World Heritage for the Nation:

Identifying, Protecting and Promoting our World Heritage

A Consultation Paper

2 December 2008

Our aim is to improve the quality of life for all through cultural and sporting activities, support the pursuit of excellence, and champion the tourism, creative and leisure industries.

Contents

Chapter 1: World Heritage Policy Review

Introduction

1.1 There are 27 World Heritage Sites in the UK and its overseas territories. Stonehenge and the Tower of London are among them, together with a broad range of sites from the Heart of Neolithic Orkney to Henderson Island in the South Pacific. They form part of a much wider World Heritage List of 878 cultural and natural heritage sites recognised by UNESCO as being of outstanding universal value under the terms of the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (the World Heritage Convention). By joining the Convention, the UK government has undertaken to identify, protect, conserve, present and transmit to future generations such places.

1.2 Should we seek to add further sites to the List? There is certainly increasing interest across the UK in putting forward new nominations, and the number of aspiring sites grows each year. World Heritage Site status is seen as highly desirable, not just in terms of its undoubted prestige but also for the benefits it is thought to bring in terms of increased tourism and regeneration.

1.3 But there are other aspects to World Heritage Site status, not widely known, which for some sites would make the prospect of applying less attractive. Perhaps the most important is that such status is not bestowed as a prize, but as recognition that a site is of sufficient importance to be the responsibility of the international community as a whole. With such recognition come responsibilities – increasing in recent years – to protect and maintain the site and its surroundings to the highest standards. Judgements on what may or may not be appropriate will be made by international as well as UK stakeholders in each site. Sites in heavily populated areas have always faced difficult choices to achieve a balance between conservation and development, but once World Heritage Site status is won such choices are no longer entirely theirs to make, as demonstrated by UNESCO missions to London and Liverpool in 2006 and to Bath and Edinburgh this year.

1.4 As competition for World Heritage Site status increases the application process has become more demanding, and countries such as the UK which are already well represented on the World Heritage List have been encouraged for many years to slow down or suspend their nominations.

1.5 UK policies on nominations were last looked at in 1999. In the light of increasing concerns over representation on the World Heritage List and changes since then in the ways in which the Convention is applied, it seems right to look again at the costs and benefits of World Heritage Site status and to pull together these strands into an overall review of our policy approach to World Heritage.

Terms of reference for the review

The review had the following terms of reference:

- To explore the extent to which the UK's current approach to World Heritage supports the interests of the UK Government and those of the Governments of the Crown Dependencies and Overseas Territories in protecting and promoting their cultural and natural heritage; their wider strategic priorities; and their international goals, particularly in relation to UNESCO.

- To examine the costs and benefits, rights and responsibilities of World Heritage Site status, the balance currently achieved between them, and the implications for the future management, promotion and funding of such sites.

- To consider what measures might be taken to clarify and/or strengthen protection for World Heritage Sites.

- To recommend a policy on making future nominations for World Heritage Site status.

Who has been involved and how

1.6 DCMS set up an internal Project Board and Project Team to manage the review. It also engaged the support of wider partners and stakeholders through a Steering Group and Advisory Group.

Steering Group

1.7 The following departments/organisations were invited to join the Steering Group for the review:

Cadw
Department of the Environment, Northern Ireland
English Heritage
Foreign and Commonwealth Office
Historic Scotland
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Manx National Heritage
Ministry of Justice
Scottish Executive
States of Guernsey
States of Jersey
United Kingdom National Commission for UNESCO

1.8 The Steering Group met at key stages throughout the review.

Advisory Group

1.9 The following departments/organisations – all key stakeholders in World Heritage - were invited to join an Advisory Group in addition to the members of the Steering Group:

Department for Communities and Local Government
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Heritage Lottery Fund
Historic Houses Association
ICOMOS-UK
IUCN (The World Conservation Union) UK National Committee
Ministry of Defence
Local Authority World Heritage Forum
National Trust
National Trust for Scotland
Natural England
Planning Officers Society
VisitBritain
British Council
World Heritage Coordinators

1.10 The Advisory Group met twice, first to inform the cost benefit analysis and then to advise on its conclusions. World Heritage Coordinators also fed into the process in the course of their regular meetings throughout the year.

1.11 There are a range of other organisations and groups with an interest in World Heritage and it is also of public interest. The purpose of this paper is therefore to open up the debate to a wider audience.

Cost benefit analysis

1.12 In February 2007 DCMS with its funding partners Historic Scotland and Cadw invited tenders for a cost benefit analysis of World Heritage Site status. Price WaterhouseCoopers were awarded this contract in May 2007 and submitted their final report in December 2007.

Chapter 2: World Heritage Sites – current position

What are World Heritage Sites?

2.1   The UK joined the UNESCO World Heritage Convention in 1984. The Convention established the World Heritage List as a means of recognising that some places, both natural and cultural, are of sufficient importance to be the responsibility of the international community as a whole. By joining the Convention, nation states are pledged to care for the World Heritage Sites in their territory as part of protecting their national heritage, as well as to protection of their cultural and natural heritage as a whole.

2.2   The Convention is overseen by the inter-governmental UNESCO World Heritage Committee. The Committee is advised by three international professional bodies. ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) is a non-governmental organisation (NGO) which advises on cultural sites. ICCROM (International Centre for the Preservation and Restorations of Cultural Property) is an international governmental organisation (IGO), of which the UK is a member, which advises primarily on training and capacity development for conservation of cultural sites, while IUCN (World Conservation Union) is a hybrid IGO/NGO which advises on natural sites. Both ICOMOS and IUCN have national committees in the UK.

2.3   The Committee publishes Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (http://whc/unesco.org/en/guidelines/), which set out procedures, for inscription of sites, on the World Heritage List, detail criteria for the judgement of 'outstanding universal value' and provides guidance on the submission of nominations.

2.4   The UK Government's responsibilities for the Convention including nominating sites for World Heritage status are exercised by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport. Individual nominations for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland should be identified and put forward as UK nominations by their respective First Ministers via DCMS. Nominations for Overseas Territories should be identified and put forward by the Foreign Secretary and for the Crown Dependencies by the Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice via DCMS.

2.5   In England, DCMS works closely with English Heritage, its statutory adviser on the application of the Convention. DCMS is also committed to working with wider partners on World Heritage. Public bodies include other government departments, the devolved administrations, Historic Scotland, Cadw, the Northern Ireland Environment

Agency, the Crown Dependencies, and the UK National Commission for UNESCO. NGOs include ICOMOS UK and the Local Authorities World Heritage Forum (LAWHF).

What sites are eligible?

2.6 State Parties are invited to submit, from their national Tentative Lists of sites for future nomination, properties considered to be of 'Outstanding Universal Value' for inscription on the World Heritage List. Outstanding Universal Value means cultural and/or natural significance which is as exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity.

2.7 The Convention is not intended to ensure the protection of *all* properties of great interest, importance or value, but only for a selective list of the most outstanding of these from an international viewpoint. This means that a property of national or even of international importance will not automatically be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage Committee considers properties to have Outstanding Universal Value if they meet one or more of the following criteria:

(i)   represent a masterpiece of human creative genius;

(ii)   exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;

(iii)   bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;

(iv)   be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;

(v)   be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;

(vi)   be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance.(The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria);

(vii)   contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;

(viii) be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;

(ix) be outstanding examples representing significant ongoing ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals;

(x) contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.

2.8 There is emphasis on the need for **comparative studies** of sites (internationally as well as nationally) in order to select sites of universal importance, particularly where a site falls into an already well-represented category.

2.9 The **protection, management, authenticity and integrity** of properties are also important considerations in their selection for inscription on the World Heritage List. These requirements are explained in the 2008 Operational Guidelines – (http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide08-en.pdf) for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. The World Heritage Committee sees these aspects of a site as part of its outstanding universal value.

