucial part of the ever-expanding set of resources made available by UNESCO to support the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and facilitate the many complex tasks associated with managing heritage sites. We wish those who put this Toolkit into practice the greatest success, and we look forward to seeing the positive impacts that the *Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit* will continue to have on exceptional heritage worldwide.

Lazare Eloundou Assomo
Director of World Heritage
UNESCO

FOREWORD BY THE ADVISORY BODIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

The *Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit 2.0* is a joint publication of UNESCO, the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). This work has been generously supported by the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), through the framework of the ICCROM-IUCN World Heritage Leadership Programme that is supported by the Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment.

The *Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0* offers a self-assessment methodology to evaluate management effectiveness in a World Heritage property or other heritage place. A management effectiveness assessment is the evaluation of how well a World Heritage property is being managed, primarily on the extent to which the heritage values of the property are being maintained and management objectives are being achieved. The Toolkit supports site managers in identifying ways to improve conservation practices, management processes and resource allocation, particularly if used before reviewing or updating management plans.

Numerous management effectiveness methodologies have been developed over the years and the IUCN Framework for Assessing the Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas (PAME) produced by the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) formed the basis of developing the first *Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit* in 2008. *EoH 2.0* continues to be structured in the same way as the original version, while offering a flexible methodology that can be applied to the specific needs of each heritage place, regardless of its category and designation. It also draws elements from, and establishes links with other existing methodologies to facilitate their integration such as the World Heritage Periodic Reporting questionnaire and the IUCN Green List Standard. The Toolkit has been revised and improved to reflect developments in the World Heritage system, as well as in the conservation field that evolved over the past decade.

While the first Toolkit was developed primarily for natural World Heritage properties, its potential use for cultural properties was always acknowledged. The revision of the Toolkit is the result of integrating the working methods of nature and culture within the scope of the World Heritage Convention, in particular through the Connecting Practice project of IUCN and ICOMOS, supported by The Christensen Fund. *EoH 2.0* is a product of testing efforts at 26 World Heritage properties, representing a range of cultural, natural and mixed properties from across the world, and has been refined based on the lessons learned from these testing cases. The Toolkit can be applied to all types of heritage, whether natural, cultural or combinations of both. While there is a focus on World Heritage it can also be applied to all heritage places.

World Heritage properties have its own unique Outstanding Universal Value and an effective management system depends on the type, characteristics and needs of the World Heritage property and its social, economic and environmental context. It is critical to evaluate the management system on a regular basis to ensure that management is effective, to better understand what is and what is not working, and to plan any necessary changes as efficiently as possible. Therefore, management effectiveness assessments should be incorporated as part of the management cycle and repeated at regular intervals.

Foreword by the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee

The Toolkit is organized around a set of 12 tools, each looking at critical elements of the management system for the heritage place. Each tool has a specific purpose and includes guidance to help users engage in full and open discussions about those management elements. EoH 2.0 can be adapted and tailored to suit the unique characteristics and context of different sites and encourages the engagement of a wide range of actors in its application, promoting collaboration and inclusivity.

ICCROM, IUCN and ICOMOS are deeply grateful to all those that have contributed to the development of EoH 2.0. It has been a collaborative effort involving various professionals and organizations, including the Executive Group, reviewers, coordinators, and managers of World Heritage properties who participated in its refinement. The Advisory Bodies are positive that this resource manual will be useful to all those involved in World Heritage management, to support better planning, implementation and evaluation of all conservation and management actions that will enable our collective efforts of protecting World Heritage sites for the future generation.

Webber Ndoro
Director General
ICCROM

Grethel Aguilar
Director General
IUCN

Teresa Patricio
President
ICOMOS
International

Madhu Rao
Chair
IUCN World
Commission on
Protected Areas


CONTENTS

FOREWORD BY THE DIRECTOR OF WORLD HERITAGE	2
FOREWORD BY THE ADVISORY BODIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE ...	4
WHAT IS THE ENHANCING OUR HERITAGE TOOLKIT 2.0?	7
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE ENHANCING OUR HERITAGE TOOLKIT 2.0	8
1.1 What is a management effectiveness assessment?.....	9
1.2 How is EoH different from other management assessment methodologies?	10
2. USING THIS TOOLKIT	11
2.1 Why use this Toolkit?	11
2.2 Who is the Toolkit for? How will it help you?	11
2.3 How does the Toolkit work?	11
2.4 How to use the Toolkit?	13
2.5 When to use the Toolkit?	16
3. HOW TO START A MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT	17
3.1 Who should be involved in the assessment?.....	17
3.2 Roles and responsibilities during the assessment.....	18
3.3 Important concepts	19
4. THE MAIN PHASES OF THE ASSESSMENT	25
4.1 Phase 1 – Preparing	25
4.2 Phase 2 – Gathering information.....	26
4.3 Phase 3 - Implementing	27
4.4 Phase 4 - Reporting and acting on findings	28
5. THE EOH 2.0 ASSESSMENT TOOLS	29
Tool 1 Values, attributes and management objectives	30
Tool 2 Factors affecting the property	36
Tool 3 Boundaries, buffer zones and the wider setting	40
Tool 4 Governance arrangements.....	46
Tool 5 Legal, regulatory and customary framework.....	57
Tool 6 Management planning framework	66
Tool 7 Needs and inputs.....	75
Tool 8 Management processes.....	85
Tool 9 Implementation of management measures.....	102
Tool 10 Outputs – Monitoring productivity	110
Tool 11 Outcomes – Monitoring the state of conservation.....	114
Tool 12 Review of management effectiveness assessment findings.....	118
What next? Making evaluation part of the management cycle	123
GLOSSARY	124
REFERENCES	129
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	130
CONTACT INFORMATION	132

WHAT IS THE ENHANCING OUR HERITAGE TOOLKIT 2.0?




This updated version of the Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit offers a self-assessment methodology to identify how well a World Heritage property or other heritage place is being managed. The Toolkit contains 12 tools that can be used separately or collectively to evaluate the effectiveness of the management system for the World Heritage property or heritage place. While there is a focus on World Heritage properties, the Toolkit can be applied to all heritage places, whether natural, cultural or combinations of both.

This Toolkit will guide you through a four-phase process to help you identify and respond to current management challenges:



Using the Toolkit requires a dedicated implementation team and the participation of a wide range of people involved in the management of the World Heritage property or other heritage place. The assessment process offers an opportunity for people to work together and strengthen collaboration. A participatory and well-structured process will also generate collective support for the changes that are needed to improve the management system, and to protect and manage the World Heritage property or other heritage place for future generations.

The following icons are used throughout the Toolkit:

-  Tips and advice.
-  Reminders and warnings
-  Examples

There are hyperlinks to the Glossary for all key terms in the text (e.g. **values**).

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE ENHANCING OUR HERITAGE TOOLKIT 2.0

The idea of identifying and protecting the world's most important natural and cultural heritage has captured the imagination and commitment of people and governments around the world. This was enshrined in the World Heritage Convention in 1972, and its subsequent ratification by 195 countries so far, all of which have committed themselves to ensuring the protection of their cultural and natural heritage considered to be of Outstanding Universal Value to humankind. As a result, over 1,100 properties have now been inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Strong political ambition to listing these properties is not always matched by the commitment needed to ensure their long-term protection. Therefore, improving management effectiveness and making the best use of available resources and opportunities has become a priority for the heritage community.

Interest in assessing the management quality of protected areas can be traced back to the 1980s, and numerous management effectiveness methodologies have been developed over the years. One of the most internationally used methods is the IUCN Framework for Assessing the Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas (PAME) (Hockings et al., 2006). This framework formed the basis for the development of the first Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit (Hockings et al., 2008) in 2008, and continues to structure this new version. While the first Toolkit was developed primarily for natural World Heritage properties, its potential use for cultural properties was always acknowledged.

The Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit 2.0 (hereafter referred to as 'EoH 2.0' or 'the Toolkit') is the result of efforts to design an assessment system for management effectiveness that could be broadly applied to all World Heritage properties, as well as other heritage places. Although structured in the same way as the original version, EoH 2.0 offers a flexible methodology that can be applied to the specific needs of each heritage place, regardless of its category and designation. EoH 2.0 also draws elements from, and establishes links with, other existing methodologies to facilitate their integration. The Toolkit has been revised and improved to reflect developments in the World Heritage system, as well as in the conservation field, over the past decade.

The following elements have informed the work to revise and strengthen the Toolkit:

- Applicability to all World Heritage properties, as well as other heritage places, while retaining as much of the original methodology and approach as possible;
- A focus on critical elements of the management system, rather than a detailed assessment of all its aspects;
- Ability to engage a wide range of actors, without the need for additional tools;
- A standardized set of worksheets, which can be adapted to specific needs and situations;
- Information gathering and analysis based on low-technology and low-cost processes;
- Self-assessment and an action-oriented methodology.

EoH 2.0 is a product of testing efforts at 26 World Heritage properties,¹ representing a range of cultural, natural and mixed properties from across the world, and has been refined based on the lessons learned from these test cases.

¹ For the complete list of properties used as testing cases, see Acknowledgments.

1.1 WHAT IS A MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT?

World Heritage properties and other heritage places constantly face challenges and threats which require strategic, sustained, and long-term management measures to make sure they maintain their **Outstanding Universal Value** (OUV) and other important **values**. A management effectiveness assessment is defined as the evaluation of how well a World Heritage property or other heritage place is being managed – primarily, the extent to which the values of the property are being maintained and **management objectives** are being achieved.

An effective **management system** depends on the type, characteristics and needs of the World Heritage property or other heritage place and its social, economic and environmental context. It is critical to evaluate the management system on a regular basis to ensure that management is effective, to better understand what is and what is not working, and to plan any necessary changes as efficiently as possible. Therefore, management effectiveness assessments should be incorporated as part of the **management cycle** and repeated at regular intervals.

Evaluation and planning processes should also be seen as interdependent **management processes**. Management effectiveness assessments include an appraisal of whether and how management plans and other planning instruments are being implemented and whether desired **outcomes** are being achieved. This type of assessment can be particularly important before reviewing or updating plans, so that the findings and recommendations can inform future plans, resource allocation and management measures.

Assessments of management effectiveness have emerged as an important tool for assisting **managers** and other **actors** to:

- reflect on their experience;
- improve the way resources are allocated;
- plan for the effective management of potential threats and opportunities; and
- understand whether management measures are being implemented successfully.



Throughout the Toolkit, the phrase ‘World Heritage property or other heritage place’ is used to remind readers that EoH 2.0 can be used to assess the management effectiveness of both. Therefore, in many parts of the document, ‘property’ and ‘place’ are used interchangeably. However, in those cases where processes only apply to World Heritage properties, then this is clearly specified.

1.2 HOW IS EOH 2.0 DIFFERENT FROM OTHER MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES?

EoH 2.0 offers a detailed management effectiveness methodology which is suitable to the specific needs of World Heritage properties and other heritage places. It is designed for internal evaluation and self-assessment at site level, and is distinct and independent from statutory processes associated with the World Heritage Convention – such as Periodic Reporting² and Reactive Monitoring.³

The Toolkit draws on and links with other existing management effectiveness methodologies and assessment tools – such as the IMET (Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool) (Paolini et al., 2006), IUCN’s World Heritage Outlook Assessment (Osipova et al., 2020) and the Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas (IUCN and World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA), 2017). While some of these methodologies may appear similar, they have different goals.

EoH 2.0 is different from the above methodologies in three important ways:

1. **It is the only management effectiveness methodology specifically tailored to all types of heritage places.** It has been developed to suit cultural and natural heritage places and, while there is a focus on World Heritage properties, it can be applied to all heritage places, regardless of designation(s) at international, national and/or local levels.
2. **It is a fully self-assessed methodology.** Unlike some of the other methodologies, which are externally led (such as the IUCN World Heritage Outlook Assessment), or need a level of external validation (such as the IUCN Green List), or share information with external actors (such as the Periodic Reporting exercise), EoH 2.0 is designed to be used directly by managers – generally without external support, validation or information sharing.
3. **It is the most detailed and comprehensive management assessment methodology.** EoH 2.0 contains a set of 12 practical tools tailored to make in-depth assessments of critical elements of the management system for a World Heritage property or other heritage place. It uses a participatory process to help you better understand the underlying reasons why certain elements of the management system may not be working as effectively as they could be.



Based on a crosswalk analysis of seven commonly used assessment methods with the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas Standard, EoH 2.0 provides the highest coverage of criteria of the Green List Standard. For further information on how EoH 2.0 relates to the Green List, please consult the *Crosswalk Analysis of Protected Areas Effectiveness Assessment Methods and the IUCN Green List Standard: Summary Report*. (UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2022).

² A statutory requirement of the World Heritage Convention that requests States Parties to submit a report usually every six years on the legislative and administrative provisions they have adopted and other actions which they have taken for the application of the Convention, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on their territories.

³ The statutory process of reporting by the Secretariat, other sectors of UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties that are under threat.

2. USING THIS TOOLKIT

This Toolkit offers a self-assessment methodology to identify how well a World Heritage property or other heritage place is being managed.

2.1 WHY USE THIS TOOLKIT?

The inscription of a property on the World Heritage List implies that there is an adequate management system in place to ensure its safeguarding for present and future generations. However, despite the best efforts of State Parties, and the input of considerable financial and human resources, many World Heritage properties and other heritage places are under threat from a range of factors affecting their state of conservation (e.g. inappropriate development, mass tourism, pollution, physical resource extraction or climate change). What can be done to better respond to those factors? Are they arising from critical management weaknesses? If so, how can the management effectiveness of the property be improved?

This Toolkit provides practical guidance for assessing the management effectiveness of World Heritage properties, whether they are natural, cultural or mixed. It aims to serve as:

- A methodology to identify achievements and actions needed to improve management.
- A collection of tools that can be used separately or collectively to better understand the strengths and challenges of different elements of the management system.
- A guide to assist people with responsibilities for managing World Heritage properties to promote discussion, participation and transparency on how management measures are planned, resources are used, and decisions are made.

2.2 WHO IS THE TOOLKIT FOR? HOW WILL IT HELP YOU?

This Toolkit is available to all people interested in protecting cultural and natural heritage, although it has been designed especially for professionals and institutions who are responsible for managing World Heritage properties. It offers a generic approach that can be adapted to different needs and contexts, allowing it to be used across the world and for all types of heritage places.

The Toolkit will help you:

- Get the full picture of how well your heritage place is being managed and understand in detail what is working well and what can be done better.
- Identify ways to improve conservation practices, management processes and resource allocation.
- Strengthen collaboration between different actors and promote accountability.
- Develop measures and agreed actions to address management gaps and challenges, and improve future planning processes.
- Generate widespread support for what needs to change to improve the management system of the heritage place.

2.3 HOW DOES THE TOOLKIT WORK?

The Toolkit is organized around a set of 12 tools, each looking at critical elements of the management system for the heritage place. Each tool has a specific purpose and includes guidance to help users engage in full and open discussions about those management elements. To facilitate their use, the tools are accompanied by worksheets in the form of either a template to help compile information in a systematic way or a questionnaire to help users identify opportunities and necessary actions. Together, the tools offer an iterative methodology that will enable you and all those involved in the assessment to identify what is working well and what can be done better.

THE EOH 2.0 ASSESSMENT TOOLS



Tool 1: Values, attributes and management objectives – Assesses the understanding of the **values** and **attributes** of the World Heritage property or other heritage place, and whether existing **management objectives** are appropriate to guide the management system.



Tool 2: Factors affecting the property – Assesses if **factors** that affect or could potentially affect the property or heritage place are known, well understood and documented. It also analyses the adequateness of management measures for the identified factors.



Tool 3: Boundaries, buffer zones and wider setting – Assesses different aspects of the configuration of the World Heritage property or other heritage place to examine their appropriateness, as well the interactions between the property, its **buffer zone** and **wider setting**.



Tool 4: Governance arrangements – Assesses if the roles and responsibilities of different **managers** are clearly defined, if there is effective coordination between them, and the level of engagement of **rights-holders** in the management of the property or other heritage place.



Tool 5: Legal, regulatory and customary framework – Assesses how policies, legislation, customary practices and other legal and regulatory **instruments** are used to manage the property or other heritage place.



Tool 6: Management planning framework – Provides an overview of the effectiveness of the planning framework and assesses the adequacy of the management plan or other main planning instrument used to guide management.



Tool 7: Needs and inputs – Assesses if current human capacity and financial, material and technological resources are adequate to effectively manage the property or other heritage place.



Tool 8: Management processes – Assesses the appropriateness of **management processes** by examining if there are policies and procedures in place to ensure that processes are implemented according to good practices and desired standards.



Tool 9: Implementation of management measures – Assesses progress in implementing the management plan, subsidiary plans, and relevant work programmes.



Tool 10: Outputs – Monitoring productivity – Assesses the delivery of **outputs** resulting from the implementation of planned actions, routine work and management processes.



Tool 11: Outcomes – Monitoring state of conservation – Examines whether monitoring programmes are adequate to assess the state of conservation of the property and if its values are being maintained.



Tool 12: Review of management effectiveness assessment results – Summarizes the findings of the assessment and helps to prioritize future follow-up actions.

2.4 HOW TO USE THE TOOLKIT?

As all heritage places are different, you will need to adjust and adapt the use of the Toolkit to your own situation. The scale and detail of each assessment will vary depending on its purpose and the willingness of various people to undertake the assessment, as well as the time they are willing to commit to it, and the information, resources and capacity available. Overall, the assessment should be relatively straightforward and inexpensive to implement.

If management effectiveness is new to you, it is advisable to follow the Toolkit from the beginning and aim to use all 12 tools. This will allow you to run a complete ‘diagnosis’ to determine the main strengths and challenges of existing management mechanisms. However, if certain mechanisms are not yet in place, you will not be able to use all of the worksheets that accompany the tools. For example, if there is no management plan or other main planning instrument to guide management at your heritage place, then Worksheet 6b – designed to assess how adequate that plan is – cannot be completed. That said, you can still use parts of the guidance associated with that worksheet to discuss why there is no such plan, whether one is necessary, and identify follow-up actions necessary for developing a plan.

If using all the tools seems to be too complex, you can initially select a few tools to apply to critical issues that you know already require attention. While from an evaluation perspective such an assessment will inevitably be incomplete, it can still provide useful information, which you can build upon and improve in the future by using the remaining tools.

You can also use the tools selectively to complement existing monitoring and evaluation methods and avoid repeating prior work. In such cases, you can replace the suggested worksheets with what you already use, or you can create something ‘hybrid’, by incorporating aspects of the worksheets into what you already use. Remember that the worksheets are generic and can be adapted to your specific context. For instance, new sections can be added, and sections that do not apply can be omitted, as long as this does not undermine the purpose of the tool.

Certain types of heritage places may require a more flexible use of the Toolkit. This is particularly the case for serial World Heritage properties. Here, you will need to decide how best to adapt the use of the tools to your needs, the complexities of the property and the management system in place. Box 2.1 outlines how you can determine which approach is best for your situation.



Box 2.1. How to use the EoH 2.0 Toolkit?

Determine which approach is best for your situation and heritage place:

- **Management effectiveness assessments are new to you and you want to do a full diagnosis.** The Toolkit will help you understand the purpose of each tool and take you through a systematic process to assess critical elements of the management system for the heritage place you are working with. Even if you are not ready to use all the worksheets that accompany the tools (e.g. because certain management mechanisms are not in place), that is not a problem. You can adapt the worksheets to your circumstances and focus on the important questions underpinning each tool.
- **You are not ready yet to use all the tools but want to start addressing some critical issues that you know require attention.** Perhaps you are concerned that people will find the process too complex and time-consuming and will not want to get involved. Perhaps you feel that they will get discouraged if they recognize that certain management mechanisms are not yet in place. In this case, you may prefer to start by undertaking a partial assessment to understand and address critical issues that have previously been identified. Or you might want to use as many tools as possible, based on what your management mechanisms allow at a particular point in time. You can always build upon the findings of your first efforts by using the other tools at a later date, or by digging deeper into the tools that you have already applied. Start by studying the specific objectives of each tool and its accompanying worksheet(s), then discuss what combination of tools and worksheets you want to use and, finally, use these to develop a plan for the assessment. Note that Tools 1 and 2 should always be completed, as they provide the foundations for the use of the other tools.
- **You want to use the tools selectively to complement existing assessment efforts addressing the same topics.** Maybe you have already identified other methods to explore the critical management issues embedded in some of the EOH 2.0 tools and you don't want to repeat previous efforts – this is often the case for worksheets that help you compile existing information and data. In such cases, you can replace the worksheets by the alternative methods or adapt the worksheets to limit data gathering and analysis to elements not yet fully covered. Just make sure that you still draw the necessary conclusions, identify gaps and challenges, and agree on necessary follow-up actions. Check the list of questions provided to help you with the final steps of completing each worksheet.
- **You have already used other management effectiveness methodologies but want to undertake a more in-depth assessment that is specific to the needs of a World Heritage property.** EoH 2.0 allows you to undertake an assessment that focuses on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and is more in-depth and detailed than other management effectiveness methodologies. This might require extra effort, especially when you are using the Toolkit for the first time. This is why it is suggested that you use the Toolkit only at certain points in your management cycle. To facilitate the transition from one methodology to another, EoH 2.0 includes a number of revisions to make sure it comprises all the critical aspects of those other methodologies. Although EoH 2.0 is designed to fit the particular needs of World Heritage properties, this does not prevent you from applying the Toolkit to other heritage places, since values are always used as the foundation for the assessment.



Box 2.1. How to use the EoH 2.0 Toolkit? (continued)

- **You want to use the Toolkit for a serial property or one with complex governance and management arrangements.** Certain types of heritage places require more complex management systems, involving multiple actors and sometimes across different countries (e.g. World Heritage transboundary and transnational properties). Adapting the use of the Toolkit to these situations can be challenging, but it is possible. Remember, this is a Toolkit that is designed to be adapted to your particular context. This means you can adapt the worksheets to analyse certain elements from multiple perspectives but also reapply them to examine the particular management mechanisms of the component parts of serial properties. For instance, the legal framework can change from one component to another if they are located in different countries, or within different administrative regions. In such circumstances, you can complete the same worksheet for each component and then analyse them collectively. Remember that regardless of the number of component parts, serial properties are included on the World Heritage List in their entirety – that is, they count as a single property. Therefore, the management effectiveness assessment should provide insights for the property as a whole, as well as for each component part.
- **You work or are involved with a heritage place that is not included on the World Heritage List.** You can use the EoH 2.0 Toolkit for any heritage place and you are encouraged to do so. You may be thinking of nominating a place for inscription on the World Heritage List, for which you want to build a complete picture of the effectiveness of existing management mechanisms and how they might be improved. Or you may want to improve the management at a heritage place, regardless of any designation that it has. All heritage places are important and, therefore, should be effectively managed to ensure that they are protected for future generations. The tools address management elements that apply to all heritage places, whether World Heritage listed or not. EoH 2.0 includes a few steps in some of the tools that are specific to World Heritage properties; for non-World Heritage properties, you can skip those steps and, as always, adapt the tools and worksheets to your needs.
- **Your heritage place has a traditional management system.** Although it is best suited to use by formal public administration systems, EoH 2.0 includes considerations and questions related to traditional management practices and governance arrangements. You will see that there are numerous references to the need to respect the rights, responsibilities, knowledge and experiences of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and their connections with the heritage place. This is a Toolkit you can adapt to your needs by retaining what you find helpful and adding extra elements where necessary. You might even develop your own versions of the worksheets, just as long as you respect the specific objectives of each of the tools. You can also choose to focus on the set of reflection questions included at the end of each worksheet – developed to help you analyse critical issues, draw conclusions and identify what actions are needed.

All heritage places are distinctive and special and so should be the way in which you use this Toolkit. Make it your own!

2.5 WHEN TO USE THE TOOLKIT?

Management effectiveness assessments are most useful if repeated at regular intervals, preferably aligned with the **management cycle** (e.g. linked to revisions of the management plan), to monitor change and help identify progress and improvements. A five-year interval is generally considered adequate for this, but if the management cycle is longer, you can repeat the assessment mid-term (e.g. every three or four years). In addition, some of the tools can be used separately between full assessments and repeated as necessary to help inform decision-making throughout the management cycle.



Figure 2.1. Suggested frequency for use of the tools (as part of an overall assessment cycle).

3. HOW TO START A MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT

The Toolkit is based on a four-phase collaborative process for designing and carrying out a management effectiveness assessment for a World Heritage property or other heritage place.

The purpose is to develop a participatory approach that enables multiple actors involved in the management of the heritage place to come together and explore ways to respond to challenges. Therefore, this is not simply a technical exercise; rather, it is an opportunity to gain a collective understanding of the World Heritage property or other heritage place and generate concrete responses to improve its management system.

The quality of the process is as important as the results of the assessment. To use the Toolkit, you will need to involve different actors and collect different types of data and information. This requires organization, time and commitment, especially when you are doing this for the first time.

While applying the Toolkit can be challenging at times, a well-designed and well-conducted process will be rewarding and will positively reinforce long-term collaboration between managers.

The total length of the assessment, and the resources needed, will largely depend on:

- the scale and detail of the assessment;
- the complexity of your World Heritage property or other heritage place; and
- the existing management mechanisms.

This process should be seen as an opportunity for exchange and reflection in order to facilitate future management. The real work of effective management begins with the implementation of the findings arising from the assessment.

3.1 WHO SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE ASSESSMENT?

EoH 2.0 is essentially designed as a participatory process for use by managers at local, regional and national levels. Remember, for the purpose of this Toolkit, the term ‘managers’ refers to actors with legal or customary authority and/or recognized responsibilities for managing all or part of the heritage place. Furthermore, rights-holders with socially recognized responsibilities for managing the heritage place, or heritage resources within the place, should also be considered as ‘managers’.

Ideally, all those involved in the **governance** and management of the World Heritage property or other heritage place should take part in the management effectiveness assessment. In practice, their involvement will vary with each heritage place. Deciding who should take part, and exactly where in the process, needs to be considered carefully in advance.

Section 4.1 provides information to help you decide who should be involved and how to bring them on board. In brief, some general guidelines are:

- a. Include key personnel or individuals from the main organization(s) or group(s) with recognized legal and/or customary responsibilities, from a heritage perspective, to manage the World Heritage property or other heritage place, as well as any buffer zone.
- b. Identify representatives from other organizations, government departments or groups with non-specific heritage responsibilities for the property, its buffer zone and its wider setting.
- c. Engage other actors with responsibility for addressing factors affecting the property, originating both within and beyond the boundaries of the property.