Further information on World Heritage Committee priorities is provided in Chapter 3

Where are our sites?

The UK currently has 27 World Heritage Sites:

- Durham Cathedral and Castle (inscribed 1986; extended 2008)
- Castles and Town Walls of King Edward in Gwynedd (1986)
- Studley Royal Park including the ruins of Fountains Abbey (1986)
- St Kilda (1986 extended in 2004 and 2005) (natural and cultural)
- Giant's Causeway and Causeway coast (1986) (natural site)
- Ironbridge Gorge (1986)
- Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (1986)
- Blenheim Palace and Park (1987)
- Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and St Margaret's Church (1987, extended 2008)
- City of Bath (1987)
- Frontiers of the Roman Empire (a transnational site incorporating Hadrian's Wall (1987), the Upper German Raetian Limes (2005) and the Antonine Wall (2008))
- The Tower of London (1988)

- Canterbury Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's Church (1988)
- Henderson Island, South Pacific Ocean (1988) (natural site)
- Old and New Towns of Edinburgh (1995)
- Gough and Inaccessible Islands, South Atlantic Ocean (1995, extended 2004) (natural site)
- Maritime Greenwich (1997)
- Heart of Neolithic Orkney (1999)
- Historic Town of St George and Related Fortifications Bermuda (2000)
- Blaenavon Industrial Landscape (2000)
- Dorset and East Devon Coast (2001) (natural site)
- Derwent Valley Mills (2001)
- New Lanark (2001)
- Saltaire (2001)
- Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (2003)
- Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City (2004)
- Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (2006)

Future nominations

In addition, we have already announced our proposed nominations for the next four years which are as follows:

- Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal – nominated in January 2008 for consideration in July 2009

- Darwin's Landscape Laboratory – to be re-submitted in January 2009 for consideration in July 2010;

- Twin Monastery of Wearmouth and Jarrow – to be nominated in January 2010 for consideration in July 2011.

How were our sites identified?

2.10 The World Heritage Committee requires each nation state to submit a Tentative List of proposals likely to be put forward over a five to ten year period. Nominations to the World Heritage List are not considered unless the nominated property has already been included on the State Party's Tentative List. State Parties are encouraged to re-examine and resubmit their Tentative Lists at least every ten years.

2.11 The UK's current Tentative List, published in 1999, – from which ten sites have already been inscribed - derives from a review announced by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport in October 1997. He was advised on English sites, and those from the Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies, by a group of experts set up at his request by English Heritage, the Government's statutory adviser within England on the built and archaeological environment. His colleagues in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland made their own arrangements for consultation. There was

however close liaison between all involved producing integrated proposals for the UK as a whole.

2.12   Sites proposed for inclusion were selected to represent themes and topics in which the UK, in whole or in part, had made outstanding contributions to the world's heritage. These sites were the subject of widespread public consultation in the latter part of 1998. Following consideration of the responses, in April 1999 the Secretary of State announced the names of the sites within the UK and its Overseas Territories which would form the new Tentative List.

How do sites from the Tentative List get onto the World Heritage List?

2.13   DCMS in consultation with the heritage agencies, the Devolved Administrations, Crown Dependencies and Overseas Territories closely monitors progress on the development of nomination bids for sites on the current UK Tentative List. On the basis of an assessment of the robustness of bids and their potential readiness for submission to UNESCO, and on the advice of English Heritage, the Government's statutory advisor on World Heritage issues, decisions on the order of future nominations are made by Ministers. Nomination of a site in any given year is dependent on preparation of the nomination document and the management plan being sufficiently advanced to meet UNESCO's deadline for submission and may be subject to change if the World Heritage Committee refers any preceding UK nomination back to us for further consideration.

2.14   Before 1997, all nominations were prepared by the relevant cultural or natural heritage agency in the country concerned. Since 1999, nominations in England and Wales have been prepared by local partnerships, normally led by the relevant local authority and also containing representatives of the site owners and government agencies. These partnerships are supported by expertise and some funding from the relevant national natural or cultural heritage agency.

2.15   After a nomination is presented there is an 18 month period of evaluation by one of UNESCO's expert advisory bodies (IUCN for natural nominations and ICOMOS for cultural), before a final decision is made by the inter-governmental World Heritage Committee at its annual meeting. Decisions on inscription to the World Heritage List rest solely with the Committee. The process of preparation of the nomination document through the various assessment stages, nationally and internationally, to final decision by the World Heritage Committee can take at least three years and most nominations have taken longer than this.

What sites remain on our Tentative List?

2.16   The sites which remain on our 1999 Tentative List are:

- Chatham Naval Dockyard
- The Lake District

- Darwin's Landscape Laboratory
- The Twin Monastery of Wearmouth and Jarrow
- Pontcysyllte Aqueduct
- Manchester, Trafford and Salford
- The New Forest
- Great Western Railway
- Shakespeare's Stratford
- Wash and North Norfolk Coast
- The Cairngorm Mountains
- The Flow Country
- The Forth Rail Bridge
- Mount Stewart Gardens
- Fountains Cavern, Anguilla
- The Fortress of Gibraltar

2.17   While some of these sites are actively developing their bids, not all of the sites on the Tentative List still wish to proceed to nomination.

How do we look after our World Heritage Sites?

Protection

2.18   World Heritage Sites are primarily protected via the UK planning framework and World Heritage Sites are a key material consideration in determining planning applications. From October 2008 World Heritage Sites are included as Article 1 (5) Land under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995

2.19   In England, World Heritage Sites are protected under the terms of Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1), Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG 15) and the policies adopted in Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) and local authority development plans.

2.20   In Scotland Scottish Planning Policy 23: Planning and the Historic Environment (2008), is the equivalent planning guidance in respect of the built and cultural heritage while NPPG 14 Natural Heritage (currently under review) provides the relevant guidance for the natural environment.

2.21   In Wales, the Welsh Office Circular 61/96, Planning and the Historic Environment provides the equivalent guidance for the protection of the built and cultural heritage.

2.22   In Northern Ireland, Planning Policy Statement 6 (PPS6), Planning, Archaeology and the Built Environment covers World Heritage

2.23   At present, throughout the UK listed historic buildings and scheduled ancient monuments and conservation areas are protected by law, but no additional statutory controls follow from the inscription of a site onto the World Heritage List. Inscription does, however, highlight the outstanding international importance of the site as a key material consideration to be taken into account by all UK local planning authorities in determining planning and listed building consent applications, and by Ministers in determining cases on appeal or following call-in.

2.24   Each regional and local authority concerned, taking account of World Heritage Site status designation and other relevant statutory designations, are required to formulate specific planning policies for protecting these sites and include these

policies in their spatial strategies and development plans. Such policies should reflect the fact that these sites have been designated for their Outstanding Universal Value, and they should place great weight on the need to protect them. It follows that development proposals must be scrutinised for their likely effect on the site or its setting in the longer term. Significant development proposals will generally require formal environmental impact assessment.

2.25   Each of the Crown Dependencies and Overseas Territories make their own arrangements for spatial planning and the protection of natural and cultural heritage. On the Isle of Man for example there are at present no World Heritage Sites, but sites which are considered on the island as having potential for this recognition have been explicitly recognised in the appropriate local spatial planning documents.

2.26   Plans to enhance the future protection of World Heritage Sites are covered separately in Chapter 7.

Management

2.27   DCMS represents the UK State Party in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and chairs an Interdepartmental Group on World Heritage which brings together its main partners and advisers. Different arrangements apply to managing World Heritage Sites according to the arrangements in place for managing cultural and natural heritage more generally.

Advisory bodies

2.28   The UK Government is advised on World Heritage issues by a number of official bodies.

2.29   English Heritage is DCMS's statutory advisor on issues affecting the built heritage in England and also advises on policy aspects of the World Heritage Convention. Cadw, Historic Scotland and the Northern Ireland Environment and Heritage Service advise their own governments while the Crown Dependencies and Overseas Territories have varied arrangements.

2.30   The UK National Commission for UNESCO is an independent civil society organisation set up by HM Government in 2004 as the focal point in the UK for policies relating to UNESCO. It is establishing a role in World Heritage issues, with a focus on raising awareness of World Heritage in communities and schools.

2.31   The Joint Nature Conservation Committee advises all parts of the UK and its Overseas Territories on issues affecting natural heritage, while each administration also calls on the advice of its national natural heritage body.

2.32   The Government and its agencies can also call on the services of NGOs. The Local Authority World Heritage Forum (LAWHF) helps local authorities play their part in protecting, conserving and presenting the UK World Heritage Sites. The UK branch of the International Council on Monuments and Sites, ICOMOS UK, is part-funded by English Heritage, Cadw and Historic Scotland to advise on World Heritage matters such as capacity development and standard setting. ICOMOS UK coordinates a regular forum for World Heritage Coordinators in the UK to share best practice.

Management plans

2.33.   All UK World Heritage Sites have management plans showing how their Outstanding Universal Value will be preserved. Such plans help ensure the preservation of the site by establishing a framework for decision-making. The process of developing the management plan brings together all the key stakeholders to agree a common vision for the future of the site. As a result, working links are reinforced and new projects emerge.

Periodic reporting

2.34   Governments must report to UNESCO every six years on the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites in their territory. The World Heritage Committee then decides whether measures are needed to resolve any recurrent problems. DCMS last submitted a Periodic Report in two parts in December 2004 and December 2005. Since then, there has been considerable follow-up work including the preparation of short Statements of Significance and minor boundary changes for a number of sites.

Notification and Reactive Monitoring

2.35   Governments are required to inform UNESCO World Heritage Committee of any significant developments which might affect a World Heritage Site or its setting. Third parties can also contact the UNESCO World Heritage Centre directly. Following consideration and consultation with national governments and its Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre can make a State of Conservation Report to the annual meeting of the inter-governmental UNESCO World Heritage Committee.

2.36   The Committee can, in serious cases, commission further reports, with or without a mission to the site concerned. Failure to satisfy the WH Committee on such issues can result in a site being placed on the List of World Heritage In Danger with conditions for improvement attached. If the Committee ultimately decides that the outstanding universal value for which the site was inscribed has been lost, the site may be de-listed.

Funding

2.37   The UK contributes around £130,000 to the Committee's World Heritage Fund every year. State Parties can apply to the World Heritage Committee for international assistance from the Fund where adequate resources cannot be secured at national level. In practice, however, priority is given to requests for assistance for sites on the World Heritage in Danger List and to requests from developing countries and low income economies.

2.38   In Scotland 'The Heart of Neolithic Orkney' is in the care of Scottish Ministers, the City of Edinburgh Council and Historic Scotland fund Edinburgh World Heritage and the

Agency funds co-ordinators for New Lanark and the Antonine Wall. In the rest of the UK government does not identify specific funds for World Heritage Sites, which are funded from normal government budgets available for conservation.

2.39 Most basic costs of maintenance and management are met by the owners of the sites, the majority of whom are private in the urban sites, but also include voluntary organisations, local and national government and its agencies, using their normal funding streams.

2.40 Capital costs of conservation or the provision of facilities are met from a variety of sources including national and local government, the Heritage Lottery Fund, economic regeneration funds, including the European Union, funds available for agri-environmental schemes and the private sector. Over £268 million of Lottery funding has been allocated to World Heritage Sites in the UK since 1994. More recently Regional Development Agencies have played a significant funding role in some instances, usually funding discrete activities and studies.

Awareness building and education

2.41 The World Heritage Committee encourages and supports the development of educational materials, activities and programmes. The Secretariat, in cooperation with the UNESCO education sector and other partners, produces and publishes a World Heritage Educational Resource Kit, 'World Heritage in Young Hands' for use in secondary schools around the world. State Parties are encouraged to develop educational activities related to World Heritage with, wherever possible, the participation of schools, universities, museums and other local and national educational authorities.

2.42 The Committee emphasises that education is not just about school children, and that opportunities to improve knowledge of the history and significance of World Heritage Sites should be open to everyone.

2.43 In the UK World Heritage Sites are not specifically included within the National Curriculum, but most sites have educational material and outreach programmes. Some sites have run programmes with local schools.

2.44 There is no joint strategy for building awareness of World Heritage Sites. Individual sites have local initiatives.

2.45 The principal source of information on World Heritage Sites is the website of UNESCO's World Heritage Centre (whc.unesco.org). Information on sites in the UK and overseas territories is dispersed between a number of websites including those of DCMS, English Heritage, Visit Britain, Historic Scotland, Cadw, the Northern Ireland Environment and Heritage Service, the UK National Commission for UNESCO, ICOMOS UK and the Local Authority World Heritage Forum. DCMS have established a World Heritage Portal at http://www.ukworldheritage.org.uk which contains useful information and links to other sites.

Should we identify any more World Heritage Sites?

2.46 With 27 sites on the World Heritage List the UK is joint seventh on the list of well-represented nations in terms of the number of sites. Although the time has come for

us to review our Tentative List and possibly to identify some new sites, we should first consider whether it is necessary or worthwhile to continue adding more.

2.47   To help us answer this question we have examined the position of the World Heritage Committee and its advisers; the findings of an independent study we have commissioned into the costs and benefits of World Heritage Site status; and the advice of a range of stakeholders with an interest in World Heritage. Our findings are set out in the following chapters.

Chapter 3: World Heritage Committee position on future nominations

3.1   We need to ensure that there is wide understanding among aspiring sites of the nature of the World Heritage List, the reasons for establishing it and the factors which will be taken into account by the World Heritage Committee in determining which properties will ultimately be inscribed. The increasing number and nature of sites being accepted onto the List may make WHS status seem more achievable, but in reality the reverse is true.

3.2   There are currently 878 World Heritage Sites spread through the territories of 145 of the 185 states who belong to the World Heritage Convention. This means that 40 member states have no World Heritage Sites. At the other extreme, five European countries have 176 World Heritage Sites between them (Italy 43; Spain 40, Germany 33; France 33: UK 27), around 20% of the total. Altogether, 435 of the 878 World Heritage Sites are in Europe.

3.3   This geographical imbalance has been a matter of concern to the World Heritage Committee for most of its existence. The Committee has also been concerned by the imbalance between natural (174) sites and cultural (679) (the remaining 25 sites are inscribed under both natural and cultural criteria). There are also marked imbalances in the types of cultural properties inscribed. As long ago as 1993, an ICOMOS study identified that Europe, historic towns and religious monuments, Christianity, historical periods and 'elitist' architecture (in relation to vernacular) were all over –represented on the World Heritage List; whereas, all living cultures, and especially traditional cultures, were underrepresented. (http://whc.unesco.org/en/globalstrategy/)

3.4   These imbalances have not been corrected since then, despite the adoption in 1994 by the World Heritage Committee of the Global Strategy for a Balanced, Representative and Credible World Heritage List. By adopting the Global Strategy, the World Heritage Committee wanted to broaden the definition of World Heritage the better to reflect the full spectrum of our world's cultural and natural treasures and to provide a comprehensive framework and operational methodology for implementing the World Heritage Convention.

3.5   Among the action points in the strategy was the identification of certain themes as having high potential to complete gaps in representation. These should be considered in their broad anthropological context through time:

HUMAN COEXISTENCE WITH THE LAND

- Movement of peoples (nomadism, migration)
- Settlement

- Modes of subsistence
- Technological evolution

    HUMAN BEINGS IN SOCIETY

- Human interaction
- Cultural coexistence
- Spirituality and creative expression.