3.2 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES DURING THE ASSESSMENT

Since the assessment will engage a wide range of people, defining roles and responsibilities up front is critical. There are four main roles:




Figure 3.1 Roles and responsibilities in the assessment

The first step is to decide who will convene the assessment and establish the assessment team. The role of convenor is normally taken on by the main organization or group responsible for managing the World Heritage property or other heritage place. If there is more than one responsible organization or group for the management of the property, and it is unclear who should assume the role of convenor, you must decide who is in the best position to lead the assessment and to build and retain trust throughout the whole process. The convenor should be largely accepted and respected by the other actors and have the capacity and institutional resources to coordinate the different phases of the assessment.

The convenor will also be responsible for inviting people to participate in the assessment and, in principle, host meetings and workshops during the assessment process. Alternatively, there can be several hosts, with different institutions hosting different activities.

The convenor will also establish the **implementation team**, who will be responsible for leading the assessment process, collecting and managing information, compiling the findings of the assessment and representing the wider group of people involved in the assessment. It is preferable to make this team a small, carefully selected group. There are two important elements to consider: representation and appropriate skills. The team should include people from the convenor organization and from other organizations or groups to ensure that diverse actors involved in the management system are represented. You will need individuals who can work collaboratively as part of a team, are well organized, and who have good communication and problem-solving skills.

Within this team, it is important to identify who will lead the discussions (the facilitators) and who will record the discussions and findings of the implementation team (the notetakers). **Facilitators** should be selected based on their facilitation skills and abilities to: maintain a neutral position; ensure a fair and equitable process that is unbiased towards the interests of any one actor; and mediate and redirect discussion when challenges arise. In certain circumstances, it may help to engage an impartial external facilitator(s) with expertise in assessment procedures and knowledge of heritage management. **Notetakers** will work closely with the facilitators to capture information presented during discussions and help complete the EoH 2.0 worksheets. They should, therefore, have good listening, writing, analytical and reporting skills.

3.3 IMPORTANT CONCEPTS

The assessment will produce the best results if it is based on a collaborative process and involves all the actors responsible for managing the World Heritage property or other heritage place. Since some of these actors may have responsibilities that are not heritage-specific, they may not be familiar with certain concepts used in the Toolkit. It is important that all those participating in the assessment process have a basic understanding of the most important concepts and terms. This can avoid confusion, misunderstandings and unnecessary frustration or delay during the assessment. Otherwise, people may feel left out or afraid of participating in the discussions. In some situations, initial capacity-building may be needed for different audiences; if that is the case, you should incorporate it into Phase 1 of the assessment process.

The Toolkit includes a **Glossary** with definitions for most of the technical terms that you will need to use. Some concepts are critical to start a conversation, and they require an in-depth understanding. These key concepts are described in detail below.

VALUES

Heritage values are the reasons why a heritage place is considered important to be protected for present and future generations. These values are socially determined (i.e., significance is ascribed by communities or cultural groups) and dependent on a range of social and cultural experiences. What is valued by one section of a society may not be valued by another, or may be valued for different reasons. Heritage places always have a range of values: aesthetic, architectural, biological, ecological, historic, archaeological, scientific, geological, social, spiritual, educational, etc. The combination and interactions of different values, including their accumulation over time, constitutes the **significance** of the heritage place.

Since not everyone values the heritage place for the same reasons or at an equal level, significance is often considered in terms of different 'levels': international, national and local. This would be the case for a World Heritage property where the focus of inscription on the World Heritage List is on Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). However, that property will invariably have a range of other values – at national and local levels – that are also part of its overall significance. These other values should be well understood to ensure that the management system, while giving priority to the property's OUV, applies a holistic approach that integrates all values.

It is important to remember that people often want to protect a place for reasons other than seeing it as their heritage, and that certain groups use the word 'value' in different ways to its heritage meaning. This is where it is also important to recall that heritage, for the purpose of this Toolkit, is defined as all inherited resources and/or assets which people value for reasons beyond mere utility. This may sound like a subtle difference, but it is one that is fundamental. The most obvious example is economic importance. A heritage place may provide economic benefits that support many people's livelihoods, but this does not constitute a reason why people consider it as their heritage. As such, the term 'benefit' is preferred when referring to situations when a recipient (whether an individual, a group or a society) derives utility – whether in monetary terms or in-kind goods, services and transactions – from the existence or protection of a heritage place.

Since values are socially determined and are essentially intangible (i.e., non-material), it is necessary to identify which attributes convey them. Attributes are the focus of management and conservation actions.

ATTRIBUTES

Attributes are the elements of a World Heritage property or other heritage place which convey its heritage values and enable an understanding of those values. They can be physical qualities, material fabric and other tangible features, but can also be processes, social arrangements or cultural practices, as well as intangible aspects such as associations and relationships. Identifying attributes is also vital to understanding the conditions of authenticity and integrity of a heritage place.

Distinguishing between values and attributes can be a complex task and the two concepts are often confused. One simple way to distinguish between them is to ask:

- ‘Why is the heritage place important?’ (the answer will be about values).
- ‘What do I need to protect and conserve to maintain the place’s significance?’ (the answer will be about attributes).

In general, people find it easier to identify the attributes, particularly physical ones (e.g. buildings, natural features, or materials). However, while identifying the attributes is important, it is critical that you consider fully why the heritage place is important (the values) – and this can have multiple answers, as mentioned above. Otherwise, you may be directing your management efforts to conserving certain attributes and neglecting others. This can often be the case for attributes such as processes, practices or relationships, which are difficult to define and identify. If the why is clear, then it will be easier to decide what needs to be protected in the heritage place, and how to do it. These distinctions are especially important when difficult and unusual situations arise that have an effect on multiple attributes, or even on the heritage place as a whole. For example, in the case of a natural disaster or a proposal for a high-impact development, or even social dynamics that can gradually lead to a change in the perception of why the place is important, and to whom.

Attributes are the focus of protection, conservation, and management because it is by implementing concrete actions on the attributes, or on the factors impacting them, that you will be able to maintain the values in the long term. Do not do forget, however, that taking no action, is in fact a management action. If things are stable in general and there are no major factors affecting (or likely to affect in the near future) the attributes, then no immediate or major action is necessary.

MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

All World Heritage properties and other heritage places must have a management system in place to ensure they are protected for future generations. The world is increasingly interconnected and actions in one part can have effects on the planet as a whole (e.g. climate change). Therefore, ‘leaving things to chance’ or ‘business as usual’ are no longer viable management strategies.

For the purpose of this Toolkit, a management system is defined as the combination of institutional structures, instruments and processes which together ensure the effective protection of the heritage place for present and future generations. An effective management system depends on the type, characteristics and needs of the heritage place and its social, economic and environmental context. Therefore, management systems may vary according to different socio-cultural perspectives, the resources available and other aspects, and may incorporate traditional, formal and informal instruments, practices and processes.

In recognizing such diversity, any management system should be based on:

- a comprehensive, shared understanding of the property or heritage place, including its values and attributes, by all managers;
- a respect for diversity, equity, gender equality and human rights, and the use of inclusive and participatory decision-making and management processes;
- a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation;
- mechanisms for the involvement and coordination of activities between different managers;
- the allocation and sustainability of necessary human, financial and material resources;
- continuous learning and capacity-building; and
- an accountable and transparent description of how the management system functions.

The term ‘system’ implies that all these elements of a management system are interconnected, and – when acting together – assume a larger scheme or structure. Changing or adding an element or an interconnection may affect how the whole management system works.

Identifying the different elements of your heritage place’s management system can be challenging, particularly if it involves multiple managers with different mandates who use different instruments and practices to exercise their rights and responsibilities. Describing how everything comes together and is coordinated may sometimes seem impossible. Each of the EoH 2.0 tools allows you to explore critical elements of a management system in order to better understand what those elements look like in relation to your particular heritage place. The tools are also designed to help you identify important interconnections between those elements. Note that the Toolkit is not intended to examine every single detail of the management system, but rather the elements that every World Heritage property should have. You can also think of the Toolkit as a general ‘check-up’, similar to one you might undertake for health reasons.

GOVERNANCE

Wherever choices and decisions are made about the protection of a World Heritage property or other heritage place, some form of ‘governance’ system exists which enables people to exercise their rights, influence, authority and responsibilities over that place. Therefore, understanding who takes those decisions and how they make them is important in assessing how well that property or place is being protected.

The concept of ‘governance’ has grown in importance over the past decade and is now used in many contexts. Consequently, there are different views as to what governance means. Often governance is inaccurately used as a synonym for government. Whereas ‘government’ refers to a set of institutions responsible for administering a country or state, the term ‘governance’ can be used in a broader sense and applied across a wider range of circumstances. It is common to talk about the governance of a financial market or the governance of a company, as well as the governance of a heritage place or a territory.

For the purposes of this Toolkit, governance comprises all the interactions among administrative structures, processes and traditions that determine how power and responsibilities over a World Heritage property or other heritage place are exercised, how decisions are taken and how different actors have their say and participate in decision-making.

Governance and management are closely related concepts, although it can be useful to distinguish between them. While governance is fundamentally about who takes decisions and how those decisions are made, management is about what is done to implement those decisions and the means and actions needed to achieve them (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013). This distinction is also helpful as it reminds us that heritage protection is influenced by economic, social and political considerations and not just technical ones. It is also important to note that, in the context of World Heritage, governance and management arrangements are situated within the management system for each property.

ACTORS

Managing a World Heritage property or other heritage place involves many people, such as individuals working for government agencies, local administrations, traditional authorities, NGOs and businesses, as well as people from Indigenous peoples, cultural groups, local communities and wider civil society. All these can be viewed as ‘actors’.

In the context of this Toolkit, the term ‘actors’ covers all the people, and the institutions and groups they represent, who are involved directly and indirectly with the protection and management of a World Heritage property or heritage place. There are three broad categories of actors: managers, rights-holders and stakeholders.

Managers refers to institutions and other types of entities, as well as the individuals working within those institutions, which are recognized, responsible and accountable for protecting and managing the heritage place. Rights-holders are socially endowed with legal and/or customary rights over the heritage place. Some rights-holder groups may also have responsibilities for managing the heritage place, or parts of it. Stakeholders are communities and/or cultural groups who have direct or indirect interests, concerns and influence over the heritage place, but do not necessarily have a legally or socially recognized entitlement over heritage resources or their management.



For the purpose of EoH 2.0, rights-holder groups with socially recognized responsibilities for managing the World Heritage property or heritage place should be considered as managers. The distinction lies in whether the rights-holder group has socially recognized responsibilities for managing the heritage resources vis-à-vis other members of the community or society, or not.

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

A number of terms are used for the goals or aims of the management system for the World Heritage property or other heritage place. Terms such as ‘aim’, ‘goal’, ‘objective’, ‘vision’, ‘results’ and ‘outcomes’ tend to be used ambiguously and interchangeably. **For the purpose of this Toolkit, ‘management objectives’ refer to the primary aims that will guide the management system of a heritage place to ensure that its values are maintained, forming the basis of management strategies, plans, policies and actions.** Management objectives are not time-bound but act as the guiding principles or foundations for the whole management system.

Management objectives need to be determined first and foremost in relation to the values of the World Heritage property or heritage place. Other aims – such as the need to ensure the function of heritage in the life of the local communities, its presentation to visitors or its contribution to sustainable development – are important but not essential to maintain the values of a property or place. In cases of conflict between different aims, those management objectives concerned with maintaining the values of the property should always take priority.

Examples of management objectives include:

- Preserving a particular traditional building technique.
- Protecting a certain endemic species.
- Maintaining a specific traditional industry as the main economic activity of the heritage place.
- Maintaining the urban structure of a traditional human settlement.
- Ensuring the preservation of particular physical formations.
- Preserving pilgrimage routes to a sacred site.
- Maintaining the habitat essential to the survival of an endangered species.

Distinguishing between management objectives and the detail of what is to be achieved over a specific time period can cause confusion. Because of their general and broad nature, management objectives need to be complemented with desired management **outcomes**, which define what is to be achieved within a specific period of time. Hence, desired management outcomes help translate management objectives into work programmes through management planning processes, which must also consider how **factors affecting the property** affect (or can potentially affect) the attributes of the heritage place.

MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROCESS

For the purposes of this Toolkit, ‘management’ means a combination of processes and measures taken in relation to decision-making, planning, allocating resources, implementing and monitoring to protect a World Heritage property or other heritage place for present and future generations.

‘Planning’ can be defined as the process used to establish how to get from the present situation (here) to a desired state or point in the future (there). This requires a clear understanding of the present situation and deciding what is to be achieved, what actions to take, and what the time-frame and costs will be.

Planning is one of the most important management processes and can take place at various geographic scales and organizational levels. This is why EoH 2.0 includes a specific tool on the management planning framework, which is centred around the management plan for the World Heritage property or other heritage place. While the development of the management plan is a critical stage in the management planning process for a World Heritage property, its implementation, monitoring and evaluation – which can also be defined as management processes in their own right – are part of the wider management cycle.

Planning is not simply a one-off event or a product, but part of dynamic sequence of iterative processes, involving:

- developing the plan;
- implementing the plan;
- monitoring implementation;
- adjusting the plan; and
- evaluating the implementation of the plan.

It is important to continue to adapt and adjust a course of action when necessary and to learn from experience in order to achieve desired management outcomes.

The complete sequence of these different iterative processes is defined as the ‘management cycle’. This cycle is typically established with regard to a fixed time-frame; that is, the period of time extending from the beginning of the development of the plan until it is reviewed or replaced by a new one.

A planning framework can include:

- planning instruments that are broader than those specific to the World Heritage property in terms of scale and scope (e.g. master plans and land-use plans); and
- ‘subsidiary plans’ that detail particular management functions or areas (e.g. conservation plans, disaster risk management plans, sustainable tourism strategies, visitor management plans, interpretation plans, business plans, operations plans, etc.).

It is important that management plans are well integrated within the national, regional and local planning framework (see Figure 3.2).



Figure 3.2. An illustrative hierarchical planning framework. Source: adapted from Worboys et al., 2015.

OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES

Outputs are the tangible products, goods and services produced as a result of the implementation of an intervention, activity or action.

Outcomes can be defined as the intended and unintended medium- and long-term effects and achievements of the implementation of management measures, interventions, activities or actions, and the outputs derived from them. The desired outcomes should be specified at the beginning of the management cycle, as part of the planning process, and assessed at the end of the cycle to establish whether they have been achieved or not, (at which stage, they should be ‘real’ and no longer in a desired state). The assessment of outcomes is critical because it allows you to identify the real results of management measures. This involves looking at:

- a) whether the outputs produced are really contributing to achieving the outcomes; and
- b) if the values of the World Heritage property or other heritage place are being maintained.

Distinguishing between outputs and outcomes can be difficult, which is why people tend to mainly assess outputs. Identifying outcomes is, nevertheless, critical if you really want to have a clear understanding of how effective the management system for your heritage place is. Imagine that in the past year you have held more than 50 meetings with different rights-holder and stakeholder groups but, despite all those meetings, the underlying issue that led to the meetings remains unresolved. If you assess your success in terms of outputs (i.e., 50 meetings), it can look impressive but in terms of outcomes, you have failed. On the other hand, if the aim of the meetings was to promote engagement of rights-holders and stakeholders in the management of the heritage place, and the meetings have allowed you to identify ways to strengthen that engagement, then you have achieved your aim and hence a good outcome.

This example illustrates two further reasons why it is easier to assess outputs rather than outcomes. First, it is easier to quantify outputs than outcomes; outcomes tend to be qualitative and broader. Second, whereas outputs are easily identifiable in the short term, once interventions and activities are carried out, outcomes may only be visible at a later stage and, consequently, may remain unknown if effective monitoring and evaluation processes are not in place.



If the EoH 2.0 Toolkit does not exist in your native language, or in any other language used by participants who will be involved in the management effectiveness assessment, you should translate the concepts listed in this section, the glossary and, at a minimum, the most critical materials that people will need to use to undertake the assessment.

4. THE MAIN PHASES OF THE ASSESSMENT

The procedure for undertaking a management effectiveness assessment using the EoH 2.0 Toolkit can be divided into four main phases: preparing, gathering information, implementing, and reporting and acting (Figure 4.1).




Figure 4.1. The four main phases of assessment in the EoH Toolkit.

4.1 PHASE 1 – PREPARING

In this first phase, you will build the foundations for the assessment. You should have a well-thought out plan to guide you through the assessment. This plan should clearly state:

- Who will be involved and their responsibilities, including those of the convenor(s) and implementation team (see Figure 3.1).
- The programme and timeline for the assessment.
- How to store the relevant information collected, and how to make it available to participants before, during and after the assessment.
- How you will communicate the findings of the assessment, and to whom.

You will also need to decide on the level of the assessment. You may choose to:

- undertake a full assessment using all 12 tools;
- use some of the tools to supplement existing monitoring and evaluation processes; or
- start with a partial assessment, based on some of the tools, and plan a full assessment for the future.

Use Box 2.1 to help you plan the level of assessment. Bear in mind that this is only a preliminary choice, as the level of assessment will also depend on the information available (to be assessed in Phase 2).

The assessment will produce the best results if it is based on a collaborative process, involving multiple actors with responsibilities for managing the World Heritage property or other heritage place. It is vital that collaboration starts at the preparation phase, since it lays the foundation for the rest of the assessment process. The best way to do this is to hold an introductory session to:

- Spend time introducing and getting to know other people, since you will be working closely together on the assessment.
- Introduce the Toolkit to all those who will be involved in the assessment.
- Explain the purpose of conducting a management effectiveness assessment.
- Identify people's willingness and capacity to participate in the assessment.

- Agree clear rules on how to hold the discussions during the assessment, how people's contributions will be used and if they are subject to free, prior and informed consent or other privacy and confidentiality considerations.
- Discuss how you are going to collect the necessary information and data to support the assessment.
- Decide how people will access the information collected and how they will be kept involved and engaged through the whole process.
- Agree on critical elements to help the implementation team develop the plan for the assessment, such as the time-frame, how you will decide on the level of the assessment and what else needs to be done before you start using the assessment tools.
- Decide how the findings of the assessment will be used, how they will be communicated and to whom.

4.2 PHASE 2 – GATHERING INFORMATION

To adequately assess what is working well and what is causing challenges, it is crucial that you base the assessment (as far as possible) on existing, well-documented information. Therefore, you need to collect relevant documents and data that can be used to complete the worksheets associated with the assessment tools. These may include legislation, regulations, management plans and other planning instruments, monitoring reports, impact assessment reports, disaster risk assessments, research projects and operational plans. For World Heritage properties, this needs to include the nomination file, the Advisory Bodies' evaluations, the World Heritage Committee's decisions, Periodic Reporting documents, State of Conservation reports and Reactive Monitoring mission reports, where applicable.

For heritage places with traditional management systems, customary practices and norms, the appropriate sources of information need careful consideration. Accessing, collecting and storing this information from a range of actors raises a number of issues (e.g. intellectual property rights) that need to be carefully addressed from the outset (see Phase 1).

As you are collecting the information, you may realize that there are important gaps that cannot be addressed immediately and that can have implications for the level and scale of the assessment – particularly if this is the first time you are undertaking a management effectiveness assessment using the EoH 2.0 Toolkit. However, you should not feel discouraged or see information gaps as an obstacle to moving forward with the assessment. Instead, you should carefully consider how to tailor the assessment to take these constraints into account. At the same time, you can use the assessment as an opportunity to highlight information gaps and how they will be addressed in the future.



Bear in mind that some knowledge and information gaps might only become clear later in the assessment process, when you actually use the worksheets during the assessment workshop(s). In such cases, you can note information gaps in the relevant row of the worksheet and decide what could be done about it. Remember that if you attempt to resolve the information gap immediately, you may be jeopardizing the quality of the assessment. Therefore, consider carefully what can be completed and analysed based on the professional experience and knowledge of those involved in the assessment and what should be addressed through further work or studies.




Figure 4.2: The process of collecting relevant information and data.

4.3 PHASE 3 – IMPLEMENTING

In Phase 1, you determined how you are going to implement the assessment, the number of workshops needed and the time-frame for the assessment. If people involved in the assessment are not familiar with some of the concepts needed when using the tools (see Section 3.3), some initial capacity-building will be helpful.

The number and length of the workshops you arrange will depend on the scale and level of the assessment. If it is the first time that you are using the Toolkit and if you are using all the tools, it is best to hold multiple workshops, particularly if you are bringing together people and institutions who may not have worked together before. This approach will allow you to undertake certain tasks in between workshops and agree the content for the next round of discussions. However, avoid breaking up the assessment over too long a period. Each workshop should last at least a full day, to allow enough time to discuss issues in depth, and be no more than two weeks apart, to avoid forgetting what was previously discussed.

If you choose to undertake the assessment using a single workshop, experience from the test cases used to develop the EoH 2.0 Toolkit shows that a full assessment will take at least **five full working days**; this excludes all the preparatory work required during Phases 1 and 2 of the assessment (see Sections 4.1. and 4.2), and that of the final phase of the assessment (Section 4.4). Since every World Heritage property or other heritage place has its own characteristics, it is difficult to estimate how long it can take to use each of the tools and, consequently, the total duration required for an assessment.



Throughout the workshop(s), facilitators should discuss with the participants whether they have sufficient information to make a judgement regarding a particular management issue. If this is not the case, participants should not feel pressured to complete that part of the worksheet. Instead, they should note the gap and/or challenge in the relevant section and decide upon recommendations and follow-up actions to address this.

4.4 PHASE 4 – REPORTING AND ACTING ON FINDINGS

It is only worth doing an assessment if it leads to concrete conclusions, and there is a willingness to implement recommendations and follow-up actions. Although this may sound obvious, there is a risk that completing the worksheets is seen as the end of the assessment process. A good assessment requires a final reflection to explore the implications of what has been learned by using the different tools.

Doing this final reflection will likely require a final workshop. This can be scheduled once the implementation team has compiled all the information gathered throughout the different phases of the assessment, drafted conclusions and identified clear and practicable recommendations for action. The recommendations and follow-up actions (mainly resulting from the use of Tool 12) should:

- be sufficiently clear and specific in order to improve conservation practices;
- be realistic enough to ensure feasible solutions are found for priority issues; and
- include short- and long-term priorities, with an indication of the time-frame, necessary budget and the responsibility for implementation (e.g. institution, department or group, including the need for collaboration).

While some recommendations will be relatively straightforward, others might be complex to implement. Recommendations may include the need to fill gaps in knowledge, to better understanding of existing human and financial capacities or to develop additional monitoring programmes. Sometimes, recommendations will address critical and strategic issues – such as a need for improved understanding of the values and attributes of the World Heritage property or a need to revise and more clearly formulate management objectives.

The analysis should also identify the extent to which challenges derive from lack of management measures, rather than from other causes, some of which may be beyond the managers' control. Having a well-developed management system in place might not completely eliminate threats to the World Heritage property or other heritage place – for instance, factors related to climate change or social dynamics. Conversely, some properties with inadequate management systems may continue to maintain their values. It is important to understand the causes of success or failure of the management system, otherwise attempts to improve management mechanisms may be ineffective.

This final workshop is also an opportunity to discuss how the assessment findings will be presented in the final assessment report and communicated to relevant policy-makers, rights-holders and key stakeholders. The report should include the following components:

- An introduction setting out the context of the assessment, the process followed and who was involved.
- A clear, plain-language summary including the analysis resulting from using the different tools, and key conclusions.
- The recommendations and follow-up actions identified, and who will be responsible for their implementation.

The convenor is usually in the best position to publish and/or communicate the assessment report, once it has been approved by all the participants. However, this may not always be the case, so you should consider who else might be suitable to do this. It is important to share the report as soon as possible after publication in order to communicate the work and support the implementation of the assessment findings.



Remember that the Toolkit is intended as a self-assessment methodology. Therefore, it is critical to ensure that findings are addressed when developing future management plans and other planning instruments. It is important to identify concrete actions to address gaps and challenges and to ensure the necessary resource allocation and cooperation among managers. The assessment will be ineffective if findings are ignored and recommendations are not implemented.

This is even more important if the assessment findings show numerous and serious gaps and challenges. However, improving the situation may require considerable effort and time. It may not be possible to implement some recommendations in the short to medium term, even if worthwhile. Such recommendations should be documented, and plans made to improve capacity and financial resources so that they can be implemented in the future. Overall, findings and recommendations should be presented in a positive way to encourage people and institutions to act and commit to improving performance and management effectiveness in the long term.

5. THE EOH 2.0 ASSESSMENT TOOLS

This section will guide you through the 12 assessment tools that make up EoH 2.0. It describes the purpose of each tool, the type of information and analysis required and the specific tasks to be completed. Each tool includes one or more worksheets, with either a set of guiding questions or a structured template to help you summarize information and findings about a particular management element.

The guidance was developed with particular reference to people who may never have undertaken a management effectiveness assessment before, either by using the original EoH Toolkit or other management effectiveness methodologies. Even if you are familiar with management effectiveness assessments, it is important that you carefully read the guidance before starting, as EoH 2.0 includes aspects that are covered in greater detail than in other methodologies. Most importantly, you should not begin to complete the worksheets without having the necessary understanding of both the purpose of each tool and the relationships between them.

At the beginning of the guidance for each tool, you will find its **specific objectives** and some **background information** explaining how the tool is structured. The guidance then provides an **overview on how to complete the worksheet(s)** associated with the tool. The worksheets are designed to document critical information about the different elements of the management system, summarize the results of your discussions and help you track progress over time by serving as a baseline for future assessments.

For worksheets that mainly require information, you will also find a set of **reflection questions** to help you reach conclusions and ensure that you do not miss important points. Worksheets structured as questionnaires already offer reflection questions – for these, you should draw conclusions from your comments in the last column of the worksheet. It is also important to consider connections between the different questions. These final discussions are a critical part of the assessment exercise, so make sure to allocate sufficient time and energy to do them well.

Remember that the worksheets can be adapted if some of the elements do not apply or are not suited to the type of World Heritage property or heritage place you are working with. However, such adaptations should be clearly recorded and justified, and should not change the purpose of the tool. There is space at the end of every worksheet for you to summarize the key issues identified during discussions, draw conclusions and define follow-up recommendations and actions.

Using the Toolkit will require a great deal of engagement from all those involved. While this may sound challenging at first, assessing how well your World Heritage property or other heritage place is being managed is critical if you want to maintain its Outstanding Universal Value and other important values in the long term. There are no shortcuts to deep, reflective and collective thinking. Treating the whole process as a listening and learning opportunity, rather than a technical exercise, will lead to the best results.



TOOL 1. VALUES, ATTRIBUTES AND MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

This tool helps to establish whether there is a clear understanding and identification of the values of the World Heritage property or other heritage place. In addition, it sets the basis for the management effectiveness assessment and the use of the other tools in EoH 2.0.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE TOOL:

- To establish whether there is a good understanding of the **Outstanding Universal Value** of the World Heritage property and its **attributes**.
- To assess if there is a good understanding, identification and documentation of the other important **values** of the property and the attributes that convey those values.
- To review if there are clear **management objectives** to guide the management of the property and whether those objectives are clearly based on the Outstanding Universal Value and other important values of the property.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Outstanding Universal Value of a World Heritage property is the reason why the property is considered to be of common importance for present and future generations and inscribed on the World Heritage List. However, all properties will invariably have a wider range of values at different levels of recognition (international, national or local) that contribute to the overall significance of the property. Therefore, it is essential to identify and recognize these other important values and ensure that the property's management system takes them into consideration.

The main concern for management should be to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value as well as the other important values of the property. In the case of heritage places not inscribed on the World Heritage List, a similar logic applies: while some values might have a broader level of recognition (e.g. if the place is designated at the national level), local communities may value it for different reasons. These local values may even differ among community groups. This understanding of the full range of the values of the heritage place, whether inscribed on the World Heritage List or not, should be reflected in clear management objectives that guide all aspects of the management system. Clear management objectives will also help focus attention on what is most important when difficult decisions have to be made and scarce resources allocated.

Together the values, attributes and management objectives for the property provide the basis for what should be analysed and evaluated throughout the whole assessment process. Hence, Tool 1 includes two worksheets:

- **Worksheet 1a** is designed to assess the identification and documentation of the values of the property and the attributes that convey those values.
- **Worksheet 1b** is designed to relate the values and attributes of the property to the management objectives.



Remember that you should complete the main sections of the worksheet based on the information gathered during Phase 2 of the assessment (Section 4.2). If the information is missing or is insufficient, you should leave the relevant section of the worksheet blank or incomplete and note the reasons for this under 'Gaps and challenges' at the end of the worksheet.

The findings of Tool 1 will underpin the analyses required for the other tools and, in particular for Tool 11, which requires you to assess the extent to which the attributes are conserved and the values of the property are being maintained. Therefore, it is important that you invest sufficient time during the assessment to complete worksheets 1a and 1b in detail, especially the sections on ‘Analysis and conclusions’ and ‘Gaps and challenges’.

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 1A

The first task in Worksheet 1a is to list the values and attributes of the property according to their level of importance (OUV, national or local). Understanding the different levels should help you to i) prioritize actions if there are conflicts between values and ii) recognize that values are interrelated and that the protection of those other important values is critical to maintaining the OUV of the property.

Worksheet 1a will also help you evaluate whether the attributes that convey the values of the property have been sufficiently identified, are well understood, and if they are the focus of management measures.

Identifying values and attributes and, in particular, distinguishing between the two concepts (Section 3.3) is not an easy task, but it is a critical one, as it will help you make full use of the other tools. There is no right or wrong way to go about this task, since values and attributes can be framed in different ways. When in doubt, focus on the main objectives of the tool rather than on the details of the concepts themselves.

Reflection questions:

- Is the Outstanding Universal Value of the property easy to understand, including by non-heritage professionals? If not, can you describe it using short and simple sentences easier to communicate to a wide variety of actors?
- How about the other important values of the property? Have they been identified and documented or recorded (including through traditional or customary oral sources)? Are the information sources accessible and/or securely stored?
- Are the values described in information sources used by managers on a regular basis to guide the management of the property? For instance, are they included in the management plan or other primary planning instrument? Or are they documented in academic and research papers that have not been taken into consideration by management, or are not readily accessible?
- What is the relationship between the other important values and the Outstanding Universal Value of the property? Are some of these values interdependent? Are some of the values divergent or in conflict? If yes, why and how does it affect management?
- Are there certain categories of values that have been overlooked or insufficiently documented or recorded? If so, is additional research needed or should further investigation and documentation be undertaken, and by whom?
- Have rights-holders and/or local communities been involved in the identification of the values of the property, particularly at the time when the property was nominated for the World Heritage List?
- Are the attributes of the property clearly and sufficiently identified and documented?
- Have processes, practices and associations, as well as other intangible elements, been considered as attributes, or is the identification of attributes mainly limited to physical elements?
- Is the distinction between values and attributes in the information sources clear?

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 1B

Maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value and the other important values of the property should be the primary concern for management, and this should be reflected in clear **management objectives**. Each value and the key attributes associated with it should normally have one or more associated objectives.

However, management is also about other aims – such as the need to ensure the function of heritage in the life of the local communities, its presentation to visitors or its contribution to sustainable development. Such aims should also be reflected in the management objectives for the property (see Box 5.1). However, if there is conflict between different aims, priority should always be given to maintaining the values of the property. Together, values, attributes and management objectives should act as the guiding principles or foundations for the whole **management system**.

Distinguishing between management objectives and what is to be actually achieved over a specific time period (i.e., desired management **outcomes**) can cause confusion. Management objectives refer to the primary aims that guide the management of the World Heritage property and ensure that its values are maintained over the long term. Because of their overarching nature, management objectives by themselves are not sufficient to direct everyday management in a precise way. They need to be complemented by desired management outcomes, which define what is to be actually achieved in a **management cycle** or a specified period of time. Through planning processes, desired management outcomes help to translate the management objectives into work programmes and take into consideration how factors affecting the property impact (or can potentially impact) the attributes. For further information on distinguishing between management objectives and desired management outcomes, see Box 5.2 and if needed, re-read Section 3.3.



Box 5.1 Heritage management and sustainable development

The inclusion of heritage as a part of the Sustainable Development Goals (related to target 11.4 ‘Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage’) is a long-overdue acknowledgement of its role within the wider development agenda. However, the growing pressures from a host of unprecedented challenges for heritage raises the question of how best to strike a balance between conservation and development, while maintaining the values of heritage places. How does heritage management engage with sustainable development, at a policy or operational level?

If the task of protecting and managing heritage is to be effective, it must be interwoven with efforts to improve the health of the planet and all its inhabitants. This calls for an alignment of heritage management objectives and development aims. In this spirit, the [Policy for the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the World Heritage Convention \(2015\)](#), seeks to harness the potential of heritage to contribute to sustainable development, while noting that the primary objective of the World Heritage Convention, to protect the world cultural and natural heritage, should not be compromised. The policy identifies four core dimensions: (i) inclusive social development (championing human rights, gender equality and Indigenous peoples and local communities), (ii) environmental sustainability (including resilience to disasters and climate change), (iii) inclusive economic development and (iv) peace and security. The effective implementation of this policy requires reflecting on existing frameworks for heritage management and radically changing our approach to designing management objectives and mechanisms at heritage places.



Box 5.2. Distinguishing between management objectives and desired management outcomes

Note that there is not a direct correspondence between the examples given here for management objectives with those of desired management outcomes.

Examples of management objectives:

- To preserve the traditional building techniques associated with wooden architecture.
- To protect the mangroves along the coastline of the property.
- To maintain the historic green spaces within the city centre.
- To maintain the townscape character of the traditional human settlement.
- To maintain the wine-making industry as the key economic activity within the cultural landscape.
- To preserve the pilgrimage routes to the sacred places.
- To maintain the habitat necessary to the survival of the endangered species.

Examples of desired management outcomes:

- Number of skilled craftspersons increased by at least 20% by 2026.
- Mangroves restored back to 60% of original extent by 2030.
- Historic garden within northern area of the historic urban centre fully rehabilitated by 2027.
- Overfishing of a particular species (state which one) significantly reduced by 2025 by working in collaboration with fishing communities.
- Interpretation of the property enhanced by working with rights-holders to improve the quality of guided visits within the property.
- Gazettement of the community-conserved areas within the buffer zone of the property completed.
- Visitor management enhanced through the construction of a new visitor centre.

When no time-frame is given for an outcome, it should be assumed that this is to be achieved by the end date of the current management plan or primary planning instrument.

Worksheet 1b is structured to help you assess whether there are both clear management objectives and desired management outcomes for the property. Some World Heritage properties may lack both, particularly if there is no management plan, or if that plan has not been reviewed. EoH 2.0, and Tool 1 specifically, is not a method for developing management objectives or desired management outcomes and cannot replace effective planning processes. If management objectives are missing, unclear or inadequate, this indicates a need to develop or improve planning processes for the property and should be noted under 'Gaps and challenges'. Clear and well-stated management objectives and desired management outcomes are the cornerstone of management planning. They are not something that can be resolved quickly during the assessment process.

Reflection questions:

- Have management objectives for the World Heritage property or heritage place been identified?
- Are the objectives clearly linked to the values and attributes of the property?
- Are the objectives specific enough to guide the management system for the property?
- Do the objectives also address how the property can contribute to other societal goals, such as sustainable development, community well-being and the generation of services and benefits?
- Are the management objectives clearly distinguishable from desired management outcomes?
- Are the management objectives distinguishable from other aims (such as organizational objectives or a vision for the property)?
- Have desired management outcomes been identified as part of the planning processes?
- Are these desired outcomes realistic and objectively verifiable?
- Have desired outcomes been defined in relation to the management objectives as well as the factors affecting the property?

Worksheet 1a. Assessment of values and attributes

Level of recognition	Values	Attributes	Sources of information used
OUV			
National			
Local			
Analysis and conclusions			
Gaps and challenges			
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions			

Worksheet 1b. Assessment of management objectives

Management objectives	Values and attributes	Sources of information used	Comments
Desired management outcomes	Values and attributes	Sources of information used	Comments
Analysis and conclusions			
Gaps and challenges			
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions			



TOOL 2. FACTORS AFFECTING THE PROPERTY

This tool assesses whether factors that affect, or could potentially affect, the World Heritage property are documented, and whether their impacts on the attributes are clearly identified and well understood. The tool also analyses the adequacy of management measures for the identified factors and their impacts.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE TOOL:

- a) To assess whether there is a good understanding and documentation of the **factors affecting the property**, both current and potential.
- b) To identify whether the list of factors affecting the property includes factors originating from outside of the property (e.g. within the buffer zone(s) and/or the wider setting).
- c) To check whether the underlying causes of the factors have been identified.
- d) To understand the complexity and relationships between factors affecting the property, their causes and the **impacts** that they have on the attributes of the property.
- e) To assess whether the management measures and time-frames identified to address the factors and their impacts are appropriate, and if it is clear who is responsible for the implementation of the identified measures.
- f) To identify challenges and ways to improve management measures.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

World Heritage properties and other heritage places face many factors which can affect their state of conservation and, consequently, their values. While there is a tendency to focus on negative factors, commonly referred to as threats, there are also factors that can have positive effects – one example of this is tourism. On the one hand, if managed appropriately and based on a sustainable approach, tourism can generate positive benefits. On the other hand, mass tourism or unplanned and unregulated tourism activities can lead to the dislocation of local communities, loss of sense of place or physical damage. Furthermore, some factors may be perceived negatively by some actors but positively by others.

Factors originating (or potentially originating) within the **buffer zone(s)** and/or the **wider setting** must also be addressed. For instance, the construction of a dam upstream of a property can severally affect the water flow to that property. Similarly, the construction of an airport near to a traditional human settlement can increase the number of visitors, which can then lead to an increase in tourist-related activities within the property and limit services and everyday commercial activities needed by local communities. Therefore, the origin of the factor is not necessarily important; rather, what is critical is the factor's current or potential impacts on the state of conservation of the property's attributes and, thus, on the ability of the attributes to convey the property's values.

The factors affecting a property typically have a complex set of causes and impacts. This tool helps you to understand the relationships between the causes and impacts of those factors and the extent and severity of current and potential impacts on the attributes of the property. It also helps you to assess whether management measures that have been put in place are sufficient to prevent or minimize impacts.

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 2

Although this worksheet can initially appear relatively simple, it can be complex to complete, especially when there is confusion between ‘factors affecting the property’, the ‘causes’ of those factors and their ‘impact’. In filling out the worksheet, it can be useful to move back and forth between the different columns when analysing each factor, rather than simply completing each row from left to right.

The definitions and relationships between factors, causes and impacts are outlined in Box 5.3. While some sections can be completed using the professional and personal experiences of those involved in the assessment (e.g. if the factor is currently affecting the property or could potentially affect it in the future), other sections (e.g. ‘extent’ and ‘severity’ of impacts) are better supported by data and detailed information sources, rather than educated guesses.



Box 5.3. Distinguishing between factors, causes and impacts

Factors affecting the property – any activity or related process that can affect, positively and/or negatively, the attributes of a World Heritage property or other heritage place. Negative factors are usually called threats. The way in which factors are affecting a property should be analysed through a series of parameters, namely the underlying causes that are at the source of the factor, their origin (within or outside the property), the current and potential impacts deriving from the factor, and the extent and severity of the impacts on the attributes of the property.

Causes – the root or underlying reasons that are at the source of the factor.

Impacts – the effects or consequences derived from or produced by a factor, and how they affect the attributes and their state of conservation. Impacts can be positive or negative as well as direct or indirect.

Example 1:

Factor – degradation of coral reefs

Causes – ocean acidification and unregulated commercial fishing

Impacts – loss of fish species

Example 2:

Factor – loss of traditional agricultural practices

Causes – population ageing and mechanization of agricultural practices

Impacts – abandonment of agricultural fields and loss of local crop varieties

Note that the distinction between these three concepts depends on what you initially define as a ‘factor’. For instance:

- **Example 1.** If you begin by listing ocean acidification as the factor, then one of the underlying causes would be overly high levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide dissolving in the ocean. Consequently, when you come to the columns on impacts and management measures, it might be difficult to identify specific and meaningful actions to respond to that factor at the site level. Therefore, it is useful to begin by listing factors that can be responded to with specific and practicable actions.
- **Example 2.** If you identify ‘mechanization of farming practices’ as the factor, the underlying cause might be the high costs of labour or lack of skilled farm workers. In this case, the impact might then be defined as the loss of traditional practices, and the management measures would need to address this impact on traditional practices (the attribute).

Reflection questions:

- Have the factors affecting the World Heritage property or other heritage place been identified and documented in information sources that are used regularly (e.g. management plan)?
- Is there a detailed understanding of the factors affecting the property and their underlying causes and impacts? Or is available knowledge mainly limited to a list of factors?
- Have positive factors been identified? Or is the list limited to negative factors or threats?
- Have potential factors been identified? Have factors originating from outside the property been identified – e.g. within the buffer zone(s), the wider setting and sometimes even beyond it?
- In some cases, the same factor can impact multiple attributes but in different ways. Are these differences well understood?
- Have the relationships between factors and the potential cumulative and multiplying effects of different impacts been considered?
- Have adequate measures to all factors with high and very high impacts been identified? Are these measures being implemented?
- Are these management measures clearly documented and monitored, including information on who is responsible for their implementation and monitoring?
- What are the main challenges and shortcomings for addressing the most critical factors (i.e., those factors having a significant detrimental impact on attributes)? How can they be addressed?



TOOL 3. BOUNDARIES, BUFFER ZONES AND THE WIDER SETTING

This tool assesses whether the boundaries, size and configuration of the World Heritage property or other heritage place are adequate. The tool also examines the adequacy of any existing buffer zone(s) and how the interactions between the property, its buffer zone and its wider setting influence the management of the property.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE TOOL:

- a) To ascertain whether the World Heritage property includes all the **attributes** that convey its Outstanding Universal Value within its boundaries, and is of adequate size to protect those attributes.
- b) To assess whether the delineation of the property considers important relationships, dynamic functions and processes that are essential to maintaining its values.
- c) To identify gaps and challenges associated with different designations and differing boundaries.
- d) To examine whether the **buffer zone** is adequate to give an added layer of protection to the property.
- e) To consider if there is a good understanding of the interactions between the property, buffer zone(s) and **wider setting**, and how management responds to these cross-scale interactions.
- f) To identify management challenges resulting from these delimitation aspects.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The location and delineation of a World Heritage property, namely its boundaries and size, can significantly affect managers' ability to manage it effectively and, in particular, maintain its integrity. This is especially important for serial and transboundary properties. Moreover, the interactions between the property, any existing buffer zone(s) and the wider setting will determine what factors affect (or can potentially affect) the property.

The boundaries of each World Heritage property, as well as of any existing buffer zone(s), are determined at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List. Any changes to boundaries need to be approved by the World Heritage Committee through established procedures. In some cases, the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone(s) at the time of nomination may have been influenced by social, economic, political and administrative issues, the consequences of which can create long-term management challenges.

This tool helps to identify shortcomings related to the boundaries of the property, as well as the boundaries of any existing buffer zone(s), and to indicate ways in which management might resolve or mitigate related issues. This includes identifying challenges arising from the size and delineation of both the property and the buffer zone(s). Challenges may also arise from cross-scale interactions (that is, the influence that processes and dynamics at one scale or area have on another scale or area) between the property, the buffer zone and the wider setting.

For properties where processes (e.g. biological and ecological processes, or agricultural and industrial processes) are important attributes, the size of the property will be important. This is particularly the case for natural properties where, for instance, the viability or long-term survival of certain species may require multiple and extensive ecosystems. However, size is also important for cultural properties – for example, in the case of a traditional irrigation system whose functioning is dependent on a water catchment area.

Intricate or complicated boundaries can make it difficult for actors to easily identify them. Conversely, over-simplified boundaries (e.g. straight lines and rectangular zones) that do not relate to geographical boundaries, for example, can also complicate the management of the property and its buffer zone(s). Alignment of boundaries with physical features or cadastral land parcels can be helpful in identifying and protecting the property.

Identifying and (if feasible) mapping attributes can be a useful way of determining whether property boundaries are adequate or not. However, when undertaking such an exercise, be aware of the risk of focusing only on physical attributes and overlooking important social and/or ecological processes and intangible elements. Consider also relationships between attributes (as analysed in Worksheet 1a) and landscape connectivity when examining the adequacy of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone.



Be aware that for World Heritage properties, the boundaries have been determined with a view to encompassing the attributes that convey Outstanding Universal Value. Those boundaries may, in some circumstances, be judged as inadequate for the protection of other important values of the property. In such cases, the protection of those other values can be considered in the delineation of the buffer zone, and/or may need to be addressed through other designation processes (at the national, provincial or local levels). For example, a World Heritage property can be situated within the boundaries of a much larger protected area, so that the property protects the Outstanding Universal Value and the larger protected area boundary encompasses significant regional and national values and attributes. In this case, the World Heritage property boundaries do not need to be altered to accommodate these other important values.

Before you can examine how adequate the boundaries are, you will need a good understanding of what factors are affecting the property and whether those factors originate from within or outside the property (see Tool 2). The [Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention \(2021\)](#) establish a specific mechanism to help respond to those factors: the buffer zone. One of the main purposes of the buffer zone is to provide an added layer of protection to the property and help address factors originating outside it. Therefore, Tool 3 helps to assess the adequacy of the boundaries and size of the buffer zone. In some cases, even a large-sized buffer zone will be insufficient to deal with all the factors affecting the property, as some factors can originate from well beyond the outer limits of the buffer zone. This is why the Operational Guidelines also include the notion of the ‘wider setting’, and the need to understand the interactions between this, the property and the buffer zone. Since factors originating outside the property and its buffer zone(s) are often beyond the direct control of managers responsible for the property, you will need to assess what agreements and other mechanisms exist, or should be put in place, to deal with issues arising from the wider setting of the property or other heritage place.

Finally, this tool helps you to establish whether the boundaries are related to existing legal protections at other levels, and if those existing legal protections can facilitate management. In some circumstances, the opposite can occur. For example, a pre-existing designation at the national level that extends beyond the delineation of the World Heritage property may be subject to rules and regulations that are insufficient for the needs of protecting the property’s Outstanding Universal Value. Similarly, when different designations exist (particularly at the international level) this can lead to different sets of boundaries (both for the property and its buffer zone), sometimes with conflicting purposes. Potential conflicts between different designations need to be carefully considered.

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 3

This worksheet offers a set of questions to examine three main aspects:

- the adequacy of the boundaries, size and delimitation of the property itself;
- the adequacy of the buffer zone to act as an added layer of protection to the property and address factors originating outside the property; and
- the extent to which the interactions between the property, the buffer zone and the wider setting influence the management of the property.

While you should complete most of the worksheets for other tools based on information retrieved from existing information sources, completing Worksheet 3 requires professional experience and analytical skills. Therefore, this worksheet is structured as a questionnaire. It is critical to always consider the questions included in the worksheet in relation to the values of the property (Worksheet 1a). When you insert responses into Worksheet 3, make sure that they reflect the result of discussions among all those participating in the assessment and that they reflect, as far as possible, a consensus among participants. Where divergent viewpoints exist, you should make this clear in your responses.

Since this worksheet is structured as a questionnaire, no reflection questions are provided. Instead, you are encouraged to draw conclusions and identify follow-up actions based on the comments and recommendations identified in the final column.

This worksheet may require some adaptation depending on the type and characteristics of your World Heritage property or other heritage place. For instance, you may be working with a World Heritage property that does not have a buffer zone, in which case you will not be able to respond to some of the questions in the worksheet. For serial World Heritage properties, you may need to repeat the worksheet for each component and then for the property as a whole. For heritage places that are not inscribed on the World Heritage List, you will need to adapt the questions in relation to other designations (e.g. at international, national, provincial or local levels). All this work requires careful reflection on how best to approach and adapt the worksheet to suit your needs.

Worksheet 3. Assessment of boundaries, buffer zones and the wider setting

Question	Response/Explanation	Recommendations
World Heritage property		
<p>1. Were the boundaries of the property defined in relation to the identification and mapping of the attributes that convey its Outstanding Universal Value? What other considerations were used to determine the boundaries?</p>		
<p>2. Are the boundaries and size of the property adequate to protect those attributes identified in response to Question 1? Do the boundaries and size of the property ensure functional, spatial and/or visual connectivity between the attributes?</p>		
<p>3. Are the boundaries and size of the property adequate to protect other important values of the property? (If not, respond to this question together with Question 9 below in relation to the buffer zone(s)).</p>		
<p>4. If there are other designations (at the international, national or local levels), are there issues deriving from different boundaries associated with those other designations?</p>		
<p>5. Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property well known to, and easily identified by, managers and rights-holders?</p>		
<p>6. Are there unresolved issues or grievances related to the delineation of the World Heritage property?</p>		

Worksheet 3. Assessment of boundaries, buffer zone(s) and the wider setting

Question	Response/Explanation	Recommendations
Buffer zone (if applicable)		
7. Is the purpose of the buffer zone(s) clear? Are the boundaries of the buffer zone(s) legally recognized?		
8. Are the boundaries of the buffer zone(s) adequate to provide an added layer of protection to the property?		
9. Was the buffer zone(s) defined in relation to the protection of other important values (that is, in addition to its purpose as an added layer of protection to the property)?		
10. Is the buffer zone(s) large enough to address threats originating from external interactions that may negatively affect the property?		
11. Are the boundaries of the buffer zone(s) well known to, and easily identified by, managers and rights-holders?		
12. Is the buffer zone(s) defined to ensure connectivity with the wider setting, as well as supporting the delivery of services and benefits?		

Worksheet 3. Assessment of boundaries, buffer zone(s) and the wider setting

Question	Response/Explanation	Recommendations
Interactions with the wider setting		
13. Have large-scale spatial and functional dynamics important to maintain the values and integrity of the property been identified?		
14. Has consideration been given to the importance of identifying and/or defining the wider setting and context of the property in relation to large-scale spatial and functional dynamics?		
15. Have factors originating beyond the property and its buffer zone(s) been sufficiently identified?		
Analysis and conclusions		
Gaps and challenges		
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions		



TOOL 4. GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

This tool assesses whether the roles and responsibilities of managers are clearly defined, whether there is effective coordination and collaboration between managers, and the level of engagement and participation of rights-holders in the management of the property.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE TOOL:

- a) To assess whether there is a good understanding of the **actors** with recognized responsibilities for managing the property (**managers**), as well as of actors with rights (**rights-holders**) and interests or influence (**stakeholders**) over the property.
- b) To understand whether the roles and responsibilities of managers are clearly defined.
- c) To identify gaps and challenges to effective coordination and collaboration between managers.
- d) To examine whether rights-holders are adequately recognized and engaged in the management of the property.
- e) To consider whether there are issues of capacity that are influencing the ability of rights-holders to participate in decision-making processes and, therefore, whether the level of rights-holder engagement is having positive and/or negative influences on the management of the property.
- f) To identify actions to engender respectful and participatory **governance** at the property.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Achieving effective and equitable governance and management requires coordination and collaboration among actors with responsibilities, rights and interests in the property. The levels of participation will vary according to the mandate, capacity and resources of those actors, whether and how their rights, roles and responsibilities are recognized and respected, and whether there are platforms and processes available to make participation easier.

This tool explores two key aspects of the relationships among different actors:

1. How authority and responsibility for managing the property is divided and shared among managers and how they are working together.
2. The level of engagement of the rights-holders and local communities in the management of the property.

The overall use of this tool is dependent on a good understanding of who the managers, rights-holders and stakeholders are. In some properties, it can be straightforward to identify the institutions or groups with socially recognized responsibilities for its management. However, for an increasing number of World Heritage properties, governance arrangements can be complex and involve multiple institutions and groups. In such situations, it might not be clear who holds, or who should rightfully hold, authority and responsibility for managing the World Heritage property and any existing buffer zone(s).

Management decisions about different issues are made and influenced by different actors, who collectively feed into the management system of the property. This is particularly the case for serial properties, which can have a high number of components across vast geographical areas, and for transboundary properties, where formal governance and management arrangements are needed between different countries. Similarly, cultural landscapes and urban settlements are generally managed by multiple actors – although in some cases, one specific organization may be assigned the main role of managing the property from a heritage perspective – requiring formal mechanisms of coordination. Managers can be empowered by legislation, by cultural practices established over time, or a mix of both legal and customary instruments.