3.6   The 1999 UK Tentative List took these into account in its selection of themes for future UK nominations, focusing in particular on industrialization and the UK's global influence.

3.7   Since then, the World Heritage Committee has commissioned the Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS and IUCN) to carry out further studies, completed in 2005 and 2004 respectively. The ICOMOS study, covering cultural sites, does not recommend specific themes but does have a comprehensive analysis of what types of cultural heritage are, and are not, represented on the World Heritage List. It should be taken into account by anyone considering proposing a site for inclusion on the new UK Tentative List (http://www.international.icomos.org/world_heritage/whlgaps.htm)

3.8   The IUCN study (http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/ouv2006_english.pdf), on natural sites, is able to be more precise and recommends that priority should be given to specific terrestrial and marine habitats within the biomes of Tropical Grassland/Savanna, Lake Systems, Tundra and Polar Systems, Temperate Grasslands and Cold Winter Deserts. The specific habitats, which are indicative and not exclusive, are:

Grasslands

- Sudd-Sahelian savanna and flooded grasslands
- Sub-Antarctic grasslands, including South Georgia
- Sub-polar and arctic tundra

Wetlands

- Flooded grasslands such as Okavango and the Sudd swamps
- Volga and Lena River deltas
- Western Ghats rivers

Deserts

- Succulent Karoo
- Namib desert
- Central Asian deserts
- Socotra desert

Forests

- Madagascar moist forests
- Forests in southern Chile and southern Argentina
- Dry and moist forests in New Caledonia
- Western Ghats forests

Marine

- Red Sea corals
- Andaman Sea (sites within the marine eco-region)
- Benguela Current (marine)
- Marine sites within the following WWF eco-regions: Fiji, Palau and Tahiti
- Gulf of California
- Maldives/Chagos atolls

3.9   The precision of the IUCN natural sites study, in recommending that priority should be given to specific terrestrial and marine habitats within specific biome, and in some cases within named countries, unambiguously defines those areas where the advisory body sees a need for future natural site nominations. These habitats include at least two specific recommendations within UK Overseas Territories (South Georgia and Chagos) but the study includes no reference to any habitats within the UK itself.

3.10   There are also a number of thematic studies looking at specific aspects of cultural and natural heritage. A list of those studies already completed is at http://whc.unesco.org/en/globalstrategy

3.11   In addition to these studies, the World Heritage Committee has also recommended in the *Operational Guidelines* (para 59) that well-represented states should slow down their rate of submission of further nominations by:

a) spacing voluntarily their nominations according to conditions that they will define, and/or;

b) proposing only properties falling into categories still under-represented, and/or;

c) linking each of their nominations with a nomination presented by a State Party whose heritage is underrepresented; or

d) deciding, on a voluntary basis, to suspend the presentation of new nominations.

3.12   Subsequently, the World Heritage Committee has also asked member states to consider harmonising their Tentative List with those of their neighbours.

Chapter 4: Costs and benefits of World Heritage Site status

4.1 Information from the World Heritage Committee and its advisers provides an invaluable steer as to the sort of site which is likely to gain inscription on the World Heritage List. But as a State Party which is already well represented on the List we are also asked to consider slowing down or suspending our nominations.

4.2 To help decide whether to suspend or space our nominations, or to focus on particular types of site in future, DCMS together with funding partners Historic Scotland and Cadw commissioned an independent study of the costs and benefits of World Heritage Site Status. In particular we wanted to know the answers to the following questions:

- What are the benefits involved in nomination and inscription?
- What are the associated costs and responsibilities of WHS status?
- How are the costs and responsibilities of WHS status affected by the location, nature of the site, or by the extent of marketing before as opposed to after inscription?
- How have costs, responsibilities and benefits changed since the last Tentative List was drawn up in 1999? How might they change in future years as values evolve and global markets develop?
- What could be done to reduce the costs and optimise the potential benefits of WHS bids?
- How far is the perception of costs/benefits matched by the reality?
- To what extent does a successful WHS bid enable sites to lever in other sources of funds?

4.3 Following competitive tender PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC) was commissioned in May 2007 to investigate the costs and benefits of World Heritage Site status in the UK.

Summary of PWC findings

4.4 The study sought to identify only those **additional** costs and benefits which were directly attributable to WHS status. It involved several different elements:

- a literature review of previous research in this area
- a consultation programme with over 70 different individuals and organisations
- a cost survey of UK World Heritage sites
- six case studies of UK World Heritage Sites involving 5 well known sites and one less well known

- a postal survey of residents across the case study sites.

4.5   The full report, literature review and case studies can be found on the DCMS website www.dcms.gov.uk and inform this consultation. Main findings from the study are as follows.

What are the costs and benefits associated with WHS status and who incurs or gains them?

4.6   There is significant variation in the costs associated with WHS as sites are so different in terms of ownership, scale, nature, information available and location.

NB: All employment costs reflect salaries and 'on-cost' in terms of overheads

Table 1: Bidding costs of WHS nomination		
Cost area	**Description**	**Value**
WHS Co-ordinator costs	• If we assume that a new site coming forward were to take on a Co-ordinator at between £36,000-£42,000 per annum[6] in the first year for 4.8 years, with an average earnings increase of 3.5% per annum, this would indicate a total cost of between £185,000-£216,000 for the bid Co-ordinator.	• £36-£42k p.a • £185-£216k total
Partner and consultation time	• Assuming an average of c£40k per annum staff cost and four meetings per annum, across the sites for which information is available and using the modal number of 13 partners. This would indicate an average cost in partner time at £7,800 per annum. Again, if we use the average length of time taken for the nomination process as 4.8 years, this would indicate that the total staff cost to partners, again assuming a 3.5% annual earnings increase, would be in the region of £41k.	• c.£8k p.a • c.£41k total
Production costs	• Document production and photography.	• £15-£50k total
Supporting studies	• Economic, tourism, conservation or international comparison studies.	• £20-£80k total per study

Table 2: Costs of producing a management plan		
Cost area	**Description**	**Value**
Partner and consultation time	• Assuming average of c£40k per annum staff cost and four meetings per annum, across the sites for which information is available, the modal number of partners is thirteen. This would indicate an average cost in partner time of around £7,800 per annum. Again, if we assume that the average length of time taken for the nomination process is 4.8 years, this would indicate that the total staff cost to partners, again assuming a 3.5% annual earnings increase would be in the region of £41k.	• c.£8k p.a • c.£41k total
Production costs	• Document production and photography of £15-£50k.	• £15-£50k

Table 3: Management costs of WHS		
Management structure	**Description**	**Value**
Special ownership model	• Sites are largely single entity where the site itself (excluding the buffer zone) has either a single or a few owners and is relatively contained where that owner often holds some special status, such as where ownership is held by the Church or by the Crown. Sites which would fit into this group would include the Tower of London, Blenheim Palace, Westminster, Durham, Canterbury, Kew and Studley Park Royal including Fountains Abbey.	• £13-£26k p.a
No WHS Co-ordinator model	• These sites are notable primarily because whilst there is a steering group and a series of working groups there is no co-ordinator in place. They are also more significant in terms of their scale or level of dispersal than others. Sites in this category include Giants Causeway and the Castles of King Edward I.	• £100-£160k p.a
WHS co-ordinator model	• This is the most common approach taken to WHS management, with nine of the 24 sites included in this category. In these locations (Orkney, Ironbridge, Greenwich, Bath, Blaenavon, Derwent Valley, Liverpool, Saltaire and Stonehenge and Avebury) there is a senior steering or management group in place which is supported by a dedicated WHS co-ordinator, sometimes with a very small staff, and a number of other working groups or technical panels which meet periodically.	• £130-£215k p.a
Separate entity model	• Some more complex sites have set up entirely separate entities set up to manage the WHS, usually with a much larger numbers of staff. These sites typically represent some of the largest sites in terms of scale and are most complex in terms of ownership making them much more complex sites to manage. Examples of this category would include Edinburgh, Hadrian's Wall, the Dorset and East Devon Coast, Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape and New Lanark.	• £190-£615k p.a