Tool 4 is comprised of three worksheets:

- **Worksheet 4a** is used to identify which actors can be considered managers. It also offers a structured framework to analyse each manager’s specific role or mandate for managing the property and any existing buffer zone(s), which key instruments and powers grant them that mandate, and the extent and level of their involvement in decision-making processes. Note that this worksheet is mainly intended for World Heritage properties with complex governance arrangements and a diversity of actors with management responsibilities. If you are working with a property with only one or a few institutions or groups responsible for most (or all) aspects of the management, you can discuss and decide whether or not to use the worksheet.
- **Worksheet 4b** explores whether there is effective collaboration and cooperation between managers. As for Worksheet 4a, the use of worksheet 4b should be determined in relation to the complexity of the governance arrangements.
- **Worksheet 4c** first assesses whether there is appropriate knowledge of the different rights-holder groups. Once this is determined, the worksheet is used to examine the levels of engagement and participation of the different rights-holder groups in the management of the property. With some adaptation, the worksheet can also be used to undertake a similar analysis for different stakeholder groups.

Overall, these worksheets help assess some key aspects of the governance arrangements at a World Heritage property. Tool 5 and Tool 8 (‘Legal, regulatory and customary framework’ and ‘Management processes’, respectively) explore other aspects of governance diversity and quality.



For the purpose of EoH 2.0, the term ‘manager’ refers to an institution or a group of people working together for a common purpose and bound by rules and norms, whether formal or informal. ‘Manager’ is preferred to ‘site manager’ for three reasons. First, because the term ‘site manager’ is often associated with a single person, frequently the head of an organization or group, whereas managing a World Heritage property, regardless of complexity, requires the involvement of many people and different organizations across different administrative levels. Second, ‘site manager’ is generally associated with an actor who holds a mandate that is specific to either cultural or natural heritage. However, certain aspects of the management of World Heritage properties fall under the mandate of, or are influenced by, actors who work with other jurisdictional areas (e.g. planning, forestry, agriculture, infrastructure, etc.). Thus, the roles and responsibilities of diverse managers need to be recognized. Third, the term ‘site’ is perceived to refer to the World Heritage property itself and excludes the management of the buffer zone(s) – both areas must be considered when applying Tool 4. Therefore, the term ‘manager’ offers a way to recognize a broad range of actors and their management responsibilities.

If confusion arises from using the term ‘manager’ to refer to a wide range of actors, you can create your own terminology to distinguish between: (a) managers with primary responsibility for the entire property, or large parts of it, from a heritage perspective; and (b) managers with responsibilities over limited areas of the property, only certain types of heritage resources and/or with a mandate that is not heritage-specific. You should also adapt the terminology to fit with what is used in your country and/or native language(s).

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 4A

Before you begin completing this worksheet, it is important that all those involved in the assessment are clear about who is to be recognized as a ‘manager’, as differing understandings of this term can create confusion. Only institutions or groups with i) legal or customary authority, or ii) socially recognized responsibilities, for managing the World Heritage property and any existing buffer zone(s), as a whole or in part, should be identified as managers. The authority and responsibilities of managers may or may not be heritage-specific. For instance, the authority to manage the buffer zone of a cultural heritage property may be the responsibility of a natural protected area agency. Similarly, the authority to regulate land use in a cultural landscape or geological site may be held by an urban planning department of a municipality or provincial government, or the authority to manage a particular religious building may lie with a religious institution. For all these actors to be recognized as managers, it is necessary that other actors recognize them as such and, consequently, hold them accountable for their responsibilities in managing the property.

If there are several groups and institutions recognized as managers, you should complete this worksheet in detail the first time you carry out a management effectiveness assessment. However, in future assessments you will not need to repeat this process if the governance arrangements remain fundamentally unchanged; although you may choose to complete the final rows on ‘Analysis and conclusions’ and ‘Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions’ to document any changes or progress made since the previous assessment. On the other hand, if there has been considerable restructuring or substantial changes to the governance and management arrangements of the property and any existing buffer zone(s) since the previous assessment, you should complete the whole worksheet in detail. Examples of substantial change can include the recognition of rights-holders as managers – for instance, through return of land to Indigenous peoples or statutory recognition of local communities.

If there has been no previous mapping of the governance arrangements for the World Heritage or other heritage place (as well as any existing buffer zone(s)), then this worksheet is essential. Many management challenges arise from weak or unclear governance arrangements. When identifying managers, it is important that you consider information documented in Worksheet 1a (on values and attributes) and Worksheet 2 (on factors affecting the property). Use Worksheet 1a to help determine whether the responsibilities of the identified managers cover the full range of values of the property or other heritage place. If needed, use the column on ‘responsibility’ from Worksheet 2 to help you identify who is a manager.

Reflection questions:

- Is it clear which actors are managers? If not, why not?
- Is each manager recognized as such by the other actors (particularly if that manager is responsible for managing only parts of the World Heritage property or buffer zone, or only certain heritage resources)? If not, why not?
- Is it clear what instruments and powers grant each manager the authority, role and responsibilities over the property and/or the buffer zone? How do those instruments and powers make them accountable to the other actors?
- In cases where there are several managers, is it clear who holds the primary responsibility for managing the World Heritage property from a heritage perspective? Is that manager also responsible for the management of the buffer zone? If not, what challenges derive from a separation in management responsibility between the property and buffer zone?
- Is the mandate for the property's primary manager adequate for the required role? Does that mandate and the instruments at its disposal grant the manager the necessary powers to effectively assume the primary responsibility for managing the property?
- Are there conflicts or overlaps between the responsibilities of different managers?
- Are there situations where certain managers are unable or unwilling to exercise their responsibilities? If yes, why? What can be done to address the situation?
- Is the governance structure – including the necessary interactions between different managers – clearly documented, transparent and accessible? Is it clear who has the main decision-making power (or final saying) in relation to different management processes?
- Are the governance arrangements in line with the values of the World Heritage property or other heritage place?

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 4B

While Worksheet 4a was used to identify the managers, Worksheet 4b is used to assess how well the different managers work together. Even if the governance arrangements for your property are relatively clear and involve a limited number of managers, completing this worksheet is still a useful exercise.

When there are several managers who have the authority and responsibility for managing the property and any existing buffer zone(s) – in full or in part – it is necessary to ensure mutually effective collaboration and coordination. The social, economic, political and administrative context in which managers operate can promote a sense of separation and competition, rather than coordination and collaboration. This can lead to each manager pursuing its own goals – particularly when no management objectives for the property have been identified or are inadequate to guide the whole management system. Your findings for Worksheet 1b are relevant here, as this way of working can lead to competition for resources and duplication of effort.

Much more can be achieved when managers work together, particularly by building effective partnerships across administrative levels. By doing this, managers can combine resources to achieve outcomes that previously may have looked impossible or difficult to attain, and to collaboratively explore creative solutions to management challenges.

Worksheet 4b is structured around a set of five topics (or themes) that can facilitate or hinder collaboration between managers. You can combine some of the suggested topics and/or include other topics that best suit your specific governance and management contexts. The assessment is undertaken by reviewing strengths and challenges for each topic or theme. Table 5.1. includes a number of guiding questions for you to consider when completing Worksheet 4b.

Table 5.1. Questions to consider when completing Worksheet 4b.

Aspects/Themes	Questions
Existence of platforms, agreements, contracts, procedures and financial resources for coordination and collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ Is there a platform or mechanism to bring managers together at regular intervals to discuss management issues and facilitate decision-making? If not, is one needed? If yes, is it working well and are necessary resources identified and allocated? ➔ Does the management plan (or similar planning instrument) for the property include a description of the governance arrangements for the property and any existing buffer zone(s)? ➔ If you are working with a serial property, is there a management planning framework for the property as a whole? If yes, how is that framework implemented? Is there a dedicated agency or body responsible for its implementation? ➔ Are there formal agreements between managers to facilitate exchange of information about the management of the property and any existing buffer zone(s)? If no such agreements exist, are there broader agreements that could be used as a basis to facilitate cooperative management? ➔ Where such agreements exist, even if not adequate, do they stipulate the roles and responsibilities of each manager and the resources available to implement the agreement? ➔ Are there informal agreements or collaborative exchange arrangements between managers? If necessary, how might such informal practices be reinforced and expanded to include other managers?
Sharing of relevant information between managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ Is important information shared among all managers or only between some of them? ➔ Are there obligations to share certain types of information among managers? If not, is information shared in informal ways? ➔ How is information compiled and archived? How is information made available to all managers?
Alignment of policies and plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ Are the most important policies and plans in alignment, or do they overlap and sometimes contradict one another? ➔ Are there clear rules and procedures as to how the management plan for the property and any existing buffer zone(s) is to be integrated into and/or align with all other planning instruments? ➔ When different managers develop policies and plans that will affect the management of the property, are other managers consulted about their content? Is it a requirement to at least consult with the manager with the primary responsibility for the World Heritage property, from a heritage perspective? ➔ When there are conflicts between policies and plans produced by different managers, is it clear which policy or plan has primacy?
Coordination – ability to work together in a planned and organised way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ Are there formal or informal protocols or agreements to support coordination between managers? ➔ Is there a clear understanding of the areas where the roles and interests of different managers are aligned and where there may be potential conflict? ➔ Who has the primary responsibility to ensure coordination and continuing dialogue among all managers?
Collaboration – ability to work together based on shared objectives, joint projects and planning and monitoring mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➔ Is there a clear understanding among managers of the difference between consultation, collaboration and information sharing? ➔ What are the ways in which managers collaborate? ➔ Are there clear, common and agreed upon management objectives for the property or other heritage place? Have all managers committed to implement the agreed objectives? ➔ Are there agreed processes and practices for identifying, planning and implementing joint projects? ➔ Are there agreed processes and practices for monitoring the state of conservation of the property and management effectiveness evaluation?

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 4C

Effective management requires the active engagement of rights-holders in decision-making processes and other management processes. While Worksheets 4a and 4b analyse the relationships between managers, Worksheet 4c examines the level of engagement of rights-holders in the management of the property and any existing buffer zone(s).

The use of Worksheet 4c is dependent on the prior identification of different rights-holder groups involved with the property and any existing buffer zone(s), usually through what is called a ‘stakeholder analysis’. However, note that a stakeholder analysis is normally undertaken for all actors involved with the property, including managers, to describe the interest and influence of each actor. The focus of Worksheet 4c is on rights-holders and their engagement in the management of the property. Remember that rights-holders with socially recognized responsibilities for managing the property (or parts of it) should have been identified as managers (Worksheet 4a). To be recognized as managers, it is important that the responsibilities of any rights-holder group(s) are acknowledged by other actors. As managers, rights-holders are accountable for fulfilling their custodial and/or legal responsibilities related to the management of the property or other heritage place.

Completing Worksheet 4c requires an in-depth (not a generalized) understanding of different groups of rights-holders – both within the property and its buffer zone(s). For instance, in a cultural landscape, rights-holders can include Indigenous peoples and local communities with customary rights, as well as landowners, business owners or religious groups with legal rights. Each group can have a different relationship with the cultural landscape and its attributes, and therefore different expectations and needs related to its management. It is useful to recognize the diversity among each rights-holder group, including age, gender and levels of authority. Therefore, to complete Worksheet 4c comprehensively, you will need to reflect on your level of knowledge about each rights-holder group.

Where your knowledge of a rights-holder group is inadequate (which may become apparent when completing Worksheet 4a), then leave the column for that group blank; that is, complete the rows and columns only for the rights-holder groups for whom you have sufficient knowledge. You should then note in the ‘Gaps and challenges’ and ‘Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up action’ rows the need for a detailed rights-holder identification or analysis.

The worksheet is presented in the form of a matrix, with different rights-holder groups listed on the top of each column, and with rows containing a series of questions for each identified group. Although this worksheet is structured in the form of a questionnaire (since you need to respond to the same questions for each different group), it is essential that you draw overall conclusions from your analysis of the information in the worksheet. To help you with this task, you will find a list of reflection questions below.

If it is helpful to your understanding of management effectiveness, you can also complete the worksheet for stakeholder groups. However, if you do so, some of the questions in Worksheet 4c may need to be adapted. Note that in certain situations, some stakeholders may have considerable power over the management of the property (or parts of it), even though they do not have socially recognized responsibilities or rights to do so.

Reflection questions:

- Have all rights-holder groups been identified? Are the rights of each group well understood?
- Are the rights of different groups respected by all managers? Are customary rights respected to the same extent as legal rights?
- Is the practice of some customary rights in conflict with the management objectives for the property?
- How is power distributed among (and within) different rights-holder groups? Do some groups have more power than others?
- Do rights-holder practices positively contribute to the protection and management of the property?
- Are the needs of rights-holders effectively addressed within the management system for the property? If yes, are the benefits provided by the World Heritage property shared equitably and/or fairly between different groups? If not, what are the main conflicts that need to be addressed?
- Are the effects of management on rights-holders positive, or at least neutral?
- Are all rights-holder groups engaged in the management of the property, or do some feel excluded?

Worksheet 4a. Assessment of roles and responsibilities of managers

Group or institution recognized as managers	Specific role, mandate and responsibilities to manage the property	Key instruments and powers at the managers' disposal to implement mandate	Extent of involvement in the decision-making processes	Comments/ explanation
<i>List the name of the institution or group in this column</i>	<i>Describe briefly the specific role(s)/ mandate(s)/responsibilities for managing the property and buffer zone</i>	<i>Record the specific legal, regulatory or customary instruments at the managers' disposal; briefly summarize the managers' key powers</i>	<i>Record the extent to which the manager is in charge of developing, coordinating and taking decisions about the management of the property and buffer zone</i>	
Analysis and conclusions				
Gaps and challenges				
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions				

Worksheet 4b. Assessment of coordination and collaboration between managers

Aspects/themes	Strengths	Challenges	Comments/Explanation
Existence of platforms, agreements, contracts, procedures and financial resources for coordination and collaboration			
Sharing of relevant information between managers			
Alignment of related policies and plans			
Coordination – ability to work together in a planned and organized way			
Collaboration – ability to work together based on shared objectives, joint projects and planning and monitoring mechanisms			
Analysis and conclusions			
Gaps and challenges			
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions			

Worksheet 4c. Assessment of rights-holders' engagement in management

Question	<i>Insert name of rights-holder group</i>	<i>Insert name of rights-holder group</i>	<i>Insert name of rights-holder group</i>	Comments/ Explanation
1. What are the main issues affecting the group?				
2. To what extent is the group aware of its rights (including rights over certain heritage resources and their use), obligations or influence in relation to the property and its buffer zone(s)?				
3. How and to what extent are the group's rights and knowledge recognized and respected by managers, as well as by other rights-holder groups?				
4. What are the nature and extent of any negative effects on the property's attributes, authenticity and integrity deriving from this group's interaction with the property?				
5. Does the management of the property and its buffer zone(s) negatively affect or undermine the group's practices or beliefs (including access to resources)? If yes, what are the negative effects on this group?				
6. What is the nature and extent of any positive effects of the group and its practices on the property's attributes, authenticity and integrity?				
7. What are the direct benefits generated from the property to the group? To what extent is the group dependent on the property for economic or other benefits?				
8. What is the group's willingness and capacity to participate in decision-making processes regarding the management of property and its buffer zone(s)? Under what terms or conditions?				

Worksheet 4c. Assessment of rights-holders' engagement in management

Question	<i>Insert name of rights-holder group</i>	<i>Insert name of rights-holder group</i>	<i>Insert name of rights-holder group</i>	Comments/ Explanation
9. What is the group's relative political or cultural leverage or influence on the management of the property and its buffer zone(s)?				
10. How and to what degree is the group organized regarding engagement with and participation in management? Are there specific mechanisms that facilitate the group's engagement?				
11. Describe the nature and extent to which the group contributes to decision-making in relation to site management. Are there formal or informal management agreements or arrangements in place in this regard?				
12. Describe the actual engagement of the group in the management of the property.				
13. Based on the information above, provide a brief overview of the group's engagement with, and capacity to participate in, the governance and management of the property.				
Analysis and conclusions				
Gaps and challenges				
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions				



TOOL 5. LEGAL, REGULATORY AND CUSTOMARY FRAMEWORK

This tool assesses how legislation, regulations and customary rules support or hinder the protection and management of the World Heritage property or other heritage place.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE TOOL:

- a) To review how the combination of various policy, legal, regulatory and customary **instruments**, at different levels, influences the protection and management of the property.
- b) To understand whether the **legal framework** provides clear and sufficient provisions for the protection and management of the property and its buffer zone(s).
- c) To assess whether international obligations and commitments are effectively incorporated into national policy and legislation, and whether there is adequate government support to implement such obligations.
- d) To assess capacity to promote compliance and implement enforcement measures in accordance with relevant legislation, regulations and traditional mechanisms and rules.
- e) To identify ways to reinforce and strengthen the legal framework and its implementation.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Every country uses a variety of instruments to identify, protect, conserve and manage World Heritage properties and other heritage places. These instruments range from constitutional provisions and legislation to unwritten rules and traditions passed down from generation to generation (see Box 5.4). Whatever their type(s), these instruments form an essential part of the management system for a World Heritage property or other heritage place. Therefore, it is important to understand whether they are adequate to ensure the long-term protection of the property, whether they are being effectively enforced and implemented, and whether they are sufficiently well known to – and applied by – the managers who draw their mandates from them (Worksheet 4a).

To facilitate the guidance for this tool, the term ‘legal framework’ is used beyond its strict definition in relation to statutory and customary law, and refers to the combination of legal, regulatory, customary and policy instruments that apply to a World Heritage property or other heritage place. In some circumstances, it can be difficult to distinguish between legal instruments (Tool 5) and planning instruments (see Tool 6, which examines the effectiveness of the management planning framework). For instance, some instruments may be relevant to both Tool 5 and Tool 6, as many plans have legal status, and are therefore both legal and planning instruments.

Tool 5 has two main purposes:

1. To assess the adequacy of the legal framework to effectively manage the World Heritage property and its buffer zone(s). **Worksheet 5a** aims to understand how different instruments support and influence the protection and management of the property at different levels (e.g. international, national and local). This review includes instruments directly concerning heritage protection, as well other legal, regulatory or customary provisions that may affect the protection and management of the property (e.g. land use, industrial or agricultural development, mining, tourism and taxation). It also helps to identify those aspects of the legal framework that could be improved and how any such improvements can be realistically implemented in the short and medium term.
2. To review whether the instruments are effectively applied and consistently enforced, and to determine the main challenges related to compliance and implementation (**Worksheet 5b**).



The aim here is not to critique the different instruments but to evaluate how they support or impede management of the property, how (and if) they are applied, and how they help managers address and respond to the factors affecting the property. Such an analysis can raise sensitive issues. Therefore, be aware and clear about these from the start and be willing to discuss them in open, collaborative and respectful ways.



Box 5.4. Types of legal, regulatory and policy instruments

People and institutions use a variety of legal, regulatory, customary and policy instruments to exercise their rights, make decisions and assume their responsibilities in managing a World Heritage property or other heritage place. These include:

- **International conventions, recommendations and other treaties** for the protection of culture and nature in general, and cultural and natural heritage in particular, that lead to commitments, obligations and responsibilities by the State Parties that accept or ratify these instruments. Some of these obligations and responsibilities need to be transcribed into national legislation in order to be fulfilled and implemented. These types of instruments also include guidance on how State Parties are to implement these treaties such as the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.
- **National legislation and other legal provisions** that have legal force – recognized in statutory law – such as constitutional provisions, acts, decrees or executive orders. Each country will have a different hierarchy of legal instruments in place. They include supporting subsidiary instruments – such as regulations, rules and other instruments with legal effect.
- **Traditional and customary rules and practices** of Indigenous peoples and local communities including practices, processes, traditions, rules of conduct, land-use mechanisms and restrictions on resource use that are dependent on local knowledge and skills. These types of instruments contribute to the protection and management of the property or other heritage place, although they may not always align with legislation and legal provisions.
- **Policies, strategies and related plans** are typically defined in a distinct policy statement and/or in national strategies and action plans (e.g. cultural strategies, sustainable development strategies, biodiversity strategies, national energy strategies, urban development strategies, national adaptation plans for climate change).
- **Financial mechanisms**, usually under the jurisdiction of other legal instruments, related to financial incentives. For example, reduction in property taxes, tax incentives or payments to property owners to promote conservation action or the ability of management institutions to retain tourism and entry fees for conservation use.

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 5A

Each World Heritage property or heritage place has its own legal framework, usually involving a specific combination and variety of instruments. Worksheet 5a helps you gain an overview of the various instruments that apply and how they are related. This is done by listing all the relevant instruments and recording their main purpose in, and influence on, the management system of the property and any existing buffer zone(s).

You should complete this worksheet in detail the first time that you carry out a management effectiveness assessment. In future assessments, it may be sufficient to update or slightly revise parts of the worksheet; generally, legal instruments are rarely amended or replaced. On the other hand, the worksheet also addresses traditional and customary practices, which can evolve and change, so these aspects will need to be carefully reviewed in future assessments.

Table 5.2 provides a series of questions to help you reach conclusions regarding different types of instruments, and identify the key issues that need attention. For instance, certain instruments may work against or challenge efforts to protect and manage the World Heritage property or other heritage place. Therefore, the last column of Worksheet 5a should draw conclusions on how different instruments interact, and how the legal framework functions as a whole. If a specific instrument poses particular challenges, then make clear the ways in which it does this. Do not forget to identify desired follow-up actions, even if some of those actions are beyond the managers' mandates (e.g. amendments to legislation). In such cases, you can frame actions in relation to how the manager(s) can work with other actors to balance legal requirements and effective implementation of management objectives.

Table 5.2. Questions to consider when completing Worksheet 5a.

Type of instrument	Questions to consider
International conventions, recommendations and treaties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Are the commitments and responsibilities assumed by the country under relevant conventions and treaties ratified by the government reflected in national laws? ➤ Are the principles and obligations of the conventions and treaties relevant to the property familiar to and understood by managers?
Heritage-specific legislation and regulations for the management of the property and any buffer zone(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ How adequate is the heritage legislation for identifying different categories of heritage (e.g. traditional human settlements, cultural landscapes, industrial or twentieth-century heritage)? ➤ Does the legislation include mechanisms to effectively implement the requirements of that legislation, or is it complemented by other instruments detailing how the law is to be implemented, such as policies, regulations or decrees? ➤ Does the legislation include the concept of a buffer zone? If not, does it include provisions to identify and protect the areas surrounding each World Heritage property or heritage place? ➤ Does the legislation include clear directives for coordination and relative authority between different institutions and with other types of legislation (e.g. planning law)? Do the directives work to benefit heritage? ➤ Does the legislation include provisions for devolving or decentralizing decision-making authority and resource allocation in order to facilitate governance at the site level? ➤ Are there provisions to enable the formal establishment of co-management agreements with other government agencies, NGOs, public or private entities, local communities and Indigenous peoples? ➤ Does the legislation include requirements for impact assessments? ➤ Does the law provide for clear and specific sanctions for non-compliance?
Other legislation and regulations for managing the property, its buffer zone(s) and the wider setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Does the legal framework include provisions for free, prior and informed consent, environmental justice, public participation and the Precautionary Principle? ➤ What is the relative strength of legislation dealing with cultural and natural heritage in comparison to other legislation (e.g. development, energy, transportation)? ➤ Does the legal framework ensure that the protection of World Heritage properties takes priority over other interests?
Policies and strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Is heritage a high priority in the legal and policy framework? What are the main competing interests? ➤ Have efforts been made to integrate and harmonize heritage protection across the legal and policy framework (e.g. in relation to the environment, resource extraction, infrastructure development and tourism)? ➤ Are there government policies and strategies that work against or undermine the protection of the values of the property?

Table 5.2. Questions to consider when filling in Worksheet 5a

Type of instrument	Questions to consider
Customary rules and practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Does legislation and policy enable rights-holder and local communities to access the property and its resources without detriment to the protection of the values of the property? If not, what are the impediments to this happening? ➤ Does the legal framework recognize customary knowledge and traditional management systems? Does the framework include provision to recognize Indigenous peoples and local communities as legal entities and to enter into co-management agreements? ➤ Do the customary rules and practices include mechanisms to effectively participate in and implement co-management agreements? ➤ Are there customary rules and practices that work against or undermine the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property? ➤ Are traditional custodians and/or rights-holder groups with socially recognized responsibilities for managing certain heritage resources formally recognized as managers? If so, are there mechanisms to support and strengthen their capacity to participate and to fulfil customary responsibilities?
Financial mechanisms, incentives and disincentives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Are there clear legal instruments ensuring that government fulfils its responsibilities for the protection and management of World Heritage properties? If yes, are such legal instruments integrated into either heritage-specific legislation or separate instruments? ➤ Are there financial mechanisms to support rights-holders in caring for the heritage resources for which they have rights and private responsibilities? ➤ Are there financial instruments, including incentives or disincentives, that negatively affect the short- or long-term protection and management of the property?
Instruments affecting rights-holders engagement in management and sharing of benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Are there legislative provisions that incorporate public consultation and participation in management planning or other management processes? ➤ Are there legal provisions for government to consult, collaborate and/or cooperate with Indigenous peoples in management processes and practices? Does this include the requirement to obtain free, prior and informed consent? ➤ Are there legislative provisions or policies to meaningfully engage local communities and rights-holders in the protection and management of heritage places? ➤ Are there legislative or policy arrangements concerning benefit sharing among managers and rights-holders?

Reflection questions:

- Is the legal designation of the property at the national level adequate in relation to its Outstanding Universal Value? For example, if the property is inscribed on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape, is that category recognized in national legislation?
- Is the entire property covered under that same legal designation? If not, what challenges arise?
- In general, is the legal framework adequate to protect the property in the long term? Are the different instruments that make up that legal framework well integrated?
- Is the legal framework adequate to manage any existing buffer zone(s) in relation to the values of the property?
- Does the legal framework facilitate effective management, or does it contain laws, policies and/or regulations that hinder or obstruct management?
- Are there inconsistencies or differences between the heritage-specific rules and regulations and those included in other instruments? If yes, can the provisions and practices in non-heritage-specific instruments negatively affect the protection and management of the property?
- Are legal instruments compatible with and supportive of customary rules and practices?
- Is the legal framework adequate to ensure engagement and participation of rights-holders in the governance and management of the property and its buffer zone(s)?
- What aspects of the legal framework could be improved? Which of these aspects are within the mandate of managers or can be influenced by them?

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 5B

Often, challenges arise from the implementation of the instruments, rather than from the instruments themselves. This worksheet helps you assess whether the main legal and customary instruments for the protection and management of the property and its buffer zone(s) are effectively applied and enforced, as well as identify the main challenges to compliance. Therefore, to complete Worksheet 5b, select the key instruments (from those listed in Worksheet 5a) that guide management from a heritage perspective; and especially those that stipulate what uses and activities are permitted (or not) within the property and its buffer zone(s). Also, include in your selection those instruments that can help address the most important factors affecting the property – as identified in Tool 2.

Effective control of uses and activities depends on a combination of awareness, voluntary application of rules and regulations, incentives, and consistent enforcement of laws and regulations. If rules and regulations are complicated or unclear and/or implementing them is costly, then people will be reluctant to comply with them. There are many ways to promote compliance – for example, making rules and regulations clear and understandable and by communicating them widely (including through information campaigns or running programmes to change behaviours). Financial incentives through tax cuts, incentives and subsidies can also encourage compliance.

When people do not voluntarily comply with the rules, or are reluctant to respect them, then governments and/or managers require mechanisms to enforce them. It can be better to promote compliance rather than relying on the threat of prosecution and punishment. Enforcing rules and regulations requires capacity to police illegal activities and enforce penalties.

Worksheet 5a. Assessment of legal framework

Instruments	Name of instrument	Brief description of the instrument	Main actor responsible for implementation	Key issues/comments
International conventions, recommendations and treaties				
Heritage-specific legislation and regulations for the management of the property and any buffer zone(s)				
Other legislation and regulations for managing the property, its buffer zone(s) and the wider setting				
Policies and strategies				
Customary rules and practices				
Financial mechanisms, incentives and disincentives				
Instruments affecting rights-holders' engagement in management and sharing of benefits				
Analysis and conclusions				
Gaps and challenges				
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions				

Worksheet 5b. Assessment of compliance and enforcement of legal framework

Question	Response/Explanation	Opportunities and recommendations
Knowledge and clarity of the rules		
<p>1. Are rules clear with regard to actions/practices/conducts that are prohibited within the property and any buffer zone(s)?</p>		
<p>2. Are those rules clearly communicated (e.g. through publications or online platforms) to those required to comply with them? In the case of traditional systems, are customary rules and prohibitions known, understood and respected?</p>		
Acceptance, compliance and prevention		
<p>3. Is significant effort (i.e., administratively, financially, technically) required to comply with the rules and legal requirements?</p>		
<p>4. If rules and legal requirements are numerous and complex, are there mechanisms to help people understand them? For instance, has information about it been published and widely distributed? Is there regular awareness-raising on illegal activities?</p>		
<p>5. Are there incentives (e.g. tax reductions, subsidies or technical and professional support) to help people to comply with the legal and regulatory requirements?</p>		

Worksheet 5b. Assessment of compliance and enforcement of legal framework

Question	Response/Explanation	Opportunities and recommendations
Acceptance, compliance and prevention		
6. Can people easily contact the management authorities issuing or enforcing rules to clarify doubts about what is permitted and what is not?		
7. Do local communities help with compliance and prevention activities?		
Enforcement powers and coordination between actors		
8. Do managers have the legal mandate to enforce all or parts of the legal and customary framework (e.g. by imposing sanctions or financial penalties), or do they rely on other institutions or actors to do so?		
9. If different actors are responsible for enforcing the rules and legal requirements, is the mandate and jurisdiction of each actor clear?		
10. When collaboration is needed to enforce laws and regulations, are there clear procedures for collaboration between actors? Are those procedures respected?		

Worksheet 5b. Assessment of compliance and enforcement of legal framework

Question	Response/Explanation	Opportunities and recommendations
Enforcement capacity		
11. Do actors with enforcement powers have adequate authority to implement their mandate? Are those actors adequately financed? If not, is corruption an issue?		
12. Is it straightforward to detect non-compliance and illegal activities? Are there inspections, patrols and surveillance methods in place? Do local communities contribute in this regard?		
13. Are there sufficient technical and financial resources to adequately enforce laws (i.e., inspections, patrols and surveillance methods)?		
Penalties		
14. If non-compliance or illegal activities are detected, are legal procedures consistently applied? Is there a coherent and systematically applied law enforcement process used by public authorities (including judiciary) to enforce penalties?		
15. Are penalties systematically imposed after detection of non-compliance or illegal activities?		
16. How effective have penalties and legal procedures been as a deterrent for re-occurrence of breaches and offences?		
Analysis and conclusions		
Gaps and challenges		
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions		



TOOL 6. MANAGEMENT PLANNING FRAMEWORK

This tool helps you to build an overview of the effectiveness of the planning framework and assesses whether the management plan or other main planning instrument is adequate for guiding the management of the property.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE TOOL:

- a) To review how different planning instruments – at various organizational levels and geographic scales – influence the protection and management of the World Heritage property or other heritage place and its buffer zone(s).
- b) To understand whether different plans specific to the property are well integrated in relation to wider planning instruments.
- c) To assess the adequacy of the management plan or other planning instrument used to guide the management of the property.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Most World Heritage properties are subject to a variety of plans, especially if they cover large areas – such as natural protected areas, cultural landscapes or urban settlements. These plans are typically developed by different institutions and apply to different geographical areas, spatial scales and administrative zones. Even at the property level, a variety of plans may exist – such as the management plan, the conservation plan, the disaster risk management plan or the invasive species management plan. As a result, these plans may overlap, without alignment of provisions within them. In some situations, the provisions included in one plan can contradict or counter measures included in another.

This tool identifies and reviews the plans that apply to the property, its buffer zone(s) and its wider setting; and how effective the **planning framework** is for the protection and management of the property. Among these different plans, the management plan for the property plays a central role. Note that for some properties, this plan may have a different name (e.g. conservation plan, safeguarding plan). Worksheet 6a focuses on the planning framework relevant to the World Heritage property or other heritage place.

The existence of a management plan or similar planning instrument is not in itself a guarantee that adequate planning processes exist and are effective. For example, the management plan may be out of date, inadequate in terms of content and quality, or is not implemented. Worksheet 6b helps you analyse the adequacy of the management plan or similar primary planning instrument, in terms of:

- Its scope and integration within the wider planning framework.
- Clarity and practicality of what is to be achieved within a defined time-frame and available resources.
- Relevance of the desired outcomes and planned actions in relation to the values of the property, the management objectives and the factors affecting the property.
- How the implementation of the plan is to be monitored and evaluated.

If no management plan or similar planning instrument exists, then you will not be able to complete Worksheet 6b. Instead, discuss why there is no plan, what type of plan is needed and what work must be done to develop an effective plan. You can use the last rows of this worksheet to document your conclusions and follow-up actions, while leaving the rest of the worksheet blank. For serial properties, in addition to the management plan, you will also need an overarching management planning framework (sometimes termed a ‘strategy’) to harmonize the management of all component parts, particularly if these component parts lie in different jurisdictions.

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 6A

Planning frameworks may vary considerably depending on the type and size of the World Heritage property or heritage place. For example, a single monument will likely be subject to fewer plans than an urban settlement or a large nature reserve. This worksheet gathers information about the extent and complexity of the planning framework and will help you analyse how different plans influence and support the protection and management of the property. It also helps you to understand the hierarchy between plans, including in relation to their scope, time-frame and legal status. This will provide a good basis for determining if the management plan, or main planning instrument, is well integrated within the planning framework (which is relevant to completing Worksheet 6b).

Worksheet 6a is structured in a similar way to Worksheet 5a (Legal, regulatory and customary framework). In general, the planning framework is less extensive in scope than the legal framework; that is, provincial, regional and local level plans will most likely be the focus of your analysis – see Figure 3.2 for a typical planning framework. While the worksheet requires you to focus on plans that guide or profoundly influence the management of the property, you should not exclude broader plans, since some of them may include elements that could significantly affect the property (e.g. the construction of an airport or other major infrastructure).

For each plan, draw a short conclusion in the final column (‘Main issues/comments’) on: i) how that plan influences the protection and management of the World Heritage property or other heritage place; ii) how that plan relates to or influences the management plan for the property and its buffer zone(s); and iii) any issues that arise from the content and implementation of the plan. Using the reflection questions below, in the last three rows of the worksheet you should develop overall conclusions about the adequacy of the planning framework, and identify the follow-up actions needed. When developing your conclusions, it is important to consider in some detail the links between the management plan or primary planning instrument for the property and the other plans.

Reflection questions:

- Is it clear which is the main planning instrument that guides the management of the property? Is it called a management plan (or does it have an equivalent title)?
- Is the management plan well integrated with those other planning instruments that influence the management of the property (including plans with a broad territorial scope, such as a land-use plan, regional tourism plan or a master plan)?
- If discrepancies exist between the provisions included in the management plan and those in other plans, is it clear that the provisions in the management plan should prevail?
- Is the overall planning framework adequate to effectively manage the property?
- Is the planning framework adequate to effectively manage any existing buffer zone(s)?
- What aspects of the planning framework could be improved? Which of these aspects are within the mandate of managers responsible for the property or can be influenced by them?

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 6B

This worksheet examines the adequacy of the management plan for the property and its buffer zone(s). In principle, the management plan should be the primary planning instrument that guides the management of a World Heritage property or other heritage place. Sometimes the management plan can have an alternative title (e.g. conservation plan, safeguarding plan).

The management plan should be prepared on the basis of comprehensive management planning processes. The context and nature of management plans can vary considerably, depending on the type of property. The management plan will also depend on the characteristics of the property's management system. In some cases, there will be a formal management plan, approved by a relevant authority; in others, the plan may be less formal and exist as a guiding document. Properties with traditional management systems often do not have written management plans, but can have alternative planning instruments and/or processes. While management plans are not mandatory for World Heritage properties, they are (or should be) a crucial element of any effective management system.

Worksheet 6b is structured as a questionnaire to help you evaluate the adequacy of the management plan. As such, the main focus of the worksheet is on the structure, presentation and content of the plan. Issues related to adequacy of the management planning processes will be analysed in more detail in Tool 8 ('Management processes'). Tool 9 ('Implementing management measures') then helps you assess whether the plan is being effectively implemented. Where there is no management plan or equivalent planning instrument, the use of Tools 8 and 9 is likely to be limited.

Worksheet 6a. Assessment of management planning framework

Name of plan	Territorial scope of plan	Level of approval*	Year of finalizing instrument or last review	Year of starting implementation	Year specified for completing implementation or next review	Brief description of plan	Main issues/comments

* L = plan has force of law

G = plan has been approved by government but is not a legal instrument

O = plan has been approved but is not recognized as an official instrument by government

SA = plan has been finalized but has not been formally approved or is not being implemented

D = plan is a draft

E = plan has officially expired but it is still used

Analysis and conclusions

Gaps and challenges

Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions

Worksheet 6b. Assessment of primary planning instrument

Name of planning instrument assessed:

Question	Response	Opportunities and recommendations
Legislative, statutory and other requirements		
1. Is the plan a legal or statutory requirement?		
2. Is the time-frame/lifespan of the plan mandated by legislation or another statutory instruments? If not, how is the time-frame determined? Is the time-frame adequate?		
3. Are the actors responsible for developing and implementing the plan clearly identified in legislation or other statutory instruments? If not, is it clear who is responsible for developing the plan and how? What implications does this have for the preparation, content and implementation of the plan?		
4. Does the plan enshrine participatory processes? Is public consultation, including public exhibition of the draft plan, a legal requirement?		
5. Is the approval process clear, including about who needs to be involved? Is that process relatively straightforward, or is it complex and time-consuming, potentially delaying the implementation of the plan?		

Worksheet 6b. Assessment of primary planning instrument

Question	Response	Opportunities and recommendations
Planning context and integration with other planning instruments		
6. Are there specific funding resources available for the development of the plan, or is preparing the plan dependent on extraordinary funding (e.g. through donors' grants)?		
7. Is the purpose and scope of the plan clearly defined in relation to the overall planning framework? Does the plan adequately acknowledge and accommodate the requirements of World Heritage (e.g. maintain OUV)?		
8. Is the plan harmonized and integrated with other planning instruments that influence the management of the World Heritage property or heritage place?		
9. Was the plan developed through a process of co-creation (i.e., did it involve all managers responsible for its implementation)?		
10. Were rights-holders and key stakeholders involved in developing the plan? Were their contributions incorporated into the plan?		
Presentation and content of the plan		
11. Is the plan available in local language(s)? Is it easily accessible to rights-holders, stakeholders and the general public?		
12. Is the plan well-presented and written in plain and clear language? Is the plan easily understood by those required to implement it, (i.e. skilled workers, technical specialists and senior level administrators alike)?		

Worksheet 6b. Assessment of primary planning instrument

Question	Response	Opportunities and recommendations
Presentation and content of the plan		
13. Is the plan respectful of and consistent with customs and traditions of rights-holders that support the protection and conservation of the property and its buffer zone(s)?		
14. Is the plan based on an adequate and relevant information base, including traditional knowledge, if appropriate?		
15. Does the content of the plan provide clear direction for the overall management of the property? Is the plan's content clear when it is to be implemented by multiple managers?		
16. Are the values and management objectives of the property or heritage place clearly identified in the plan? Are they linked to desired outcomes and specified time-frames?		
17. Does the plan establish desired outcomes for the management of the property, or does it only specify actions?		
18. Does the plan establish desired outcomes related to sustainable development and benefits for rights-holders and local communities? Do any of these desired outcomes conflict with or undermine the protection of the values of the property?		

Worksheet 6b: Assessment of primary planning instrument

Question	Response	Opportunities and recommendations
Presentation and content of the plan		
<p>19. Does the plan include information about the factors affecting the property? Do the desired outcomes and identified management actions clearly relate to those factors?</p>		
<p>20. Do the desired outcomes and management actions specified in the plan provide an adequate response to the most important and urgent factors affecting the property?</p>		
Resources, commitment and implementation capacity		
<p>21. Is there political and institutional will to implement the plan? Is this the case if the plan is not a legal instrument? Is this the case if the plan is to be implemented by different managers?</p>		
<p>22. Does the plan include a well-defined programme of actions? Does each action have a stated time-frame and priority, allocated funding and clear identification of responsibility for its implementation?</p>		
<p>23. Is that programme of actions realistic in terms of time-frame and human and financial capacity? Can the programme of actions be easily translated into annual (or multi-year) workplans?</p>		

Worksheet 6b: Assessment of primary planning instrument

Question	Response	Opportunities and recommendations
Monitoring and review		
24. Does the plan provide for a process of monitoring and review during the life of the plan?		
25. Does the plan include indicators or other means of assessing how desired outcomes are being achieved, or is it based only on a list of actions implemented and outputs produced?		
26. Does the plan require an evaluation to be undertaken before revising or drafting a new plan? Is this a legal requirement? If a final evaluation is required, have the necessary time and resources been factored into the current plan?		
27. Does the management cycle allow sufficient time to develop and approve a new plan before the time-frame of the previous plan ends?		
Analysis and conclusions		
Gaps and challenges		
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions		



TOOL 7. NEEDS AND INPUTS

This tool assesses whether current human capacity and financial, material and technological resources are adequate to effectively manage the property.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE TOOL:

- a) To understand whether or not a comprehensive needs assessment has been undertaken to determine the **inputs** required to effectively manage the property – and create a benchmark to assess needs against current resources.
- b) To assess existing human capacity and competences compared to needs.
- c) To assess current levels of funding compared to needs, and the security of that funding.
- d) To assess the adequacy of infrastructure, equipment, facilities and information systems compared to needs.
- e) To assess whether there are sufficient resources to effectively manage the property and whether those resources are being used in the most efficient manner.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Inputs (or resources) are the ‘fuel’ for the management system of a World Heritage property or other heritage place. To assess the adequacy of existing resources – human capacity, funding, facilities, equipment and information systems – you will need to understand:

- the level of resources required;
- the extent to which these resources are available; and
- whether existing resources are being used in the most effective and efficient way.

The level, adequacy and consistency of resources available will significantly influence the ability to effectively manage the property and any existing buffer zone(s). However, not all issues arise from a lack of sufficient resources – they can relate to how resources are allocated compared to management needs, or from the quality of the resources. For instance, staff numbers may be appropriate overall, but people may not have the correct competences, and/or may lack institutional support to apply some of the competences they have.

Tool 7 requires you to look at the availability and adequacy of resources across the management system for the World Heritage property or other heritage place. Therefore, how you use this tool and related worksheets depends on the complexity of the governance arrangements for the property and the number of managers involved. The work undertaken for Worksheet 4a, on the identification of managers, provides a good basis for the use of Tool 7. If several managers are responsible for the property and any existing buffer zone(s), it can be best to, first, understand the resources available for each manager and, second, assemble and evaluate all the resources available. That is, you need to assess both the adequacy of the resources available to each manager and collectively for the whole management system. This collective view is important because, in some situations, resource gaps identified for one manager can be filled by making better use of the resources available to another manager.

In addition, in order to fully understand whether existing resources available to each manager are adequate or not, you need to establish what level of resources is enough for them to effectively carry out their responsibilities. This is not a simple task: it requires what is usually called a ‘needs assessment’ to establish a benchmark against which available resources can then be compared.

Resource needs, at the level of each manager and collectively, can fluctuate over time, depending on the state of conservation of the property and the factors affecting it. A World Heritage property with no major threats can operate with a certain level of resources, but if those threats increase, more resources will be needed. Differing levels of resources may also be needed seasonally, for example corresponding to high visitation periods.

Understanding resource needs requires you to draw on the analysis and findings of previous tools. For example, if in Tool 1 you concluded that a certain category of values is insufficiently recognized and documented, this may imply that staff competences are not well aligned with the values of the property, or there are no resources allocated to protect such values. Likewise, if in Tool 2 you identified factors that are negatively impacting on some attributes and those impacts are not currently being addressed (or are being insufficiently addressed), then more resources may be required, or existing resources may need to be re-prioritized and reallocated.

An estimation of what resources are needed should also be based on planning processes and what is to be achieved within the current and/or next management cycle. That is why Tool 7 is positioned immediately after you analyse the management planning framework, in Tool 6.

For these reasons, Tool 7 is structured around three worksheets:

- **Worksheet 7a** examines human capacity;
- **Worksheet 7b** assesses financial resources;
- **Worksheet 7c** examines the adequacy of material resources (infrastructure, facilities and equipment) and information systems.

Although the worksheets may seem straightforward to complete, in reality they can be challenging – particularly if a detailed needs assessment has not been undertaken beforehand.



If you are working with a World Heritage property with complex governance arrangements, involving many managers, you must first assess whether you have sufficient information to complete the worksheets associated with this Tool for each of the managers you identified in Worksheet 4a. If that is not the case, complete the worksheets only in relation to the managers with the most important roles and responsibilities.

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 7A

This worksheet looks at existent human capacity in terms of staff levels and composition, and their competences relative to those needed for managing the property. Note that the term ‘staff’ here is used in a broad sense and can include, for example, contractors and traditional custodians. Consider all types of staff categories, permanent and temporary, seasonal and voluntary. You should also consider staff who work exclusively on the management of the property or other heritage place, as well as people who only dedicate part of their employment time to it.

Staff numbers can vary considerably depending on the size and complexity of the World Heritage property. Consequently, it is best to analyse staff composition in terms of broad disciplinary expertise (e.g. archaeologists, biologists, architects, rangers) rather than necessarily listing individual staff positions. Consider also staff location; in some situations, staff who contribute to the management of the property may be located either on-site or in a different physical location.

To assess whether staff numbers and composition are adequate, you should understand the amount of work required and, accordingly, the number of staff positions needed. For example, if you have estimated that there is a need for five architects to effectively manage the property, but realise that there are only four such positions, then there is a human capacity shortfall. Alternatively, you may have five positions filled but only two staff members work full-time and three work part-time. Without such a benchmark for comparison, it is difficult to work out whether the existing human capacity is adequate.

Assessing staff numbers and composition should be relatively straightforward; assessing whether they have the necessary competences to do their jobs is more difficult and involves a degree of subjectivity. The worksheet enables you to establish whether existing staff competences are sufficient or not, based on a suggested scoring system. A more detailed assessment of staff competences can be undertaken using other tools (see Box 5.5).

Use the suggested reflection questions below to help you reach conclusions and identify what follow-up actions may be needed. The questions can be used for:

- A single manager, as in the case where there is a dedicated management agency responsible for most aspects of the management of the property and any existing buffer zone(s).
- Different managers, as in the case where several managers exist, and you undertake an assessment for each.
- The whole or collective management system, to build an overview of existing and required resources for all managers with responsibilities over the property and the buffer zone(s).

Reflection questions:

- Are staff numbers adequate to effectively manage the World Heritage property and any existing buffer zone(s)? If not, what are the main gaps and what are the reasons for those gaps?
- How can identified gaps be addressed? Can some of the gaps be addressed by strengthening collaboration between managers, or by strengthening the engagement of rights-holders in the management of the property?
- Is the balance between staff levels across different professional categories adequate to manage the property?
- Are the competences of the staff appropriate in relation to the values of the property?
- Do staff have the required competences to fulfil their roles and responsibilities? Are those competences aligned with current and future management demands? If not, what types of capacity building are required?
- If certain competences are only needed from time to time, are temporary staff and/or external consultants employed or engaged to address those needs?
- Is staff time being directed to the highest priority management actions, identified in Worksheet 2 ('Factors affecting the property')?



Box 5.5. Assessing competences and identifying priority needs for capacity development

What guidance is available to determine whether the staff of a World Heritage property or other heritage place have the necessary competences to adequately fulfil their roles? While needs will largely depend on the values, scale and complexity of the property, it is important that the heritage practitioners and other professionals engaged in planning and implementing management measures have the skills, knowledge and attitudes to carry out their work in accordance with current standards and good practice.

Two complementary publications offer guidance for managers to identify competences and needs for individual practitioners, as well as across organizations:

- The *Global Register of Competences for Protected Area Practitioners* (Appleton, 2016). Published by IUCN, the register details over 300 competences relevant to protected area management. The competences are classified into four job levels (executive, senior manager, middle manager/technical specialist, skilled worker), and arranged into 15 functional categories covering organizational management, applied protected area management and generic work-related skills.
- The *Competence Framework for Cultural Heritage Management: A Guide to the Essential Skills and Knowledge for Heritage Practitioners* (UNESCO Bangkok Office, 2021). This framework, based on the IUCN Register, provides benchmarks for professional practice in the cultural heritage sector. It defines four major groups of competences: core competences, managerial competences, personal competences and specialized technical competences. These four groups are further categorized into multiple specialized competences.

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 7B

Most managers of World Heritage properties, even in relatively wealthy countries, will argue that existing levels of funding are insufficient to effectively fulfil their mandates and responsibilities. Therefore, the main purpose of this worksheet is to assess i) whether the budget is sufficient to carry out high priority management actions and ii) whether existing financial resources are being effectively allocated. It is not the purpose of the worksheet to identify the ideal or 'perfect' level of funding, but to be realistic in terms of funding available to appropriately and effectively manage the property or other heritage place.

For properties managed by a single (or one main) manager – and with a dedicated budget aimed exclusively or primarily at the management of the property – completing this worksheet should be straightforward. However, in most cases, the management of World Heritage properties is dependent on a variety of funding sources, across multiple managers (identified and analysed in Worksheet 4a). This means that each manager will need to complete the worksheet individually before all managers collectively undertake an analysis and assessment of the financial resources across the whole management system.

For Worksheet 7b, data on funding will be most useful if it is categorized by management need, rather than types of expenditure, as this gives an indication of the directions and priorities of management. However, such financial information may be difficult to access. If that is the case, you can base the assessment on expenditure categories. Information included in the management plan and the annual (or multi-year) work plan or operational plans will help you assess funding needs against actual budgets. In completing the worksheet, take note of the period covered for different budget items, as this can vary between expenditure categories.

It can be challenging to complete Worksheet 7b in detail the first time you use it. However, you should not feel discouraged if you are only able to initially fill in certain sections. This is a worksheet that can be used on a frequent basis, e.g. annually (see Section 2.5 on when to use the Toolkit). Over multiple years of completing Worksheet 7b, you will be able to gather a fuller picture of the financial situation for the property. You may also gain valuable insights, such as long-term trends in budgetary allocations and actual expenditure – especially if analysed against the achievement of desired outcomes.

If completing this worksheet feels too challenging (e.g. because there is no management plan nor annual work plans specific to the management of the property), then use the reflection questions to help you identify the underlying reasons for this, including the challenges of obtaining accurate information on financial allocation and expenditure. You can then draw general conclusions on the adequacy of existing financial resources based on the professional experience of those involved in the assessment.



Be aware that some managers may be unable, and sometimes reluctant, to share information on financial resources. There can be many reasons for this, one being that the institution may have mandates that cover an area larger than the World Heritage property, making it difficult to calculate exactly what resources are allocated specifically to the management of the property.

People should be encouraged to disclose only the information they feel comfortable sharing with the other participants involved in the assessment. Remember that completing these worksheets should not be seen as a technical exercise but rather as an opportunity to improve aspects of the property's management system. When resources are scarce, looking for possible ways to combine efforts, as well as tap into alternative funding sources, can have a significant and positive effect.

Reflection questions:

- Is there a detailed needs assessment of the financial resources that are required for the effective management of the property – as a whole and in relation to each manager involved? If yes, is that assessment based on a thorough understanding of current and future management needs and linked to the high-priority management actions identified in Worksheet 2? If not, why not, and is it possible to undertake such a needs assessment?
- Do you systematically collect information on existing financial resources that would allow you to monitor changes in resource availability over time? Are you able to monitor how the use of financial resources is broken down into: i) staff costs; ii) routine management actions or operations; iii) project-based management actions or operations; and iv) emergency response management actions?
- Based on the information available and professional experience, do you consider that existing financial resources are sufficient to carry out the most important management needs? If not, what are the main funding gaps?
- Are existing sources of funding secure, and likely to remain so in the foreseeable future? If not, how is this affecting the ability to plan for continuing and future management measures and needs?
- Are there efforts to mobilize or raise funds beyond traditional funding sources?
- Are financial resources being allocated according to identified management priorities and in response to those critical factors impacting the attributes of the property?

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 7C

Worksheet 7c helps you assess the adequacy of resources with respect to infrastructure, facilities, equipment and information systems. These types of resources can easily be overlooked but are fundamental to staff doing their jobs well. Structured around a questionnaire, this worksheet offers a set of questions to help you gain a general understanding of i) the availability of these resources and ii) how they are used to support the management of the property.