Table 4: WHS Benefits and recipients		
Benefit area	Hypothesis/Description	Beneficiary
Partnership	• WHS status is said to increase the level of partnership activity through the consultation required to create and fulfil the requirements of the management plan. The hypothesis is largely borne out by the evidence.	• Local residents and visitors benefit indirectly through improved management
Additional funding	• As a result of gaining WHS status, and through the diverse range of partners involved, the site is likely to be viewed more favourably, particularly by conservation and heritage based funding sources and, subject to a variety of other considerations, these sources appear to invest additional public funds in the site. This is a significant area of benefit for WHS status but only at a local or regional level.	• Local residents and visitors benefit indirectly through increased investment in the site but since funding is almost entirely public, the net effect at a national level is nil.
Conservation	• The additional funding generated by WHS status improves conservation levels and the increased publicity provides greater scrutiny in planning applications influencing the scale and quality of local development. WHS status is seen as having a marginal impact on the planning system, but a significant impact on funding.	• 'User' benefits accrue to local residents and visitors who enjoy enhanced conservation. 'Non-user' 'option' and 'bequest' benefits accrue to the wider population.
Tourism	• WHS status is suggested to provide a promotional advantage and a 'branding effect' which encourages additional visitors. The evidence indicates that this is likely to have a marginal effect (c.0-3%) and this will be stronger for less 'famous' sites.	• Local tourism businesses benefit from increased visitor income.

Benefit area	Hypothesis/Description	Beneficiary
Regeneration	• WHS status is assumed to be a catalyst for regeneration, predominantly through stimulating new investment, inward migration and increased tourism. Only one example exists where this has occurred across our case studies, however other factors were involved.	• Local people and businesses benefit from increased levels of economic activity in a variety of ways.
Civic Pride	• WHS status is seen as a mechanism for building local confidence and civic pride. This also appears to be a significant area of benefit but it is dependant on the local conditions and the nature of the site.	• Locals enjoy increased confidence in the area and improved quality of life.
Social Capital	• WHS status is recognised as having the potential for providing increased social unity and cohesion through increasing opportunities for interaction and engagement within the local community. There is evidence from the postal survey that these benefits are accruing at a reasonable level. The survey also suggests that these benefits are more significant within the ethnic and religious majority rather than supporting minority groups.	• Local populations and organisations.
Education and learning	• WHS status is considered to be a tool for learning engagement. Again there appears to be a degree of learning and cognitive growth at the sites.	• Visiting educational groups (local or regional).

How are these costs and benefits affected by the specific characteristics of sites?

The following characteristics significantly affect their relative costs and benefits.

Ownership structure

4.7   Where sites are in single ownership many of the activities required by WHS status will already be taking place, making the additional costs of such status significantly lower. Larger sites often require more significant partnership structures with some of the most diffuse ownership arrangements requiring over 70 partners. This increases costs, but also increases opportunities to involve partners in the management and funding of the site.

Fame of site

4.8   Sites which are already well known have little need for WHS status as a measure of quality and consequently make little use of the brand.

Location

4.9   Urban sites are likely to require a more significant level of resource in management since the levels of activity within or surrounding the location are likely to be higher. Development pressures indicate a relatively high opportunity cost and correspondingly higher benefit in terms of conservation. Sites close to larger towns and cities have greater opportunity to attract tourists and school visits.

Motivations

4.10   WHS status is what sites and their Steering Groups have made of it. Where the status has been used to full effect it has brought partners together, leveraged additional funding, led to new developments and enhanced educational benefits, improved conservation and even led to regeneration in some locations. Where these opportunities have not been seized there have been more limited benefits.

Marketing

4.11   It is unclear whether the level of marketing undertaken by each site has had any significant effect on its tourism numbers although this does of course depend on the fame of the site before it was inscribed as a WHS.

Nature of site

4.12   The nature of the site and what it represents to the local population determines whether it will lead to community benefits and civic pride.

Heritage listing arrangements

4.13   Sites which are already well protected are less likely to gain significant conservation benefits from WHS status, but benefit from holistic management. In the overseas territories there are sites where designation has made a significant impact.

How are the costs and benefits perceived and how prepared are sites for them?

4.14   Although general awareness of the costs and benefits of world heritage inscription is improving, in some areas they are less well understood (in relation to opportunity costs/development pressures) or overstated (in relation to tourism and regeneration benefits).

How could we reduce costs?

- Explain the levels of cost and benefit involved to equip sites better to make decisions about whether or not to bid for WHS.
- Explain the nature and characteristics of sites which are likely to be accepted onto the World Heritage List.
- Streamline the application process.
- Establish best practice in governance and management arrangements.
- Encourage sites to align the benefits of WHS more closely with the interests of the private sector to encourage greater private sector funding.

How could we increase benefits?

At national level:

- Raise awareness of WHS
- Provide greater recognition of WHS in the planning system
- Slow down nominations to maintain the current value of the WHS brand
- Clarify position on use of WHS logo in marketing

At site level:

- Appoint a full time WHS coordinator at all sites and make core funding available on a permanent basis
- Support more community activities to maximise benefits of civic pride and social capital
- Include education and interpretation strategies within all World Heritage Site management plans

How is this situation likely to change in the future and what else needs to be considered?

- Increasing competition for a place on the World Heritage List and the more exacting standards involved are pushing up nomination costs, with the increasing number and

nature of sites being accepted onto the List making WHS status seem more achievable.

- Devaluation in the WHS brand and benefits as more sites are included on the list.
- Increasing interest in pursuing WHS as a tool for regeneration rather than for conservation reasons.
- Increasing scale and breadth of consultation on heritage, conservation and planning activities leading to increasing costs.
- In the absence of objective guidance, sites are coming forward with little prospect of success, leading to wasted effort.
- As UNESCO requirements change and/or increase sites need to be kept in touch, so that they can factor these into their decisions.
- Although a national designation (see Chapter 6 on alternative designations) could provide a useful filtering process for potential new WH sites, this would add additional complexity to an already overly complex listing system.

Messages for aspiring sites

4.15   PwC's report suggests that aspiring sites should think carefully before pursuing World Heritage Site status. The process is expensive at all stages, and costs are rising. There are no automatic benefits in terms of additional tourism and economic regeneration. Such benefits may indeed follow inscription, but only where sites have worked to achieve them. The same applies to additional funding, which sites must pursue and which will generally come from public sources and may be at the expense of sites elsewhere. The scale, height and quality of development around World Heritage Sites will come under close scrutiny.

4.16   It is clear however that for some kinds of site, where conditions are right, not only do benefits follow inscription, but the mere prospect of nomination can have benign effects on the way sites are managed and protected. Additional local, national and indeed international prestige may accompany inscription, particularly for lesser known sites. World Heritage Site status can increase local pride and raise awareness of conservation issues.

Chapter 5: Future nominations for World Heritage Site status

5.1 With a review of our current Tentative List now due, we should consider carefully the position of the World Heritage Committee and its advisers and the research we have commissioned into costs and benefits to determine whether we should continue to make nominations to the World Heritage List. The main options are:

i) continue to nominate annually from our existing Tentative List;

ii) suspend new nominations for a period and focus instead on making the most of the sites we already have; or

iii) draw up a shorter and more focused Tentative List, streamlining the application process and spacing out our nominations so that we are not necessarily proposing a new site each year.