Due to the increased use of constantly evolving technology, information management has become a critical tool to support planning, decision-making and monitoring. Modern technologies facilitate the collection of and access to high-quality data and large amounts of information. Such information can be easily shared between managers and, where appropriate, with relevant rights-holders and stakeholders. When human capacity and financial resources are limited, information systems can help perform tasks and provide access to information and knowledge that would be otherwise difficult and costly to collect and access. The collection of data, information and knowledge should not be seen as an end in itself, which is why information systems need to be designed to take into consideration limitations – such as human capacity to operate them and to ensure secure storage and regular backup. Therefore, when completing Worksheet 7c, you should reflect on the relationships between the use of all different types of resources identified and analysed.

Worksheet 7a. Assessment of human capacity

Staff category	Required number of staff	Current number of staff	Percentage of time dedicated to management of the property	Main competences required	Level of competences*	Comments/Explanation

* Very good: more than 75% of staff have at least basic- to medium-level competences to carry out activities required

Good: 50 to 75% of staff have at least basic- to medium-level competences to carry out activities required

Fair: between 25% and 50% of staff have at least basic- to medium-level competences to carry out activities required

Poor: less than 25% of staff have at least basic- to medium-level competences to carry out activities required

Analysis and conclusions	
Gaps and challenges	
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions	

Worksheet 7b. Assessment of financial resources

Management needs/ Expenditure categories	Budget required	Actual budget available	Period covered by actual budget	Funding source(s)	Comments/ Explanation
Analysis and conclusions					
Gaps and challenges					
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions					

Worksheet 7c. Assessment of other resources

Question	Answer	Opportunities and recommendations
Material resources (infrastructure, facilities and equipment)		
1. Are infrastructure and facilities (e.g. roads/access, fences, offices, personnel accommodation) adequate for the needs of the property?		
2. Are visitor and interpretation facilities (e.g. visitor centres, audio guides, etc.) adequate for the type of property and sufficient to communicate its values?		
3. Is the necessary equipment available to staff to adequately carry out their duties (e.g. vehicles, computers, software, phones, desks, drones, sensors, etc.)?		
4. Is equipment regularly maintained to avoid unnecessary and costly replacements?		

Worksheet 7c. Assessment of other resources

Question	Answer	Opportunities and recommendations
Information systems		
5. Are there adequate information systems to support knowledge storage, planning and decision-making (e.g. GIS, databases, etc.)?		
6. Are there adequate information systems (e.g. archives, inventories, GIS, databases, etc.) and equipment (e.g. drones, sensors, etc.) to monitor the state of conservation of the property?		
7. Is there sufficient expertise and technological capacity to effectively use existing information systems and maintain associated equipment?		
8. Is information and data adequately stored, secure and easily accessible? What measures are in place for culturally (and politically) sensitive data?		
Analysis and conclusions		
Gaps and challenges		
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions		



TOOL 8. MANAGEMENT PROCESSES

This tool assesses the adequacy of management processes by checking if there are relevant policies and procedures in place, and whether these are being implemented according to good practice and desired standards.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE TOOL:

- a) To review whether the rules and procedures guiding **management processes** are clear, and whether they are being followed.
- b) To identify how existing management processes can be improved, and whether additional management processes are required.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Management is about processes, or what is done in pursuit of defined objectives. How people go about doing things (i.e., the quality of those processes) can sometimes matter more than the results of the processes themselves. For example, are processes clear, informed and participatory, or are they unclear and decided by a few people on an ad hoc basis? At what point do management processes become widely accepted and implemented based on agreed rules and procedures?

The number, complexity and type of management processes can vary significantly between World Heritage properties. These processes can also overlap and be implemented at multiple levels, making them interconnected and hard to distinguish. Tool 8 helps you to explore the most critical processes for effectively managing a World Heritage property or other heritage place.

Management processes can be formal – based on policies, laws and regulations – or informal – based on traditions, cultural practices, social relationships and trust. In all cases, processes should be based on a range of accepted (written and unwritten) rules and procedures, so that everyone involved is aware of what each process involves, how it is implemented and what it is expected to deliver. Therefore, this tool assesses the efficiency and appropriateness of formal and informal management processes, where ‘efficiency’ is concerned with the ability to get things done in an agreed way, and ‘appropriateness’ is concerned with suitability with regard to the particular context of the World Heritage property or other heritage place.

Completing Tool 8 will help you to answer two basic questions:

- Are key management processes in place and are they based on clear and agreed rules, appropriate policies and procedures, and on good conservation practices?
- What aspects of existing management processes require review, and can they be improved to better manage the property?

The tool is structured around two worksheets:

- **Worksheet 8a** is a multiple-choice questionnaire, with each required response based on a rating system. This worksheet focuses on three main processes: decision-making, planning and community engagement. Your responses will enable you to assess whether good practices are being followed and implemented.
- **Worksheet 8b** is also structured as a questionnaire but each question requires a simple response. The processes included in this worksheet are as important as those in Worksheet 8a but are analysed in less detail because there are other methodologies that can help you further analyse these questions (Box 5.6).

The processes included in these worksheets are not exhaustive. Therefore, you can adapt the worksheets by adding additional questions and/or listing other processes that you consider important in relation to the management system you are working with. The majority of the processes listed in the worksheets are relevant to most World Heritage properties and other heritage places. However, if you feel that some questions are not relevant, they can be excluded from the worksheet, provided that you justify why.

The questions included in both Worksheets 8a and 8b are designed to give you an overview of the adequacy of the management processes. Where greater detail may be required for any one management process, you can use other existing resource materials (see Box 5.6).

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 8A

As mentioned above, the way in which decisions are made can be as important as who makes them. For example, are decisions made using transparent, inclusive processes, respectful of rights and according to agreed rules and procedures? Are rights-holders significantly affected by a decision given the opportunity to have their say about it? Decision-making processes are central to effective and equitable governance and management, as are management planning processes. Planning involves deciding on desired management outcomes, determining what actions and activities need to be undertaken in order to achieve those outcomes, defining time-frames, and allocating adequate resources.

Often, planning is reduced to the production of a management plan. However, planning is a process, so the adequateness of that process needs to be examined. While a management plan can be the main output of a planning process, it is equally important to consider how the plan was developed. The actual implementation of the plan often depends on the planning process behind it. In some situations, people may feel less committed to implement a plan that they did not contribute to developing. Implementation issues are dealt with in more detail in Tool 9.

Active and meaningful engagement of local communities and Indigenous peoples in the management of World Heritage properties and other heritage places depends on the processes in place that allow them to exercise their rights, contribute to decisions and benefit from conservation efforts. Participatory processes, in which communities share decision-making power and responsibility, while often complex, can reduce conflict and improve conservation outcomes.

Since Worksheet 8a offers a multiple-choice questionnaire and applies a rating system, it can be tempting to go through these questions quickly and without adequate reflection. Therefore, it is fundamental that you justify the reasons for each choice and that you complete the last two columns in detail. When examining the different processes, make sure that you establish the necessary links with previous tools – and in particular Tool 4 ('Governance arrangements') and Tool 6 ('Management planning framework').

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 8B

As mentioned previously, the types, complexity and extent of management processes can vary widely from one World Heritage property to another. Worksheet 8b complements Worksheet 8a but is more generic because it addresses other management processes that can be explored in more detail by other existing tools, such as the *Guidance and Toolkit on Impact Assessments (2022)* or the *Managing Disaster Risks for World Heritage (2010)* (Box 5.6).

Worksheet 8b also addresses what can be called ‘organizational processes linked to administrative functions’, which enable managers to fulfil their responsibilities. Other processes, such as visitor management, communication, education and interpretation, and research, are also covered in Worksheet 8b, since conservation is also about ensuring that heritage plays a role in the lives of local communities and in enriching the experiences of visitors.

Tourism and visitor management can be a challenging element for many World Heritage properties, which requires specific and detailed processes, strategies and tools. For this reason, a dedicated programme has been developed under the direction of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, and which provides detailed resources. Box 5.6 provides information on these resources, as well as other tools, methodologies and publications that can help you to explore the topics covered in Worksheet 8b in more detail.



Box 5.6. Tools, methodologies and publications to support further analysis of management processes

- The *Guidance and Toolkit for Impact Assessment in a World Heritage Context* (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2022). This revised Guidance helps States Parties, heritage managers, decision-makers, project proponents and communities in situations where a transformative action is proposed or undertaken in or around a World Heritage property – in particular those related to development projects or resource extraction – which may affect its Outstanding Universal Value. It explains the clear process for undertaking Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and/or Heritage Impact Assessment, together with tools and checklists for application.
- The *Resource Manual on Managing Disaster Risks for World Heritage* (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2010). This resource manual helps government and non-government organizations, managers and communities in identifying, assessing and reducing disaster risks to World Heritage properties resulting from natural or human induced hazards, including those resulting from climate change, which may affect the property’s Outstanding Universal Value. It provides methodologies and tools for risk assessment, mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery of World Heritage Properties, and also explains how these properties can contribute towards building disaster resilience.
- The UNESCO World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme. Offering a range of tools on how to improve visitor management at World Heritage properties, this programme represents a new approach where planning for tourism and heritage management are integrated at a destination level. Its ‘How To’ Guides offer direction to managers to help identify solutions to common problems and maximise tourism benefits.
- The range of publications and resources on the 2011 Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) Recommendation. The HUL approach addresses the inclusive management of heritage resources in dynamic and constantly changing environments, aimed at guiding change in historic cities. A vast diversity of resources is available from case studies, to videos and expert lectures to help managers to learn more about the approach and how best to implement it.

Worksheet 8a. Assessment of key management processes

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comments/Explanations	Recommendations and follow-up actions
Decision-making				
1. If authority and responsibility for managing the property is shared between different managers, are there clear rules and procedures to guide coordination and collaboration?	Very good: Agreed rules and procedures to guide coordination and collaboration among managers exist and are implemented			
	Good: There are rules and procedures to guide coordination and collaboration but they are not always followed			
	Fair: Coordination and collaboration is undertaken informally and is mainly dependent on personal relationships			
	Poor: Coordination and collaboration among managers is minimal (e.g. only occurs when major problems arise) or is non-existent			
2. Are there clear procedures for sharing information between administrative levels and institutions?	Very good: Procedures to share information related to the management of the property among different administrative levels and institutions have been developed and are implemented			
	Good: Procedures to share information among administrative levels exist but are not always followed			
	Fair: There are no procedures to share information among managers, but it occurs on an informal basis			
	Poor: Sharing of information rarely occurs and/or only when required legally			

Worksheet 8a. Assessment of key management processes

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comments/Explanations	Recommendations and follow-up actions
Decision-making				
3. Are there clear requirements for the participation of local communities, Indigenous peoples and other rights-holders in important planning and decision-making processes (e.g. through multi-party advisory and decision-making bodies)?	Very good: There are clear and widely respected rules and policies to engage local communities and rights-holders in decision-making processes			
	Good: There are some rules and policies in place to involve communities and rights-holders but these could be improved			
	Fair: There are some rules and policies in place but these mainly require managers to inform communities and rights-holders of decisions after they are taken			
	Poor: There are no requirements to involve local communities and rights-holders in decision-making processes related to the management of the property			
4. Are the outcomes of key decision-making processes publicly available and/or widely communicated?	Very good: The outcomes of key decision-making processes are publicly available and readily accessible			
	Good: The outcomes of key decision-making processes are publicly available but access to them can be difficult for the general public			
	Fair: It is possible to obtain information about key decision-making processes but only through complex administrative procedures			
	Poor: In general, decision-making processes are not documented and decisions are not made available			
5. If conflicts between managers and rights-holders or stakeholders arise, are there mechanisms in place to help enable resolution?	Very good: Conflict resolution mechanisms exist and are applied when conflicts arise			
	Good: Conflict resolution mechanisms exist but are only partially effective			
	Fair: Conflict resolution mechanisms exist but are either ineffective or rarely used			
	Poor: No conflict resolution mechanisms exist			

Worksheet 8a. Assessment of key management processes

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comments/Explanations	Recommendations and follow-up actions
Management planning				
6. Is management planning for the property based on a clear and well-established management cycle?	Very good: A clear management planning cycle exists and is well articulated within the overall planning framework			
	Good: A management planning cycle exists but there are aspects that could be improved to facilitate integration with broader planning mechanisms			
	Fair: No agreed management planning cycle is defined but planning for the property follows certain legal requirements (e.g. the management plan for the property is reviewed on a regular basis)			
	Poor: Planning processes specific to the management of the property do not exist or are deficient			
7. Are there clear rules or procedures on how to align the management plan for the property with the provisions of other planning instruments?	Very good: Clear rules and procedures exist that detail how to align management plan with other planning instruments			
	Good: There are rules and procedures on how to align the management plan with other planning instruments but some aspects could be strengthened			
	Fair: Rules and procedures on how to align the management plan with other planning instruments are vague; therefore, in practice the management plan is not integrated with other planning instruments			
	Poor: There are no rules or procedures to align the management plan with other planning instruments			

Worksheet 8a. Assessment of key management processes

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comments/Explanations	Recommendations and follow-up actions
Management planning				
8. Is the development of the management plan undertaken through participatory processes requiring the involvement of all (or most) managers, as well as different sources of expertise?	Very good: The management plan is developed through participatory and interdisciplinary processes involving a wide range of actors			
	Good: The management plan is developed through participatory processes but some aspects could be strengthened			
	Fair: The management plan is mainly developed by a restricted group of people but other actors have opportunities to provide comments at certain stages			
	Poor: The management plan is mainly developed by a restricted group of people (often consultants external to the institution responsible) and consultation is limited to what is legally required			
9. Are there clear rules and procedures for involving local communities and rights-holders at all stages of the planning process for the property?	Very good: Rules and procedures require that rights-holders are actively involved throughout the planning process and that their contributions are reflected in the content of the plan			
	Good: Rules and procedures require that rights-holders are involved in the main stages of the planning process but their contributions are not always reflected in the content of the plan			
	Fair: Rules and procedures require that rights-holders are involved in some stages of the planning process, mainly through public consultation during the final stages of completing the plan			
	Poor: There are no rules and procedures that require the involvement of rights-holders in the planning process			

Worksheet 8a. Assessment of key management processes

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comments/Explanations	Recommendations and follow-up actions
Management planning				
10. Are there clear rules and procedures for the approval and/or endorsement of the management plan at different administrative and decision-making levels?	Very good: There are clear rules and procedures for approving and/or endorsing the management plan across different administrative and decision-making levels, and without excessive bureaucracy or unreasonable delays			
	Good: There are clear rules and procedures for approving and/or endorsing the management plan across different administrative and decision-making levels but can involve complex and lengthy processes			
	Fair: There are some rules and procedures for approving and/or endorsing the management plan across different administrative and decision-making levels but they are not clear and therefore are not always followed or respected			
	Poor: There are no specific rules or procedures for approving or endorsing the management plan across different administrative and decision-making levels			

Worksheet 8a. Assessment of key management processes

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comments/Explanations	Recommendations and follow-up actions
Management planning				
11. Are the values and management objectives of the property considered to be critical elements in the planning process?	Very good: Values and management objectives are well understood and defined and serve as a foundation for the planning process.			
	Good: Values and management objectives are not explicitly used as a foundation for the planning process but inform it nevertheless.			
	Fair: Values and management objectives are included in the content of the management plan but are not used as key elements guiding the planning process.			
	Poor: Values and management objectives are insufficiently understood and defined, and are therefore not considered during the planning process.			
12. Is the planning process informed by realistic funding forecasts?	Very good: Financial security and sustainability allows managers to plan most actions based on secure funding sources.			
	Good: Financial security allows managers to plan priority actions based on regular funding sources but the implementation of other activities depends on the ability to raise additional resources.			
	Fair: Funding sources are not secure and can fluctuate, making it difficult to plan actions with any certainty.			
	Poor: Funding sources are not secure and are therefore not considered when planning actions.			

Worksheet 8a. Assessment of key management processes

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comments/Explanations	Recommendations and follow-up actions
Management planning				
13. Is monitoring and evaluation considered as part of the management cycle? Are there clear rules and procedures to guide monitoring and evaluation and ensure that findings are incorporated into future planning?	Very good: Monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the management plan (and other planning instruments) is conceived from the early stages of the planning process, based on clear methods for collecting information; findings are used to improve the management system as required.			
	Good: Monitoring and evaluation is included in the management cycle but identified procedures and methods are not systematically followed, or findings are not used to adjust implementation.			
	Fair: There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation of planned actions but there are no systematic methods to collect information and act on the findings.			
	Poor: There is no monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the plan.			
14. Are there clear policies or guidelines on how to articulate and integrate specific planning subprocesses (e.g. disaster risk management, tourism management) into the overall management planning process for the property?	Very good: Subsidiary planning processes are well articulated with the overall management planning process for the property and the content of the different plans is well integrated.			
	Good: Subsidiary planning processes are well articulated with the overall management planning process for the property but some aspects could be strengthened.			
	Fair: Subsidiary planning processes are insufficiently articulated within the overall management planning process for the property and, as a result, the content of the plans is not well articulated and implementation follows different cycles.			
	Poor: Subsidiary planning processes are developed in complete separation from the overall management planning process for the property, with each plan developed in isolation.			

Worksheet 8a. Assessment of key management processes

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comments/Explanations	Recommendations and follow-up actions
Community engagement				
15. Are there initiatives and programmes that consider local communities' well-being and/or identify how they can benefit from the protection and management of the property? Are such programmes developed through inclusive and participatory processes?	Very good: There are programmes in place to ensure that local communities benefit from the protection and management of the property and that they are the primary beneficiaries of socio-economic investments in and around the property.			
	Good: There are programmes in place to ensure that local communities benefit from the protection and management of the property but these are insufficient or could be strengthened.			
	Fair: There are efforts to ensure that local communities benefit from the protection and management of the property but the results do not live up to expectations.			
	Poor: There are no concrete initiatives or programmes in place to ensure that local communities benefit from the protection and management of the property.			
16. Are there clear rules, guidelines and/or protocols on how to access and appropriately use Indigenous and local knowledge?	Very good: There are clear guidelines and protocols to guide how to access and use Indigenous and local knowledge (including the need for free, prior and informed consent) and they are strictly applied.			
	Good: There are guidelines and protocols to guide how to access and use Indigenous and local knowledge (including the need for free, prior and informed consent) but they are not systematically applied.			
	Fair: There are general principles or general awareness on how to access and use Indigenous and local knowledge but are not sufficiently detailed and, therefore, rights are not always respected.			
	Poor: There are no guidelines or protocols to guide how to access and use Indigenous and local knowledge.			

Worksheet 8a. Assessment of key management processes

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comments/Explanations	Recommendations and follow-up actions
Community engagement				
17. Are traditional practices that contribute to the conservation of the property respected and incorporated into management processes? Are there protocols in place to ensure this?	Very good: Traditional practices that contribute to the conservation of the property are recognized and incorporated into management processes.			
	Good: Traditional practices that contribute to the conservation of the property are recognized but are not formally incorporated into management processes.			
	Fair: Some traditional practices are seen to contribute to the conservation of the property but are not necessarily recognized by managers, and are therefore not incorporated into management processes.			
	Poor: Traditional practices are not or are insufficiently recognized as contributing to the conservation of the property.			
Analysis and conclusions				
Gaps and challenges				
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions				

Worksheet 8b. Assessment of other important management processes

Question	Response	Opportunities and recommendations
Organizational (work programming, administration and reporting)		
1. Are there clear policies and procedures for preparing annual (or multi-year) workplans, as well as budgets?		
2. Are there clear policies or guidelines as to who is responsible for monitoring and reporting requirements (e.g. at the national and/or international level)? Is it clear how such reports are to be compiled and presented?		
3. Are there institutional norms and standards for procurement, budgets, financial management and/or auditing?		
4. Are there established procedures to identify staff needs, conduct performance appraisals and identify capacity-building needs?		
5. Are there clear rules and procedures to ensure ethical conduct standards for staff, contractors and volunteers?		

Worksheet 8b. Assessment of other important management processes

Question	Response	Opportunities and recommendations
Communication, education and interpretation		
<p>6. Is there a communication strategy or plan about what information is to be communicated to different actors (i.e., managers, rights-holders and stakeholders) and when and how that information can be shared?</p>		
<p>7. Is there an awareness and education programme that addresses all audiences (i.e., children, youth, adults, different genders, different language speakers) that contributes to raising understandings of the property and its values?</p>		
<p>8. Are the rules on how to use the World Heritage emblem respected, adequately integrated into local contexts, and enforced?</p>		
<p>9. Is key information about the management of the property made available to the public – and to rights-holders in particular (e.g. management plan is available online or consultation events are widely communicated through different media)?</p>		

Worksheet 8b. Assessment of other important management processes

Question	Response	Opportunities and recommendations
Impact assessment, risk management and climate change mitigation and adaptation		
<p>10. Are there clear rules and procedures as to when impact assessment processes should be triggered and how they should be carried out?</p>		
<p>11. Is there a disaster risk management plan to assess, mitigate, prepare, respond, and recover from various disasters caused by natural and human-induced hazards – such as earthquakes, floods, fires, vandalism, etc.? Is this plan well integrated into the management planning framework for the property?</p>		
<p>12. Is there a climate change mitigation and adaptation strategy? If yes, is this strategy well integrated into the planning framework for the property? Does the climate change mitigation and adaptation strategy align with agreed international and national targets?</p>		
<p>13. Is resilience thinking integrated into long-term, planning processes?</p>		

Worksheet 8b. Assessment of other important management processes

Question	Response	Opportunities and recommendations
Access, tourism and visitation		
14. Is there a tourism strategy or similar instrument to manage visitors, tourism activities and its derived economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts? If such a strategy exists as a separate instrument, is it well aligned with the management plan for the property?		
15. Are visitor numbers and other relevant tourism-related indicators monitored regularly? Is the resulting data and information used to improve visitor management and inform management decisions?		
16. How well is the information on the OUV and other important values of the property presented and interpreted to tourists and visitors?		

Worksheet 8b. Assessment of other important management processes

Question	Response	Opportunities and recommendations
Research		
<p>17. Is there a planned programme of research (or research agenda) for the property which is directed towards management needs and/or improving understanding of OUV and other important values of the property? Is it incorporated into or aligned with the management plan?</p>		
<p>18. Are there clear policies as to how external partners and/or institutions can conduct research related to the property and how research findings are to be shared and disseminated?</p>		
Analysis and conclusions		
Gaps and challenges		
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions		



TOOL 9. IMPLEMENTATION OF MANAGEMENT MEASURES

This tool assesses progress in implementing the management plan, subsidiary plans and relevant work programmes.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE TOOL:

- a) To assess whether the management plan (or primary planning instrument) is being implemented according to a defined programme of actions.
- b) To review whether subsidiary plans and strategies are being effectively implemented.
- c) To analyse whether budgets and work plans (annual or multi-year) have been developed based on the programme of actions and/or other management measures included in the management plan and subsidiary plans.
- d) To assess what mechanisms, other than the budget and/or work plan(s), are in place to ensure the implementation of the management plan and subsidiary plans and strategies.
- e) To identify gaps and challenges with regard to implementing management measures.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Management plans are ineffective if they are not implemented or are ignored in day-to-day operations. Typically, the effectiveness of management plans is evaluated with regard to its content (covered in Tool 6) but less so with regard to the extent to which planned actions are implemented and desired outcomes achieved. Similar shortcomings can be found in the implementation of subsidiary plans and other complementary strategies or instruments (e.g. disaster risk management plan, fire plan, invasive species plan, tourism strategy, business strategy, communication strategy and educational programmes).

Planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation are interrelated and equally important processes of the management cycle. However, at the planning level it is often assumed that once a management plan (or other planning instrument) is prepared and approved, implementation will happen ‘naturally’. This is generally not the case because i) those responsible for implementing the plan may not have been involved in its development and therefore may not feel committed to its implementation; ii) the plan is overly ambitious and resources required to ensure its implementation are insufficient; or iii) circumstances change over time and, if implementation is not closely monitored and the programme of actions adjusted accordingly, it may no longer be possible to adhere to time-frames and achieve desired outcomes. For World Heritage properties or other heritage places with complex governance structures, including where multiple managers are responsible for the implementation of plans, ensuring implementation can be complex and needs effective collaboration.

Regular monitoring of the implementation of the management plan and other planning instruments is, therefore, critical to achieving desired outcomes. This is why Tool 9 can be used every one to two years rather than five to six years (as for the majority of other tools in this Toolkit). Regular monitoring should be incorporated into the development of budgets and work plans (annual or multi-year) to ensure that they are aligned with the content of the planning instruments. If monitoring is not planned for or regularly undertaken, there is a risk that work plans will be developed on an ad hoc basis, which may perpetuate recurrent problems, fail to address challenges that can only be solved through long-term actions and prevent the achievement of desired outcomes.

Planning processes encompass assumptions about the future, and such assumptions involve a degree of uncertainty (particularly in a rapidly changing world). Therefore, regular and continuous monitoring is necessary to collect new information, review and revise previous assumptions and make necessary adjustments and adaptations. The more a management issue is left unmonitored, the more difficult responding to that issue can become. If the adjustments needed are seen as too demanding, people may not even attempt them – for instance, when bureaucratic and administrative procedures to adjust or revise a plan are seen as too complex. In the long run, such difficulties can create an atmosphere of unwillingness to engage in future planning processes.

To help you identify what is working well and what the challenges are with regard to implementation of management measures, Tool 9 is structured around two worksheets:

- **Worksheet 9a** helps you assess progress in the implementation of the management plan, or other subsidiary plan or strategy, by examining if actions, activities and management measures are being carried out according to projected time-frames. The structure of the worksheet is generic and can be used for different types of planning instruments.
- **Worksheet 9b** helps you explore broader implementation issues. Structured in the form of a questionnaire, this worksheet serves three main purposes. First, to review how financial budgets and work plans are developed, and whether they are aligned with the desired outcomes and actions identified in the management plan and/or other subsidiary plans. Second, to examine what monitoring mechanisms are in place to ensure that management measures are being implemented. Third, to examine how unexpected situations and implementation challenges are dealt with.

Tool 9 is structured to suit a ‘typical’ public administration management system and may need to be adapted to suit, for example, a traditional management system.