Option i: Continue to nominate annually from our existing List

Business as usual – or continuing to nominate annually from our existing List – is in our view unlikely to be a worthwhile option, since it would combine the high costs of World Heritage nominations with a low likelihood of success as WHC priorities have evolved and changed.

Option ii: Suspending nominations

5.2 There would be advantages to suspending nominations for a while. This would:

- help to maintain the global balance of the World Heritage List;
- help to maintain the credibility of the List and the value of the sites we already have by limiting their number;
- avoid the need to rate future heritage sites according to international priorities and gaps rather than our own national values;
- save the time and expense involved in making new nominations, allowing us to direct our resources instead to looking after existing sites and strengthening international cooperation;

- provide opportunities for renominating existing World Heritage Sites under additional criteria and/or significantly extending their boundaries – major changes which under current guidelines must be considered as new nominations;
- allow time to develop further transnational nominations.

5.3   But there would also be drawbacks. We would:

- lose the benign effects which application, nomination and inscription have on the way in which sites are managed and protected;
- lose the opportunity to gain local/regional/national prestige and to raise the profile of our cultural and natural heritage generally;
- fail to update our list in ways which reflect current values.

On balance we believe that the cost of suspending nominations would outweigh the benefits.

Option iii: Spacing nominations from a shorter and more focused Tentative List

5.4   We propose the compromise of spacing nominations to the World Heritage List over the next ten years, so that we would no longer routinely make a nomination every year, but would retain the option of making appropriate nominations drawing on a shorter and more focused Tentative List. A two-stage application process would help to filter out early those sites unlikely to be successful.

5.5   There are obvious challenges in shortening our Tentative List at a time when interest in World Heritage status is increasing, but we believe that with increased understanding of the World Heritage Committee's priorities, and more information about the potential costs and benefits of applying, aspiring sites will themselves think much more carefully in future before submitting an application for WH status.

Streamlining the application process

5.6   The PwC study notes that if a process could be established which was shorter and more explicit, with bids being removed earlier from the process and a tighter pipeline of fewer potential sites then this would reduce costs for all concerned.

5.7   Our aim would therefore be to streamline the application process by:

- providing clarity from the outset about the criteria to be met and the gaps to be filled;
- ensuring that aspiring sites fully understand the likely costs and benefits of the process; and
- introducing a two stage application process with a view to filtering out at an early stage those sites which are unlikely to be successful.

Questions for aspiring sites

We would encourage all prospective sites before they apply to consider carefully the stated priorities of the World Heritage Committee and the 'gaps' to the current list identified by its advisers ICOMOS and IUCN (summarised in Chapters 2 & 3).

While there has been increasing interest over the years in bidding for WHS status, research has shown that the likely costs and benefits are not always well understood. Aspiring sites should examine carefully the research we have commissioned into costs and benefits (summarised in Chapter 4).

Key questions for aspiring sites are:

Does our site meet the criteria for Outstanding Universal Value?

Does it meet the criteria for authenticity and integrity?

Does it stand the test of national and international comparison?

Are we committed to managing the site and setting in the future in ways which will protect its Outstanding Universal Value?

Appendix C, extracted from PwC's report on the costs and benefits of World Heritage Site status, offers further guidance for aspiring sites to consider before they bid. We would recommend sites to read this guidance as well as the Operational Guidelines before deciding whether to apply for World Heritage Site status.

Criteria

5.8 Given the increasing complexity of the WHC's requirements and priorities we shall require that prospective sites acquaint themselves with these and apply only if they meet the following criteria:

- *Prima facie* evidence of Outstanding Universal Value including authenticity and integrity

- Extent to which proposals meet the requirements of the global strategy and the gap studies

- Whether the site falls into an under-represented category on the World Heritage List

- Extent to which site is subject to development pressures which might affect outstanding universal value

- Extent to which there is international cooperation or linkages to be followed up actively

- Strong local consensus to pursue nomination.

Strengthening international cooperation

5.9 In line with the World Heritage Committee's recommendation, where it is feasible to do so we would encourage aspiring sites to link their applications with sites in countries whose heritage is under-represented on the World Heritage List. Where a trans-national nomination is not feasible, we would encourage potential sites to consider what other support they might be able to offer. Beneficiaries might include

Commonwealth or other countries with a shared heritage in the area of the potential nomination, particularly where these countries lack the resources or expertise to nominate or manage their own sites. As UK sites have already shown, there are many ways of offering support to the international community, reaping the benefits in the process of exchanging best practice and improving cooperation between heritage professionals. Such approaches help to ensure that the acknowledged outstanding universal value of our sites is of genuine benefit across the world.

Links with the international community

- In 2005 the World Heritage Committee announced that Hadrian's Wall, a UK World Heritage Site in its own right since 1987, had been extended to include the Upper German-Raetian Limes to form the first section of a major trans-national World Heritage Site, the **Frontiers of the Roman Empire.** It is expected that as the site is further extended it will eventually encompass remains of the Roman Frontiers around the Mediterranean region. The next section of the site, The Antonine Wall in Scotland, was inscribed by the Committee as an extension to the Frontiers site in July 2008.

- **Royal Botanic Gardens Kew** is developing a global collaborative programme involving key activities such as creating global access to essential information, helping to implement global conservation programmes, and extending the Millennium Seed Bank's global partnership.

- When **Cornish and West Devon mining** declined in the 1860s, large numbers of miners emigrated to work and live in mining communities based on Cornish traditions, in for instance South Africa, Australia, and Central and South America, where Cornish engine houses still survive. Frontiers of Cornish Mining is a concept for a trans-national, incremental, serial nomination that comprises the best surviving and most historically significant international Cornish Mining cultural landscapes.

- The **Jurassic Coast** Steering Group has supported the St Lucian Government in their work to manage the Pitons Management Area World Heritage Site. This has involved significant technical assistance and culminated in a week long visit to the Jurassic Coast by key St Lucian government officials.

5.10   There is an international role for Government and heritage agencies as well as for individual sites. State Parties are invited to provide support to the Convention in addition to obligatory contributions paid to the World Heritage Fund, and the UK has engaged with UNESCO signed a bilateral agreement with UNESCO to assist in the support of World Heritage Centre projects for development and capacity building in the Caribbean, sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. State Parties are also encouraged to promote the establishment of national, public and private foundations or associations aimed at raising funds to support World Heritage conservation efforts. A reformed nomination process could help us to achieve our international goals for developing countries, and the UK as a whole could pursue further ways of increasing international cooperation, working closely with DFID, FCO, DEFRA, the UK National

Commission for UNESCO and the British Council, ICOMOS and IUCN in the UK to build on existing conservation programmes.

5.11 Sites in the UK Overseas Territories deserve special consideration where they fall within areas which are under-represented or in need of international support. They are for example rich in bird species and according to the RSPB currently hold 47 species of global conservation concern, of which 34 are classified as Globally Threatened. Conservation policies and their implementation in the UK Overseas Territories do not always receive the same support that they do in the UK.

Reflecting current values

5.12 One of the reasons for continuing to make nominations to the World Heritage List – even though we are already among the best represented countries – would be to retain the opportunity to update our own contribution to the List and to ensure that it truly reflects our diverse heritage. Heritage values change and sites which we might consider of outstanding universal value today might not even have been contenders when the List was first drawn up. Nominations must of course be consistent with World Heritage Committee criteria and priorities, but there are some similarities between areas rising to the top of the international heritage agenda and the areas to which we attach importance domestically. The importance attached for example by ICOMOS to 20th century history and to living cultures, especially traditional cultures, chimes with our own increasing interest in popular culture and sense of place. PwC's research has shown that the sites which derive the greatest community benefit and pride are those which are locally considered meaningful. There need not be a conflict between the concepts of outstanding universal value and local significance where a site for example bears exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition which is living or has disappeared.

A two stage application process

5.13 To filter out unsuitable applications at an earlier stage and provide more help and advice for those applications which are likely to succeed we would propose to introduce a two stage application process.

Stage 1

At Stage 1 applicants would be required to complete an application form outlining:

* *prima facie* evidence of Outstanding Universal Value including authenticity and integrity

* whether the site falls into an under-represented category on the World Heritage List and how it relates to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee Global Strategy (see above Chapter 3)

* extent to which the site is subject to development pressures which might affect outstanding universal value, and how this will be managed

* extent to which there is international cooperation or linkages to be followed up actively

* whether the application could be viewed as an extension to an existing site either in the UK or in any other country.

5.14 Clear reasons would be given to all those rejected at this stage.

Stage 2

5.15 Applicants successful at Stage 1 would be asked to complete a Stage 2 application. This should provide more detail on the areas above including:

- evidence that the site is the best or most representative example nationally and internationally of the kind of cultural or natural heritage which it represents

- how the application meets the requirements of the global strategy and the gap studies

- evidence of strong local support for the application

- proposed arrangements for managing the site in future in ways which will protect its outstanding universal value, including funding (see para 7.18)

- where appropriate, the support they would be able to offer to a country or countries whose heritage is under-represented on the World Heritage List.

Procedure for sites on the current Tentative List

5.16 While some sites on the current Tentative List may no longer wish to pursue World Heritage Site Status, others have spent time and money in pursuit of their bids and in doing so have introduced improvements which should benefit those sites in the years to come. It has always been understood that the Tentative List would be reviewed within ten years to allow us to take account of changing priorities. If we failed to do so and simply continued to nominate from the existing list we could not expect the success rate to be high. So while acknowledging the special place which Tentative List sites hold in our heritage we must ask them to consider whether they still wish to pursue World Heritage Site status in the light of the information now available on WHC priorities and the likely costs and benefits. If they do wish to continue, they will be invited to reapply following the same process as potential new sites.   There will be no presumption that because a site appeared on the old Tentative List it should have no place on the new one – nor that it should receive preferential treatment. Each case will be considered on its merits.

Selection process

5.17 For the 1997-99 Tentative List review, a review committee was set up by English Heritage on behalf of DCMS to review the list for England, the Crown Dependencies and the Overseas Territories. The Scottish and Welsh Offices and the Northern Ireland Department of the Environment made their own arrangements, each conducting separate reviews.

5.18 There were concerns at the time however that having separate lists for each country made judgements more difficult and produced inconsistent lists. There were also

concerns about the transparency of the process and the fact that some parties to the decision were placed in a subordinate position to others.

5.19   In order to achieve the aim of drawing up a shorter list to meet more focused priorities and requirements we would propose that the next review is steered by a single panel chaired by English Heritage (as statutory advisers to DCMS on World Heritage) and involving historic/cultural & natural representation from each devolved administration together with representatives or delegates of Natural England, the JNCC, the UK National Commission for UNESCO, the Ministry of Justice on behalf of the Crown Dependencies and FCO on behalf of the Overseas Territories. Other Government departments (such as DCLG, DEFRA and MoD) and the Local Authority World Heritage Forum (LAWHF) should be consulted where appropriate.

5.20   ICOMOS-UK and IUCN UK should be consulted by the panel before recommendations are made.

5.21   Once agreed by the panel and its advisers recommendations on the sites to be included on the Tentative List should be published for public comment.

5.22   All proposals would be subject to the approval of the Ministers at DCMS, the devolved administrations, DEFRA, FCO and the Ministry of Justice.

Engaging people in debate

5.23   Workshops for stakeholders might involve potential sites, local government, local communities, NDPBs and other interested parties and partners. The purpose of such discussions would be to increase understanding of the World Heritage Committee's priorities, and of the costs and benefits of World Heritage Site status, and to offer advice on implementation issues such as writing management plans, defining boundaries, and future development control.

Timetable

5.24   DCMS Ministers have already announced proposed nominations until January 2010. In January 2011 we propose to submit a new Tentative List to the World Heritage Centre. In January 2012 we would submit our first nomination from the new List, which under UNESCO rules would enable us to submit our first nomination from a new list in 2012.

We propose the following indicative timetable:

Dec 08	Consultation paper published
Jan 09	*Re-submission of Darwin's Landscape Laboratory*
Feb 09	Deadline for responses
May 09	Announcement on World Heritage policy, including invitation to make Stage 1 applications and publication of appropriate guidance/criteria *nomination*
June 09	Workshops for stakeholders to raise awareness of the requirements and responsibilities of WH status before any applications are made
July 09	Deadline for receipt of Stage 1 applications

Dec 2009	Decisions and notification to successful applicants to submit Stage 2 applications and/or consider transnational nominations
Jan 2010	*Twin Monastery of Wearmouth & Jarrow nomination*
April 2010	Deadline for receipt of Stage 2 applications
Aug 2010	List of recommended sites published for public comment
Nov 2010	Deadline for responses
Jan 2011	Announcement of new Tentative List
Jan 2011	Submission of new Tentative List to WH Centre
Jan 2012	First nomination from new List submitted to WH Centre

Chapter 6: Alternative designations

6.1   We have considered the extent to which alternative designations might help us to respond to the rising costs of bidding for inscription on the World Heritage List, the difficulties of matching the heritage we most value with gaps on the global list, and the steer from the WHC that well-represented countries should slow down or suspend nominations. Nominations to a National or European Heritage List could provide alternative forms of recognition and either replace or run in parallel to nominations to the World Heritage List.

National Heritage List

6.2   In England and Wales we already have what amounts to a national heritage list, to the extent that listed buildings (Grade I, II* and II) and scheduled ancient monuments are by definition of national significance. Our natural heritage is similarly protected and managed through a range of national and European designations for species, habitats and ecosystems. We could however draw up a much more selective list of sites with the highest level of significance. Advantages might include:

- ensuring that sites are in a state of readiness for nomination to the World Heritage List, increasing their likelihood of success and reducing costs at the nomination stage;

- providing recognition for sites which - while they might fail to demonstrate outstanding universal value or might fall into an over-represented category of world heritage - are still of high national importance.

6.3   There are nonetheless drawbacks:

- Bidding for inclusion on a National Heritage List might in time involve similar costs to bidding for inclusion on the World Heritage List without the attendant benefit of international prestige.

- If the tourism and regeneration effects of WH status have been overstated, we should not expect the alternative of a National designation scheme to deliver significant benefits either.

- We would need to decide whether sites on the World Heritage List could also appear on the National Heritage List, and vice versa, with the attendant risks of duplication of time and effort.

- A discrete National Heritage List would conflict with current plans in England and Wales to create a single system for national designation to replace the current fragmented system of listing, scheduling and registering our important heritage assets and landscapes.

European Heritage Label

6.4   A European Heritage Label was launched in spring 2007. The impetus for the Label came from a tri-partite French, Spanish and Hungarian initiative whose joint proposals were presented at a meeting of the Council of Culture Ministers in Brussels in May 2006. The purpose of the Label is to highlight sites and monuments that have played a key role in European history and to raise their profile as tourist attractions. The UK is broadly content with the principles of the scheme, in particularly that it is proposed that the scheme is to be voluntary, which will allow the UK to decide on the extent of any future participation. If we were to participate in the scheme we would need clarity on a number of issues including the costs and responsibilities of involvement; how duplication with the World Heritage List will be avoided; and the extent to which the process for nomination will be open, accountable and inclusive.