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 9A

This worksheet should be used first and foremost to track the implementation of the management plan (or other primary planning instrument) for the World Heritage property or other heritage place. Subsequently, it can be repeated or reapplied for other existing subsidiary plans and strategies specific to the property (see Figure 3.2 illustrating the typical hierarchy of a planning framework). While the worksheet is generic and can be used to assess the implementation of different types of plans, a key objective is to assess the implementation of those plans that are the most important and specific to guiding management at the site level. Repeating the worksheet for other planning instruments will help you to monitor how the implementation of subsidiary plans aligns with the implementation of the management plan and thus strengthens synergies between the different plans.

Worksheet 9a allows you to review and assess each action or management measure specified in the planning instrument and to assign to it a status category (e.g. ranging from ‘Action has not commenced’ to ‘Action has been completed’). This will help you to track progress and verify whether actions are being implemented within projected time-frames. Ideally, this type of assessment should be carried out annually, in order to identify as soon as possible whether implementation is progressing as expected and whether adjustments are needed.

The analysis for Worksheet 9a is based on five status categories, which can be revised to suit your needs:

- Action has not commenced.
- Preparatory work required for implementation of action is in progress (e.g. necessary approvals have been obtained but the work itself has not commenced).
- Implementation of the action has commenced.
- Implementation of the action is well under way and substantial progress has been made.
- Action has been completed.

Some actions or activities will take more time than others to be implemented, depending on their complexity, cost and scale. Therefore, the way in which actions are defined is important for tracking progress. For instance, if you define the action as ‘construction of a visitor centre’, the action may take many years and you will categorize the action as having ‘commenced’ or ‘substantial progress’ made for a significant period of time. However, if you divide the activity into more detailed actions (e.g. run architectural competition for visitor centre, complete public tender for construction, complete pre-construction planning and approvals, etc.), this will make it simpler and more informative to monitor implementation.

Overall, this type of analysis will help you identify whether the implementation of some actions is progressing slower than others; and whether the implementation of the overall programme of actions is proceeding too slowly to enable all actions to be completed within an initial projected time-frame. Remember, the aim is to monitor progress regularly and systematically, and to adjust the programme of actions accordingly. With time and experience, fewer adjustments may be necessary. However, it is unrealistic to think that no adjustments will be needed, since the future rarely unfolds as expected or planned for.

The reflection questions below will be most helpful if you repeat the assessment for several planning instruments. The questions will help you cross-reference findings between instruments and identify issues which cannot be addressed by simple adjustments to the time-frame of the programme of actions included in the plans. They may require broader considerations about the existing management system.



Be aware that some management plans may not include a detailed programme of actions but may require separate annual work planning processes. In such cases, you must complete the worksheet based on the work plans produced as a result of those processes. This makes it important to verify whether the management plan identifies desired outcomes (i.e., what is to be achieved within the time-frame of the plan as a result of the implementation of different actions), and if those outcomes are used as a basis for developing annual work plans.

Reflection questions:

- Are implemented actions in alignment with the desired outcomes stated in the management plan or other primary planning instrument?
- If implementation is not progressing as planned, what are the main reasons for this? Is the programme of actions too ambitious or based on flawed assumptions about the availability of resources? Or do problems arise from a lack of political will and/or professional motivation to implement the plan? If this is the case, what are the causes?
- If different managers are responsible for the implementation of actions, are those responsibilities stated clearly in the programme of actions?
- If certain actions were outsourced to external contractors, were potential risks identified with respect to the defined time-frame for those actions?
- Was the programme of actions developed with sufficient flexibility to allow for necessary adjustments to be made? If one action does not proceed according to plan, is there a risk that the implementation of other actions may be impacted and/or delayed?
- Are actions commenced only when the necessary resources and conditions are in place, or at least when there is sufficient confidence that those resources will be available when needed? Or is it the case that some actions are commenced but then have to be halted part way through because of a lack of resources?
- Is monitoring the implementation of the plan seen as a high priority? If not, why not? If different managers are responsible for the implementation of actions, does the plan clearly define who is responsible for monitoring its implementation as a whole, or are there mechanisms to coordinate monitoring efforts among managers on a regular basis?
- If implementation is not progressing as planned, is it a relatively simple process to adjust the programme of actions, or does adjustment to the programme of actions require complicated administrative procedures? Could this prevent managers from making such adjustments? If yes, how can the issue be addressed?
- In the event that the programme of actions needs to be adjusted, are there clear policies as to the parameters (e.g. type of activities foreseen, time-frame, costs) that can be altered (and in what order) and those that cannot?
- With regard to the different plans examined using Worksheet 9a, are the time-frames and programme of actions well-articulated and well-aligned? If not, is the implementation of the programme of actions of one or more plans negatively impacting or impeding the implementation of another plan?

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 9B

Programmes of actions included in different plans should be sufficiently detailed in terms of what actions and activities are to be implemented, who will be responsible for their implementation, when they are to be implemented, what human capacity and financial resources are needed and who will provide those resources. Some management plans may not include a detailed programme of actions, but may require the development of annual work plans. Either way, since most management plans cover multiple years (usually between five and ten), it is unlikely that a single programme of actions can be sufficiently detailed to guide implementation over five years or more. Moreover, many plans include actions that can only be implemented when and if additional resources are made available. This is why many institutions develop short-term work plans (also termed ‘operational plans’ or ‘work programmes’) that detail the actions, activities and tasks that are achievable within identified time-frames and with secured resources. Work plans are usually completed each year once an institution is certain of the resources available and an annual financial budget has been approved.

For World Heritage properties managed mainly by a single institution, the logic and flow of developing the management plan, any subsidiary plans and subsequent work plans is relatively straightforward. However, many World Heritage properties have complex governance arrangements, and implementing multiple plans can be complex. The implementation of those plans is often dependent on multiple managers, which means that each manager may only incorporate in their own work plan the actions, activities and tasks for which they are responsible. This can increase the likelihood that some actions, activities and tasks will overlap unless all managers develop their work plans in collaboration. In addition, in such situations, managers may be responsible for functions beyond the management of the property as a whole, or parts of it. Consequently, the financial budgets and work plans of different managers may not focus exclusively on the management of the property. All these aspects make it challenging to track implementation, unless agreed mechanisms are in place to ensure that tasks are completed, and a single actor is made responsible for overseeing that implementation of the programme of actions.

Worksheet 9b is structured as a questionnaire to help you analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the existing mechanisms available to monitor the implementation of programmes of actions included in different plans – particularly when implementation is dependent on the efforts of multiple managers. The worksheet also provides a number of questions to help you identify whether each programme of actions is adequate to address the factors affecting the property. You should therefore revisit the work undertaken for Tool 2, where you analysed what high-priority actions are needed to address those factors requiring urgent attention.

Finally, Worksheet 9b offers an additional set of questions to help you to examine how unexpected situations and implementation challenges are dealt with. In a complex world shaped by accelerating change and the intensifying impacts of climate change, the future is becoming more and more uncertain. This can make planning challenging. Nevertheless, by considering alternative scenarios, anticipating the unexpected (i.e., by incorporating risk assumptions) and putting mechanisms in place that allow you to adapt quickly, you can be better prepared.

Worksheet 9b should be completed by each manager with primary heritage responsibilities. A series of reflection questions are included below to help you to draw conclusions about implementation issues in the management system for the entire World Heritage property or other heritage place. If the property is managed by a single manager-institution, you do not necessarily need to address the questions; nevertheless, they may trigger useful ideas for your responses to the questions in the worksheet.

Reflection questions:

- Do all managers with primary heritage responsibilities prepare, or contribute to the development of, work plans (annual or multi-year)? If not, does that have negative effects on the implementation of the programme of actions included in the management plan or other primary planning instrument? In particular, does that delay or prevent the implementation of high-priority actions with regard to factors negatively affecting the property?
- Can you identify common oversights and challenges in the way work plans and financial budgets are prepared and how the implementation of actions is prioritized? At the same time, can you also identify good practices that could be shared with other managers facing similar challenges?
- If urgent and potentially detrimental situations arise during the management cycle (e.g. the imminent collapse of a building unless stabilized; or the appearance of an invasive species that, if not eradicated immediately, could pose serious threats) and the manager held responsible for addressing it does not have the financial or human capacity to respond quickly, are there mechanisms in place that allow use of resources from other parts of the management system? Note that this question does not refer to disasters, such as flooding or earthquakes.

Worksheet 9a. Assessment of implementation of planning instrument

Name of planning instrument assessed:

Period covered: (e.g. 2022–2023)

		Not commenced	Preparatory work in progress	Implementation commenced	Substantial progress	Completed	Comments/Explanations
[list action]	Year 1						
	Year 2						
[list action]	Year 1						
	Year 2						
[list action]	Year 1						
	Year 2						
[list action]	Year 1						
	Year 2						
Total							
Analysis and conclusions							
Gaps and challenges							
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions							

Worksheet gb. Assessment of implementation approaches

Question	Response	Opportunities and recommendations
<p>1. When your institution or group prepares annual (or multi-year) work plans and financial budgets, does it consider the programme of actions included in the management plan (or other primary planning instrument) and other subsidiary plans or strategies? If not, or if insufficiently, what are the implications for the effective implementation of those plans?</p>		
<p>2. What are the main considerations when developing the budget and work plan? Are the factors affecting the property part of those considerations and are actions to address the factors with the highest impact and urgency given priority?</p>		
<p>3. If your institution or group has responsibilities beyond the management of the property, how are decisions made as to what responsibilities are given priority and what actions are to be implemented when you develop the work plan and budget?</p>		
<p>4. When developing the work plan, do you take into consideration whether infrastructure and equipment needed to implement actions are sufficient and are in good condition? If additional infrastructure and equipment are needed to implement certain actions, is that adequately reflected in the projected costs of those actions?</p>		
<p>5. How does your organization or group monitor the implementation of actions and use of financial resources? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the mechanisms in place to monitor implementation?</p>		

Worksheet 9b. Assessment of implementation approaches

Question	Response	Opportunities and recommendations
<p>6. When the implementation of actions does not go according to the work plan and/or additional funding is needed compared to what was budgeted, how fast and easy is it to detect issues and make necessary changes and corrections? If such changes have implications for the implementation of other actions, how are choices made as to which actions to prioritize?</p>		
<p>7. Does the budget include contingency funding with regard to unforeseen circumstances and unexpected activities?</p>		
<p>8. If actions are to be carried out (fully or in part) by external contractors and conflicts arise during implementation, are there mechanisms in place to resolve matters (e.g. set out in the contract)?</p>		
<p>Analysis and conclusions</p>		
<p>Gaps and challenges</p>		
<p>Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions</p>		



TOOL 10. OUTPUTS – MONITORING PRODUCTIVITY

This tool assesses the delivery of outputs from the implementation of planned actions, routine work and management processes, as a measure of the productivity of the management system.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE TOOL:

- a) To review whether there are monitoring mechanisms in place to assess work productivity.
- b) To assess whether management processes, routine work, and planned actions are delivering projected **outputs**.
- c) To evaluate whether the outputs produced are related to identified management needs and lead to the achievement of desired **outcomes**.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Outputs are measures of ‘productivity’ resulting from the implementation of planned actions, routine work and management processes. Different types of output can be expected across the management cycle. These can include:

- plans and/or strategies, policies and other instruments resulting from planning processes (e.g. a completed and approved management plan or tourism strategy);
- physical works carried out on the ground (e.g. building repairs, maintenance work, information panels installed);
- material products or goods produced (e.g. publications, audio guides, websites);
- the volume of work and activities undertaken (e.g. numbers of meetings held with other actors, patrols undertaken, surveys completed, research undertaken and published);
- data and information derived from management processes, including monitoring processes, which can inform future planning and actions (e.g. numbers of visitors, numbers of users of a specific service provided); and
- services provided (e.g. fire-safety systems, recreation activities, educational activities).

Identifying the outputs produced is important, but not sufficient. What is important is to assess whether those outputs are in line with planned actions and needed management measures, thereby leading to desired outcomes being achieved. Note that an output may not directly respond to a management need, but may form the basis of another action or process. For instance, a desired outcome identified in the management plan may be the reduction of physical impacts on certain attributes because of excessive visitation. Therefore, an initial output can be a tourism strategy, followed by the construction of a new visitor walking route (another output), which reduces the number of visitors accessing the attributes being impacted. The data generated from monitoring changes in visitor numbers is yet another output that can provide valuable information about management needs and the impacts on the attributes of the property.

Outputs are usually expressed in numbers, such as: number of surveillance patrols; number of community meetings conducted; number and proportion of archaeological assessment studies initiated and ongoing; number of condition assessments undertaken for buildings and/or other structures and number of school visits. The assessment of outputs derived from a programme of actions – based on a management plan as well as annual (or multi-year) work plans – requires the outputs to be defined or, in some cases, for targets (either quantitative or qualitative) to be set. The assessment of output productivity can be measured using:

- actual work undertaken, and products and services delivered versus what was planned (e.g. numbers of patrols or maintenance works undertaken compared to what was projected in the work plan(s);
- the extent to which planned actions were completed); and
- actual versus planned expenditure.

Certain types of output will be produced on a regular basis (e.g. annually), while others will be delivered sporadically or may even be a one-off product, such as the establishment of the visitor walking route, mentioned above. Assessing whether all expected outputs were produced within set targets (e.g. in terms of cost, quantity, quality and time-frame) will promote transparency and accountability. However, it can be time-consuming – and not always helpful – to monitor all forms of productivity over time. Therefore, the relevant outputs need to be defined in advance – preferably when the management plan is being developed. In general, outputs that offer a good measure of productivity involve:

- repeated actions or activities that are important for achieving the management objectives for the property;
- aspects related to the use of the property; and
- products and services that are part of annual reporting requirements.

Developing a set of indicators will help you to measure productivity (see Box 5.7).



Box 5.7. What are indicators?

An indicator is a quantitative or qualitative variable that can be measured over time to provide information about something being assessed and evaluated.

As the name implies, an indicator should not only provide information about its own status, but also measure and/or assess the degree to which desired outcomes are being achieved. Selecting indicators is a skill and, to a certain extent, an art form. There are two important aspects in determining appropriate indicators. First, a variety of indicator types (including a combination of qualitative and quantitative measures) is more likely to be effective. Second, selecting fewer indicators that can be readily measured may be better than measuring many things simultaneously, since data collection can be costly and time-consuming. That said, there needs to be a sufficient number of indicators to fully understand the progress being made in the situation under assessment.

While outputs are a good measure of productivity and an important tool to communicate to donors, local communities and decision-makers how funding is being used, they are insufficient to assess management effectiveness. People often measure outputs to judge performance since the data for these are easier to collect and monitor than for outcomes. However, management effectiveness needs to be assessed on what is being achieved (outcomes) in addition to what is being produced (outputs). This is 'Outputs' (Tool 10) is positioned right before 'Outcomes' (Tool 11), since both are interrelated. Ultimately, the production and delivery of outputs needs to be examined based on its contribution to the achievement of outcomes. If needed, refresh your understanding of the difference between outcomes and outputs by returning to Section 3.3 of the Toolkit.

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 10

The use of this worksheet is dependent on prior identification of output indicators or at least output targets. Where indicators and/or targets are not available, this should be noted. In such cases, leave the main columns of the worksheet blank but complete the final rows, and consider the following questions:

- Does the programme of actions included in the management plan and/or work plans identify the outputs to be produced and delivered? If not, why not?
- If outputs have not been identified or no management plan exists, what products and services being delivered might be good measures to assess productivity?
- What needs to be done to put in place monitoring mechanisms to measure and assess outputs?

Note that in this case, parts of the worksheet can be used as a template for the identification of output indicators.

If output indicators exist, it is likely that you will use a different assessment approach or method to that suggested in Worksheet 10. You may also use different terms to assess outputs. Box 5.8 provides an example of the assessment approach embedded in Worksheet 10. You can decide if the worksheet offers a better approach to the method that you currently use; in which case, you can adapt the worksheet to complement this. Alternatively, you can replace the entire worksheet with your current method. Whatever you decide, the important thing is that you draw conclusions on what is working well, what is not working, what could be improved, and what should be done about it. The reflection questions included below can help you to respond to such issues.



Box 5.8. Examples of output indicators and their assessment

Indicator: Number of law enforcement patrols conducted

- **Output target:** 100 patrols per year with coverage of all border areas of the World Heritage property at least once per month
- **Performance:** 95 patrols undertaken, coverage of all border areas achieved each month with exception of remote northern region of World Heritage property where patrols were only undertaken every second month.
- **Performance/Level in previous year:** 80 patrols undertaken, with coverage of all border areas completed every third month.

Indicator: Number of buildings assessed to determine their conservation condition

- **Output target:** 50 buildings assessed per year in a defined part of the property.
- **Performance:** 45 assessments undertaken in the defined part of the property.
- **Performance/Level in previous year:** 45 assessments undertaken in the defined area, plus 10 additional assessments in other parts of the property.

Reflection questions:

- Do planning instruments (e.g. management plan and work plans) include a logical and clear understanding of inputs, actions or activities, outputs and outcomes – and the links between them? If not, what aspects are missing? For instance, are annual (or multi-year) work plans organized by actions only, without a clear link to the outputs and outcomes those actions are intended to produce or deliver?
- Where output indicators have been identified, are they well defined and aligned with the management objectives and other desired outcomes for the World Heritage property?
- Do the identified indicators cover different types of outputs and collectively provide a good understanding of the productivity of the management system, or are they limited to the output indicators that are the easiest to measure?
- Do the identified indicators enable the tracking of management productivity over time?

Worksheet 10. Assessment of outputs

Indicator	Output target	Performance	Performance/Level in previous year	Source(s) of information	Comments/Explanation
Analysis and conclusions					
Gaps and challenges					
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions					



TOOL 11. OUTCOMES – MONITORING STATE OF CONSERVATION

This tool examines whether monitoring programmes are adequate to assess the property's state of conservation. It will help you to answer the most important heritage management question of all: whether the Outstanding Universal Value and other important values of the World Heritage property are being maintained and management objectives achieved.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE TOOL:

- a) To establish whether there are monitoring programmes in place to assess the state of conservation of the property and the conditions of its attributes.
- b) To ascertain whether those monitoring programmes are adequate to capture information that will help determine if the Outstanding Universal Value and other important values of the property are being maintained.
- c) To establish whether monitoring programmes are adequate to assess whether the management system is also delivering expected services and benefits.
- d) To assess whether findings from monitoring programmes are being used to make improvements to the management system in response to gaps and challenges identified and/or in response to new and emerging needs.
- e) To identify follow-up actions to improve existing monitoring programmes, where needed.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This is the most challenging part of the assessment, because it requires judgements to be made about long-term trends in the conservation of the World Heritage property or other heritage place. Tools 9 and 10 helped you to understand whether management actions listed in the management plan, work plan or similar instruments had been completed and expected outputs produced. However, these outputs, while being important as a way of examining management performance, do not provide you with all the information needed to judge whether desired outcomes are being achieved, factors affecting the property are being dealt with and, most importantly, whether the Outstanding Universal Value and other important values of the property are being maintained.

For example, a desired outcome might be to increase the population of an endangered animal species above a certain threshold, while an associated output might be to undertake a set number of boundary patrols within a specified time period. However, undertaking patrols is not the same as saving the endangered species, which could be killed by poachers who learn to avoid the patrols. A second example of a desired outcome could be to prevent further deterioration of highly important rock paintings, with an associated output being the installation of access platforms that prevent visitors from touching the art. Nevertheless, the rock art can continue to deteriorate because visitors might step off the platforms or climb over barriers. Delivering outputs therefore does not necessarily equate to the achievement of desired outcomes. In the examples given, desired outcomes need to be assessed by regularly counting the population numbers of the endangered species or by regularly assessing the condition of the rock paintings.

Monitoring and assessing the state of conservation of a World Heritage property are the most demanding parts of management and can also be the most expensive. Hence, you should take care to avoid unnecessary costs and time commitments. This therefore requires carefully planned and implemented monitoring programmes (often called 'monitoring systems'). While some World Heritage properties have robust monitoring programmes, many do not. If you consider that you need to develop a new monitoring programme or strengthen an existing one, you should not complete Worksheet 11 at this point. Instead, note the need to develop and/or substantially revise the existing monitoring programme in the row on 'Gaps and challenges', and discuss what is required.

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 11

The purpose of this worksheet is to help you analyse and summarize the status and trends related to the conservation of the attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value and other important values of the property, based on the data collected through your monitoring programmes.

The first point to discuss is how best to use this worksheet to complement what you already use as part of your management system. Does your monitoring programme cover more or less the same parameters as those listed in Worksheet 11, or would your programme benefit from adding some of the parameters? Maybe you feel that the opposite is true, and your monitoring programme is more detailed and comprehensive than that suggested in Worksheet 11?

Do you have a comprehensive list of indicators that you feel are adequate and provide you with a clear picture of how well you are maintaining the values of your property? If you feel that completing Worksheet 11 will not be useful in this part of the management effectiveness evaluation, you can replace the worksheet with what you already have. In this case, you should note this decision and explain the reasons for it in your overall assessment report. An important thing to check before you make such a decision is to verify whether your monitoring programme covers and/or relates to the key attributes of your property. In addition, look through the reflection questions provided below to make sure that you do not miss important issues requiring further consideration.

Worksheet 11 is structured in a way to help you to quickly summarize and visualize findings. The different columns in the worksheet allow you to insert information in written as well as in graphic form, using a simple rating system to help you describe the state of conservation of the attributes, and any trends. This system integrates two types of information: i) the current state of the attributes (see Figure 11.1 for four suggested categories); and ii) the trend (that is, whether the condition of the attributes is improving, stable or deteriorating). To make these judgements, remember to look back at the information compiled in Worksheet 2 on factors affecting the property and how those factors are threatening and/or impacting the attributes.

Rating	Assessment status
Good	The overall condition of the attributes is good.
Low concern	The overall condition of the attributes is stable, although there are reasons for caution.
High concern	Serious threats are developing which could negatively impact, or are already negatively impacting, some of the attributes, and which may contribute to their loss if not addressed urgently.
Critical	Loss of attributes or serious concerns about the state of conservation of attributes.

Figure 11.1. Rating system for summarizing the state of conservation of attributes.

Reflection questions:

- What has been the basis for developing indicators to monitor the condition of the attributes at your World Heritage property or other heritage place?
- Do existing indicators cover the attributes that provide a good understanding of whether or not the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is being maintained? Do they relate to tangible as well as intangible attributes? Do the attributes listed in Worksheet 11 align with those identified in Worksheet 1?
- Are the indicators current or are some of them no longer applicable?
- What is the relationship between the indicator and the measure of the condition of the attributes? Is it a direct or indirect relationship?
- Where possible, have thresholds been identified?
- Are the indicators sufficient to enable an assessment of the overall condition of the property or place? If yes, are there some indicators that are unnecessary or unhelpful? If no, what additional indicators might be useful?
- What does the rating system tell you about the overall condition of the property or place? Are there some types of attributes in good condition while others are in poor or critical condition? What are the reasons for this (e.g. insufficient priority given to the attribute)? How might these reasons be addressed?

Worksheet 11. Assessment of monitoring programme of the state of conservation

Attribute(s)	Indicator	Threshold	Overall state of conservation of the attribute(s)	Comparison with baseline and last assessment	Rating		Management measures: Urgency and details of actions
					Status	Trend	
<i>List the attribute or attributes related to the indicator</i>	<i>List the indicator used to measure the condition of the attribute(s)</i>	<i>List the threshold acceptable range of variation</i>	<i>Assess the overall state of conservation of the attribute(s) here</i>	<i>How does this compare with any previous assessments?</i>	<i>Summarize the state and trend of the condition of the attribute(s)</i>		<i>Identify any specific actions needed in response to monitoring information collected</i>
Analysis and conclusions							
Gaps and challenges							
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions							



TOOL 12. REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

This tool summarizes the findings of the assessment and helps to prioritize follow-up actions in response to identified gaps and challenges in the management system.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE TOOL:

- a) To combine the findings from the individual tools and gather an overall picture of the effectiveness of the management system.
- b) To identify what improvements to the management system should be made and devise a strategy to implement necessary actions in the short, medium and long term.
- c) To help prioritize follow-up actions necessary to address identified gaps and challenges.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

If the management system is not delivering (or only partly delivering) desired outcomes and protecting the values and attributes of the property, it may be tempting to think that external causes are mostly to blame. However, there can be shortcomings within the management system itself, and carrying out a management effectiveness assessment will help you to identify where these might be. A thorough application of the EoH 2.0 tools should, at this point in the process, reveal a considerable body of information on the management system for the World Heritage property or other heritage place. The assessment will have identified strengths and weaknesses, as well as challenges and opportunities. However, the assessment of the management system is only an initial step: assessments are only worth the time and energy needed to undertake them if they lead to improvements in management measures to address identified gaps and challenges. Therefore, all assessments must conclude with the development of an action plan or strategy to prioritize and implement findings and follow-up actions.

Assessments of management effectiveness will often be linked to specific management requirements or ongoing projects (such as revisions to the management plan), development of annual work plans and budgets, or to support various reporting requirements. As well as informing such requirements, the assessment will also indicate where additional management measures are needed. For example: developing new monitoring programmes or strengthening existing ones; revising staff work practices; revisiting governance arrangements; and strengthening planning processes. In some cases, follow-up actions can be implemented immediately; other actions may take many years and require long-term funding. It is essential that any action plan or strategy identify time-frames and funding sources, as well as ensure the commitment of all relevant actors to implementing management measures.

A key purpose of periodically assessing management effectiveness is to check that the management system continues to perform efficiently and effectively, particularly in response to new and emerging needs. Heritage places are constantly changing. Therefore, management systems need to adapt and continuously improve in order to effectively respond to growing uncertainty and change.

COMPLETING WORKSHEET 12

For each of the tools provided in this Toolkit, there are rows at the end of each worksheet to record opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions identified during each part of the assessment. Worksheet 12 allows you to list the follow-up actions identified during the assessment process. For tools and worksheets that were not used – either because certain management mechanisms were not in place or because you decided to only use a selection of tools at this point in time – state the reasons why. Once compiled, Worksheet 12 provides a basis for the development of a strategy and/or action plan that can be used to implement the findings of the management effectiveness evaluation. The evaluation, as well as the action plan or strategy, should inform the revision of the next management plan or other primary planning instrument for your World Heritage property or other heritage place.

Worksheet 12: Review of management effectiveness assessment findings

Tool	Worksheet	Follow-up actions
Tool 1. Values, attributes and management objectives	Worksheet 1a. Assessment of values and attributes	
	Worksheet 1b. Assessment of management objectives	
Tool 2. Factors affecting the property	Worksheet 2. Analysis of factors affecting the property	
Tool 3. Boundaries, buffer zones and the wider setting	Worksheet 3. Assessment of boundaries, buffer zones and the wider setting	
Tool 4. Governance arrangements	Worksheet 4a. Assessment of roles and responsibilities of managers	
	Worksheet 4b. Assessment of coordination and collaboration between managers	
	Worksheet 4c. Assessment of rights-holders' engagement in management	

Worksheet 12: Review of management effectiveness assessment findings

Tool	Worksheet	Follow-up actions
Tool 5. Legal, regulatory and customary framework	Worksheet 5a. Assessment of legal framework	
	Worksheet 5b. Assessment of compliance and enforcement of legal framework	
Tool 6. Management planning framework	Worksheet 6a. Assessment of management planning framework	
	Worksheet 6b. Assessment of primary planning instrument	
Tool 7. Needs and inputs	Worksheet 7a. Assessment of human capacity	
	Worksheet 7b. Assessment of financial resources	
	Worksheet 7c. Assessment of other resources	

Worksheet 12: Review of management effectiveness assessment findings

Tool	Worksheet	Follow-up actions
Tool 8. Management processes	Worksheet 8a. Assessment of key management processes	
	Worksheet 8b. Assessment of other important management processes	
Tool 9. Implementation of management measures	Worksheet 9a. Assessment of implementation of planning instrument	
	Worksheet 9b. Assessment of implementation approaches	
Tool 10. Outputs – Monitoring productivity	Worksheet 10. Assessment of outputs	
Tool 11. Outcomes – Monitoring the state of conservation	Worksheet 11. Assessment of monitoring programme of the state of conservation	

WHAT NEXT? MAKING EVALUATION PART OF THE MANAGEMENT CYCLE

Assessment findings should lead to improvements in the management system. The long-term goal is to repeat the assessment at regular intervals to allow managers to track progress over time.

A one-off assessment, while beneficial, is only a diagnosis at a given moment. The results of the follow-up actions and recommendations you defined to address the gaps and challenges throughout the assessment can only be measured after implementation, which requires time. This is why management effectiveness assessments should be embedded in the management cycle and linked with scheduled timings for revisions of the management plan.

When you undertake a management effectiveness assessment for the first time and the findings show numerous gaps and challenges, people can feel discouraged and lack motivation to define concrete follow-up actions to address gaps and challenges, or feel unwilling to implement them. However, the situation will never improve unless you are prepared to take action, and the assessment will need to be repeated at regular intervals to see how far a gap or challenge has been addressed. This in itself can be motivating and beneficial for the whole team.

If there are a great many gaps and challenges, it will not be possible to address them all in a single management cycle, and longer periods of time will be required. This reinforces the need to repeat the assessments at regular intervals in order to evaluate how management effectiveness is progressing.

Term	Definition
1. Actors	<p>Refers broadly to all the people, and the institutions and groups they represent, involved directly and indirectly with a World Heritage property or heritage place.</p> <p>Three broad categories of actors are defined in relation to the management of a World Heritage property or heritage place: managers, rights-holders and stakeholders.</p>
2. Attributes	<p>Attributes are the elements of a heritage place which convey its heritage values and enable an understanding of those values. They can be physical structures, material fabric and other tangible features, but can also be intangible aspects such processes, social arrangements or cultural practices, as well as associations and relationships which are reflected in physical elements of the place.</p> <p>For cultural heritage places, they can be buildings or other built structures and their forms, materials, design, uses and functions but also urban layouts, agricultural processes, religious ceremonies, building techniques, visual relationships and spiritual connections. For natural properties, they can be specific landscape features, areas of habitat, flagship species, aspects relating to environmental quality (such as intactness, high/pristine environmental quality), scale and naturalness of habitats, and size and viability of wildlife populations.</p> <p>Attributes, and the interactions between them, should be the focus of protection, conservation and management measures. The term ‘attributes’ is particularly used for World Heritage properties and a clear understanding of the attributes that convey their Outstanding Universal Value is critical for their long-term protection. The spatial distribution of those attributes and respective protection requirements should inform the boundary of the property and other management measures.</p>
3. Buffer zone	<p>For World Heritage properties, the buffer zone is defined as an area surrounding the property which has complementary legal and/or customary restrictions placed on its use and development in order to give an added layer of protection to the property. This should include the immediate setting of the property, important views and other areas or attributes that are functionally important as a support to the property and its protection. The area constituting the buffer zone should be determined in each case through appropriate mechanisms.</p>
4. Customary framework	<p>The set of customs, norms and practices that are repeated by members of a particular group for such an extent of time that they are considered to be mandatory. These customs, norms and practices are usually rooted in local or Indigenous tradition, religion or culture beyond the formal statutory legislation.</p>
5. Decision-making/ Decision-making processes	<p>The formal and informal processes of taking decisions, selecting a course of action or making choices about the identification, protection and management of a World Heritage property or other heritage place, its buffer zone(s) and wider setting.</p>
6. Factors affecting the property (or other heritage place)	<p>Everything that can affect positively and/or negatively the values and attributes of the World Heritage property and its state of conservation. Negative factors are usually called threats.</p> <p>How factors affect a property needs to be analysed through a series of parameters, namely the underlying causes that are the source of the factor, their origin (if originating within or outside the property), the current and potential impacts deriving from the factor, and the extent and severity of the impacts on the attributes of the property.</p>

Term	Definition
7. Governance	The interactions among structures, processes and traditions that determine how power and responsibilities are exercised, how decisions are taken and how different actors have their say in relation to the identification, protection and management of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone(s).
8. Heritage	All inherited assets which people value for reasons beyond mere utility. Heritage is a broad concept and includes shared legacies from the natural environment, the creations of humans and the creations and interactions of humans and nature. It encompasses built, terrestrial, freshwater and marine environments, landscapes and seascapes, biodiversity, geodiversity, collections, cultural practices, knowledge, living experiences, etc.
9. Impact (of factors affecting the property)	The effects or consequences of a factor on the attributes of the property, both in terms of the attributes' state of conservation and their ability to convey the heritage values.
10. Inputs	The financial, human (physical and intellectual), material and technological resources used to manage a heritage place.
11. Instruments	<p>The set of documents and means used by actors to assert the recognition of and implement their responsibilities, rights and interests over the heritage place.</p> <p>The term applies to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● legislation, regulations, policies, strategies, guidelines and agreements; ● planning documents such as master plans, land-use plans and management plans; ● customary rules, obligations and traditions; ● technical and other forms of advice; or ● legal contracts, financial resources and incentives.
12. Legal framework	The set of legal instruments including the constitution, legislation, regulations, policies and contracts concerning the protection and management of a heritage place. This includes instruments adopted specifically for the protection of heritage as well as adopted for other purposes but that are used to help protect the heritage place.
13. Management cycle	The cycle of iterative processes of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation in terms of the time-frame defined for the management plan for the World Heritage property or other heritage place.
14. Management effectiveness assessment	The evaluation of how well a World Heritage property or other heritage place is being managed – primarily the extent to which management is protecting the Outstanding Universal Value and the other important values of the property, and achieving defined management objectives.
15. Management objectives	<p>The primary aims that will guide the management system of a heritage place and ensure that its values are maintained over the long term. Management objectives first need to be defined in relation to the values of the heritage place before addressing other objectives (such as tourism and visitation or sustainable development) that are also important but not essential to maintain its significance. These objectives will form a basis for the development of management strategies, plans, policies and actions.</p> <p>Management objectives should not be confused with desired outcomes, although the two concepts are interdependent. While management objectives can be seen more as guiding principles which are not time bound and indicate the broad goals to which management aspires, desired outcomes need to be defined in relation to what is to be achieved within a defined time-frame.</p>

Term	Definition
16. Management planning	<p>The process used to establish how to get from the present situation (here) to a desired situation in the future (there). This requires a clear understanding of the present situation and deciding what is to be achieved and what actions to take, within a specific budget and time-frame. Planning for a World Heritage property or other heritage place can involve many different types of planning at various geographic scales and institutional levels.</p> <p>The management plan is the main product of the management planning process for a heritage place. However, planning is not simply an one-off event but continues through a dynamic sequence of iterative processes of implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The management plan can be accompanied by a number of other subsidiary plans or related instruments, which derive from, or support it, such as conservation plans, disaster risk management plans, sustainable tourism or visitor management plans or strategies, interpretation plans, business plans, etc.</p>
17. Management planning framework	<p>The set of planning instruments at different geographical scales and institutional levels that guide and influence the protection and management of a heritage place, its buffer zone, and the wider setting.</p> <p>A planning framework can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● planning instruments that are broader than those specific to the World Heritage property in terms of scale and scope (e.g. master plans and land-use plans); ● 'subsidiary plans' that detail particular management functions or areas (e.g. conservation plans, disaster risk management plans, sustainable tourism strategies, visitor management plans, interpretation plans, business plans, operations plans, etc.). <p>Among these different plans, the management plan for the heritage place plays a central role in guiding its protection and management.</p>
18. Management processes	<p>The series of processes which contribute to the management of the World Heritage property or other heritage place.</p> <p>In broad terms, the following processes are considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● decision-making processes; ● planning processes; ● implementation processes; ● monitoring and evaluation processes. <p>These broad processes in themselves can involve other processes (e.g. visitor management, community engagement, human and financial resource management) to effectively manage the heritage place. Processes should be based on a range of accepted policies, procedures, and standards so there is a clear idea of what the process entails, what is expected to be delivered, and the extent to which established or accepted processes are being followed.</p>

Term	Definition
19. Management system	<p>The combination of institutional structures, instruments and processes which together should ensure the effective protection of the World Heritage property or other heritage place for present and future generations.</p> <p>An effective management system depends on the type, characteristics and needs of the heritage place and its social, economic and political context. Therefore, management systems may vary according to different cultural perspectives and the resources available, as well as other factors, and may incorporate traditional, formal and informal instruments, practices and processes. In recognizing such diversity, any management system should be based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● a thorough shared understanding of the property and its values by all actors involved; ● a respect for diversity, equity, gender equality and human rights and the use of inclusive and participatory decision-making and management processes; ● a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation; ● the development of mechanisms for the involvement and coordination of the various activities between different actors; ● the allocation of necessary resources; ● continuous learning and capacity-building; and ● an accountable, transparent description of how the management system functions.
20. Managers	<p>The institution(s) or other type(s) of entity(ies) and group(s), as well as the individuals working within them, with legal or customary authority or recognized responsibilities for managing the heritage place as a whole or in part.</p> <p>Rights-holders with recognized responsibilities for managing the heritage place, or heritage resources within the place, should be considered as managers.</p>
21. Monitoring and evaluation (in relation to the management planning cycle)	<p>The processes used to assess whether plans, projects or programmes are implemented effectively and delivering desired outcomes. Monitoring focuses on tracking progress and the implementation of planned interventions, actions or activities within established time-frames and allocated funds. Evaluation assesses the efficiency and results of interventions, typically after they have been implemented. Together, monitoring and evaluation allow managers to track results, suggest corrections or improvements during implementation, and assess success.</p>
22. Monitoring the state of conservation of the World Heritage property or the heritage place	<p>Collecting information to assess the state of conservation of the World Heritage property and the factors affecting it. Monitoring is based on a set of indicators defined in relation to the attributes of the property, which can be measured so as to give an indication of trends over time. Monitoring should be undertaken regularly, according to a time-frame which is appropriate to the robustness or fragility of the attributes and their susceptibility to change.]</p>
23. Outcomes	<p>Intended and unintended short- and medium-term achievements of the implementation of management measures, interventions, activities or actions and the outputs derived from them.</p> <p>It is important to distinguish between desired and actual outcomes. Desired outcomes are defined during planning processes and reflect what managers wish to achieve over a period of time, usually defined in the management plan. Actual outcomes reflect what has really been achieved after implementation.</p>
24. Outputs	<p>The tangible products, goods and services produced as a result from the implementation of an intervention, activity or action.</p>

Term	Definition
25. Outstanding Universal Value (OUV)	Cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole.
26. Rights-holders	Actors socially endowed with legal or customary rights with respect to heritage resources.
27. Significance	<p>The overall importance of a heritage place, determined by the combination of and interactions between its different heritage values.</p> <p>Significance often has different layers, sometimes recognized at different scales: international, national, regional and local. This is the case of World Heritage properties where the focus of the inscription of that property on the World Heritage List is on its Outstanding Universal Value. However, that property will invariably have a range of values with different layers of importance that are part of its overall significance. These other values should also be well understood – good conservation practice requires the harmonious protection, conservation and management of all values.</p>
28. Stakeholders	Actors who possess direct or indirect interests and concerns about heritage resources, but do not necessarily enjoy a legally or socially recognized entitlement to them.
29. Values (heritage)	<p>The qualities for which a heritage place is considered important to be protected for present and future generations.</p> <p>Values are determined by a range of social and cultural factors. What is valued by one section of society may not be valued by another, or may be valued for different reasons, or one generation may value it but it may not have been valued by the previous one. Heritage places may have a range of values: aesthetic, architectural, biological, ecological, historic, geological, social, spiritual, etc. These values are embodied in and conveyed by the attributes of the heritage place.</p>
30. Wider setting	The wider setting of a World Heritage property may relate to the property's topography, natural and built environment, and other elements such as infrastructure, land-use patterns, spatial organization and visual relationships. It may also relate to large-scale functions, processes and dynamics. The wider setting might also play an essential role in protecting the property from external factors which could affect its Outstanding Universal Value.

REFERENCES

- Appleton, M. R. 2016. *A Global Register of Competences for Protected Areas Practitioners*. Gland (Switzerland), IUCN.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Dudley, N., Jaeger, T., Lassen, B., Pathak Broome, N., Phillips, A. and Sandwith, T. 2013. *Governance of Protected Areas: From understanding to Action*. Gland (Switzerland), IUCN. (Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 20.)
- G. L. Worboys, M. Lockwood, A. Kothari, S. Feary and I. Pulsford (eds.). 2015. *Protected Area Governance and Management*, Canberra (Australia), ANU Press.
- Hockings, M., James, R., Stolton, S., Dudley, Mathur, V., N., Makombo, J., Courrau, J. and Parrish, J. 2008. *Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit: Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Sites*. Paris, UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- Hockings, M., Stolton, S., Leverington, F., Dudley, N. and Courrau, J. 2026. *Evaluating Effectiveness: A Framework for Assessing Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas* (2nd edition). Gland (Switzerland), IUCN.
- IUCN and World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) 2017. *IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas: Standard, Version 1.1*. Gland (Switzerland), IUCN.
- Osipova, E., Emslie-Smith, M., Ostia, M., Murai, M., Åberg, U. and Shadie, P. 2020. *IUCN World Heritage Outlook 3*. Gland (Switzerland), IUCN.
- Paolini, C., Rakotobe, D. and Djossi, D. J. 2016. *Coach Observatory Mission Information Toolkit (COMIT): A toolkit to support coaching missions to improve protected areas management and develop the information system of the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) programme*. Gland (Switzerland), IUCN.
- UNEP-WCMC and IUCN. 2022. *Crosswalk Analysis of Protected Areas Effectiveness Assessment Methods and the IUCN Green List Standard: Summary report*. Cambridge (UK) UNEP- WCMC, and Gland (Switzerland), IUCN. https://resources.unep-wcmc.org/products/WCMC_RT490
- UNESCO. 1972. *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. Paris, UNESCO. <https://whc.unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf>
- _____. 2010. *Managing Disaster Risks for World Heritage*. Paris, UNESCO. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/630/>
- _____. 2012. *Managing Natural World Heritage*. Paris, UNESCO. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/managing-natural-world-heritage/>
- _____. 2013. *Managing Cultural World Heritage*. Paris, UNESCO. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/managing-cultural-world-heritage/>
- _____. 2015. *Policy on the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris, UNESCO. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/sustainabledevelopment>
- _____. 2021. *Competence Framework for Cultural Heritage Management – A Guide to the Essential Skills and Knowledge for Heritage Practitioners*. Bangkok, UNESCO.
- _____. 2021. *The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris, UNESCO. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>
- _____. 2022. *Guidance and Toolkit for Impact Assessments in a World Heritage Context*. Paris, UNESCO. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/guidance-toolkit-impact-assessments/>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0 (EoH 2.0) is the result of different efforts and projects that were undertaken over more than a decade. The original Toolkit (Hockings et al., 2008)⁴ was developed primarily for natural World Heritage properties, however its potential use for cultural properties was always envisaged. EoH 2.0 still follows the same underlying structure of the original Toolkit, based on the IUCN Framework for Assessing the Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas (Hockings et al., 2006). We would like to acknowledge the contribution of the authors involved in that original work.

Initial discussions about the potential to adapt the original Toolkit to fully suit all World Heritage properties, started in 2010, as part of the first joint capacity-building programme of the three Advisory Bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM). This was a three-year programme for cultural and natural heritage, funded by the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN).

Mindful of the pilot experience led by Finland between 2010 and 2011 to apply the original Toolkit to their natural and cultural World Heritage properties, IUCN and ICOMOS made it an objective of the second phase of their joint Connecting Practice project to explore what aspects of the original Toolkit needed to be strengthened, in order to facilitate its use for cultural properties through the generous support of the Christensen Fund. As part of this project, in 2016, a two-day meeting was organized at IUCN Headquarters (Gland, Switzerland), bringing together professionals from all over the world to explore ways to adapt the Toolkit. To test the recommendations made during that meeting and continue the work, IUCN and ICOMOS teamed up again with the FOEN. Over two workshops held in October 2016 and March 2017, managers of eight World Heritage properties in Switzerland tested the suggested changes to the EoH tools, confirming the need and potential to develop a fully integrated management effectiveness methodology for cultural and natural properties. In 2018–2019, further testing was carried out via a series of workshops involving ten World Heritage properties, with the support of the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage. Based on the results of these different activities, the development of EoH 2.0 was launched in May 2019, thanks once more to the support of FOEN.

EoH 2.0 is a product of the strong commitment and effort of numerous professionals working for the Advisory Bodies, UNESCO and many other organizations, at the national and local levels. In total, 26 World Heritage properties were involved to different degrees and at different moments in time, in developing EoH 2.0:

NAME OF THE PROPERTY	CATEGORY	PARTICIPATING COUNTRY	REGION
1. Old City of Berne	Cultural	Switzerland	Europe
2. Three Castles, Defensive Wall and Ramparts of the Market-Town of Bellinzona	Cultural	Switzerland	Europe
3. La Chaux-de-Fonds/ Le Locle, Watchmaking Town Planning	Cultural	Switzerland	Europe
4. Pre-historic Pile Dwellings around the Alps	Cultural	Switzerland	Europe
5. Lavaux, Vineyard Terraces	Cultural/cultural landscape	Switzerland	Europe

⁴ The original EoH Toolkit, published under the World Heritage Paper Series (number 23), remains a valid management effectiveness methodology for those who wish to use it. The publication is available at: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/series/23/>

NAME OF THE PROPERTY	CATEGORY	PARTICIPATING COUNTRY	REGION
6. Swiss Alps Jungfrau-Aletsch	Natural	Switzerland	Europe
7. Monte San Giorgio	Natural	Switzerland	Europe
8. Swiss Tectonic Arena Sardona	Natural	Switzerland	Europe
9. Petra	Cultural	Jordan	Arab States
10. Ksar of Ait-Ben-Haddou	Cultural	Morocco	Arab States
11. Aflaj Irrigation Systems of Oman	Cultural/cultural landscape	Oman	Arab States
12. Land of Olives and Vines – Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir	Cultural/cultural landscape	Palestine	Arab States
13. Tassili n' Ajjer	Mixed	Algeria	Arab States
14. Wadi Rum Protected Area	Mixed	Jordan	Arab States
15. Wadi Al-Hitan	Natural	Egypt	Arab States
16. Banc d'Arguin National Park	Natural	Mauritania	Arab States
17. Sanganeb Marine National Park and Dungonab Bay – Mukkawar Island Marine National Park	Natural	Sudan	Arab States
18. Ichkeul National Park	Natural	Tunisia	Arab States
19. Robben Island	Cultural	South Africa	Africa
20. Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso	Cultural	Chile	Latin America
21. Historic City of Ahmadabad	Cultural	India	Asia and the Pacific
22. Churches of Chiloé	Cultural	Chile	Latin America
23. Saloum Delta	Cultural	Senegal	Africa
24. The Dolomites	Natural	Italy	Europe
25. Kinabalu Park	Natural	Malaysia	Asia and the Pacific
26. Rock Islands Southern Lagoon	Mixed	Palau	Asia and the Pacific

The revised Toolkit underwent three rounds of reviews with many substantial contributions and critical feedback from different heritage professionals. We would like to particularly thank all the reviewers and coordinators of the testing cases below who have taken the time to go through various versions of EoH 2.0 and provided their valuable insights and experience: Mohammed Absi, Ludi Apin, Haifaa Abdulhalim, Dora Benhart, Mohamed Ziane Bouziane, Kristal Buckley, Marina Cracco, Alfredo Conti, Jeanne Corthay, José Courrau, Sarah Court, Guy Debonnet, Luisa De Marco, Mirja Díaz, Youssouph Diedhiou, Benoit Dubosson, Regina Durighello, María Eugenia Espiñeira, Sandy Fernandez, Nicole Franceschini, Maya Ishizawa, Rohit Jigyasu, Joseph King, Maria Jose Larrondo, Thierry Lefebvre, Ian Lilley, Susanna Lindeman, Selma Kassem, Valerie Magar, Loreto Mancilla, Andrea Margotta, Cesare Micheletti, Marcella Morandini, Elena Osipova, Celmará Pockock, Laura Robinson, Grellan Rourke, Peter Shadie, Abdoul Sow, Pascal Taruvinga, Ashish Trambadia, Jane Thompson, Montira Horayangura Unakul and Réka Viragos.

The task of coordinating the development of EoH 2.0 was assigned to Leticia Leitao, under the leadership of an Executive Group composed of Marc Hockings (IUCN/WCPA), Tim Badman (IUCN), Deviah Aiama (IUCN), Eugene Jo (ICCROM), Gwenaëlle Bourdin (ICOMOS), Feng Jing (UNESCO), Richard Veillon (UNESCO), Carlo Ossola (FOEN) and Sabine Herzog (FOEN). The support of the World Heritage Leadership Programme funded by the Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment was fundamental throughout the development and publication of EoH 2.0, particularly regarding its integration with the new *Manual for Managing World Heritage*, to be published soon. Finally and most importantly, we would like to express our gratitude to the participants and institutions involved in the testing cases, who made it all possible.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Name and address	Brief details	Responsibilities within the Convention
<p>ICCROM International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property Via di S. Michele, 13 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: +39 06.585-531 E-mail: iccrom@iccrom.org www.iccrom.org</p>	<p>ICCROM (International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property) is an intergovernmental organization with headquarters in Rome, Italy. Established by UNESCO in 1956, ICCROM's statutory functions are to carry out research, documentation, technical assistance, capacity building and public awareness programmes to strengthen conservation of immovable and movable cultural heritage.</p>	<p>The specific role of ICCROM in relation to the Convention includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • being the priority partner in training for cultural heritage, • monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage cultural properties, • reviewing requests for International Assistance submitted by States Parties, and • providing input and support for capacity-building activities.
<p>ICOMOS International Council on Monuments and Sites International Secretariat 11 rue du Séminaire de Conflans 94 220 Charenton-le-Pont France Tel: + 33 (0) 1 41 94 17 59 E-mail: secretariat@icomos.org www.icomos.org</p>	<p>ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) is a non-governmental organization with headquarters in Paris, France. Founded in 1965, its role is to promote the application of theory, methodology and scientific techniques to the conservation of the architectural and archaeological heritage. Its work is based on the principles of the 1964 International Charter on the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (the Venice Charter).</p>	<p>The specific role of ICOMOS in relation to the Convention includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluation of properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List, • monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage cultural properties, • reviewing requests for International Assistance submitted by States Parties, and • providing input and support for capacity-building activities.
<p>IUCN International Union for Conservation of Nature Rue Mauverney 28 1196 Gland Switzerland Tel: +41 22 999-0000 E-mail: worldheritage@iucn.org www.iucn.org</p>	<p>IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) was founded in 1948 and brings together national governments, NGOs, and scientists in a worldwide partnership. Its mission is to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable. IUCN has its headquarters in Gland, Switzerland.</p>	<p>The specific role of IUCN in relation to the Convention includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluation of properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List, • monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage natural properties, • reviewing requests for International Assistance submitted by States Parties, and • providing input and support for capacity-building activities.
<p>UNESCO World Heritage Centre 7, place de Fontenoy 75352 Paris 07 SP France Tel: +33 (0)1 45 68 11 04 whc.unesco.org</p>	<p>Established in 1992, the World Heritage Centre is the focal point and coordinator within UNESCO for all matters relating to World Heritage. Ensuring the day-to-day management of the Convention, the Centre organizes the annual sessions of the World Heritage Committee, provides advice to States Parties in the preparation of site nominations, organizes international assistance from the World Heritage Fund upon request, and coordinates both the reporting on the condition of sites and the emergency action undertaken when a site is threatened. The Centre also organizes technical seminars and workshops, updates the World Heritage List and database, develops teaching materials to raise awareness among young people of the need for heritage preservation, and keeps the public informed of World Heritage issues.</p>	



Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit 2.0

Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places

The objective of this publication is to provide a self-assessment methodology to evaluate management effectiveness in a World Heritage property or other heritage place. It contains 12 tools that can be used separately or collectively to understand in detail what is working well and what can be done better. To facilitate their use, the tools are accompanied by worksheets, in the form of either a template to help compile information in a systematic way or a questionnaire, both of which can be adapted to the specific needs of each heritage place. The Toolkit supports managers in identifying ways to improve conservation practices, management processes and resource allocation – particularly if used before reviewing or updating management plans.

The Toolkit also serves as a resource for capacity building and awareness raising about the management of World Heritage properties. It will form the basis of related capacity building activities provided by UNESCO, the Advisory Bodies and the UNESCO Category 2 Centres, and can also be used independently for self-directed learning. It is intended to support implementation of the World Heritage Convention itself, along with the Operational Guidelines.

With the financial support of the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment



Supported by