Chapter 7: Future protection, management and promotion of World Heritage Sites

Summary

7.1   World Heritage is not just about the identification of future sites. It is also about the protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of our heritage assets. If we are to do this properly we must ensure that we are focusing our energies on looking after our existing sites as well as on considering new ones.

7.2   There are various sources of advice on which we can draw to get the most out of our existing sites:

- General guidance from the WHC Committee and its advisers ICOMOS and IUCN.

- A periodic reporting exercise carried out in 2004 and 2005 in response to the requirement that State Parties submit reports on actions taken for the application of the Convention.

- Regular monitoring reports from each site.

- ICOMOS-UNESCO reactive monitoring missions to World Heritage Sites in London and Liverpool in October/November 2006, to Bath and Edinburgh in 2008.

- The analysis we have commissioned into costs and benefits, which offers lessons for existing sites as well as for new ones.

- Advice, such as the English Heritage Conservation Principles, developed to improve management of the historic environment generally will also be relevant to World Heritage Sites.

7.3   Steps we could take to enhance the way our sites are run include:

- measures already in train to enhance the protection of World Heritage Sites including strengthened planning guidance and call-in procedures;

- stronger management arrangements and a more systematic exchange of good practice between sites;

- a joint promotion strategy, with the Cultural Olympiad providing a showcase for our World Heritage Sites; and stronger education strategies to raise awareness of our own sites, of sites throughout the world, and of the need to preserve World Heritage.

Protection

7.4 World Heritage Sites have not yet become a statutory designation in the UK. Parts of World Heritage Sites may be designated in their own right, but the principal means of protection has been through the planning system. The need for local authorities to treat World Heritage Sites as a key material consideration has been highlighted and they have been asked to develop policies to protect their Outstanding Universal Value. All World Heritage Sites have consensual Management Plans which also provide significant support to their protection and conservation.

7.5 The Government has taken the opportunity through the Heritage Protection Review to consider whether additional protections are required for World Heritage Sites. In England the White Paper 'Heritage Protection for the 21st Century', which covers England and Wales, concludes that while in general WHSs are adequately protected, there is a case for some small changes that will clarify and, in some cases strengthen, current protections. The White Paper made specific proposals for England with a more general commitment to change the system in similar ways in Wales.

7.6 In April this year the Government published in draft a Heritage Protection Bill for England and Wales setting out the legislative framework for a unified and simpler heritage protection system. The Bill reflects Government policy as expressed in the White Paper and embraces three key principles: a unified approach to the historic environment; greater opportunities for inclusion and involvement; putting the historic environment at the heart of an effective planning system. World Heritage sites will be given statutory recognition for the first time by inclusion in the new unified Register of Historic Assets to be established by the Heritage Protection Bill, which would also require Local Authorities to take World Heritage Sites into account when determining planning applications.

7.7 The Heritage Protection Bill underwent pre-legislative scrutiny by a Select Committee in July. The Government published its response to the Committee's findings in October and is hoping to introduce the Bill at the earliest opportunity, subject to the availability of Parliamentary time.

7.8 Other measures to enhance protection for our World Heritage Sites through the planning framework are:

- as part of a wider review of the Call-In Directions, specific notification and call-in requirements will be introduced for significant development affecting World Heritage sites. The new Direction will be published shortly, following public consultation earlier this year.

- a new planning circular and accompanying English Heritage guidance was published for consultation in May 2008. These documents further recognise in national policy the need to protect WHSs as sites of Outstanding Universal Value each with an accompanying management plan, including, where needed, the delineation of a buffer zone or equivalent around it. Following public consultation, the circular and accompanying English Heritage Guidance Note will be published shortly

7.9   Government endorsed guidance on tall buildings has been produced for England by English Heritage and the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment.

7.10   The UNESCO WH Committee over recent years has taken a stand against inappropriate contemporary development, and tall buildings in particular, which could have an impact on the setting of WHSs and has sent missions to London, to Liverpool, to Bath and to Edinburgh in response to these concerns.

7.11   In Liverpool UNESCO WH Committee has raised similar issues with contemporary development. Conditions were placed on the WHS at the time of inscription in 2004 relating to the height of new buildings in the WHS; the character or construction and how such construction could complement historic buildings. Additionally, the 2006 mission required further explanation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Liverpool World Heritage site to the public in general and to those involved in bringing forward development proposals and wider consultation on those proposals.

7.12   These recent WH Committee decisions and findings from missions are illustrative of the more stringent requirements required of WH sites to which the UK is responding and which must be taken into account by any aspiring sites.

Management

7.13   As shown in Chapter 2 responsibility for managing World Heritage is dispersed and reflects the shared responsibilities for managing cultural and natural heritage more generally.

7.14   Periodic reporting for the UK in 2004 and 2005 suggested that there was room for improvement in the way World Heritage is managed, given that:

- there is lack of integration between natural and cultural heritage;
- the skills base is sometimes weak or patchy; and
- better coordination is needed between sites.

7.15   PwC's cost benefit analysis found that the governance and management arrangements differ significantly across all sites and that this is another significant driver of costs. Whilst each site must define the arrangements that are right for them, a more complete understanding of the different arrangements in place and how these affect the ability of the management to operate economically, efficiently and effectively would be beneficial.

7.16   To put management on a firmer footing and provide more support for individual sites we propose:

- greater clarity about lines of responsibility and how they are shared and/or devolved (eg between participating administrations, between government departments, between central and local government, and between natural and cultural heritage agencies)

- closer inter-departmental working and a more joined-up approach to World Heritage as part of government's wider international strategy

- an enhanced website to improve signposting/communications on relevant UNESCO/WHC developments and share best practice and research

- a stronger network for sharing and learning from experience and pursuing shared goals/concerns such as capacity development, communications, skills, international cooperation, evaluation and risk.

7.17 The network could also explore ways of communicating best practice from World Heritage Sites to the wider heritage community. If World Heritage Site status is what sites make of it, it follows that many of the benefits should be available to non-WHS prepared to follow similar strategies including:

- identifying the value of the site and its significance for local people;
- drawing up an effective management plan;
- looking at the site holistically including conservation, tourism and public realm;
- recognising multiple areas of responsibility and forming effective partnerships via a strong steering group;
- involving the community in decision-making and building consensus.

Funding

7.18 It is wrong to assume that World Heritage Site status will itself provide an automatic route to additional funding. Sites which are already well known may in particular find it difficult to attract extra funds on the basis of World Heritage Site status. The strong partnerships needed to pursue and maintain such status do however provide the environment in which funding can potentially be brought together from a wide range of sources.

7.19 Cost benefit analysis conducted by PwC suggests:

- Ensuring that a full time WHS coordinator is in place at all sites and that core funding is made available on a permanent basis ensures that coordinator time is focussed on the management of the site rather than completing future funding applications.

- Complex ownership arrangements involving multiple partners increase the costs associated with partner and staff time, but also increase the opportunity to involve partners in the funding of the site and can lead to significant sources of additional income, predominantly from the public sector.

- Where sites are in single ownership the opportunity is often available to gain income from visitors, allowing private funding to be used to support conservation of the site.

- Sites should continue to work to align the benefits of WHS status more closely with the private sector and encourage private sector funding in those instances where this is possible.

7.20 Future sites interested in pursuing World Heritage Site status should first consider whether they can ensure that basic funding for coordination costs is secured.

Promotion

7.21   The World Heritage Convention aims to raise the general public's awareness, understanding and appreciation of the need to preserve cultural and natural heritage; enhance the function of World Heritage in the life of the community; and increase the participation of local and national populations in the protection and presentation of heritage.

Awareness raising

7.22   State Parties are encouraged to raise awareness of the need to preserve World Heritage. In particular, they should ensure that World Heritage status is adequately marked and promoted on site.

7.23   The periodic reporting exercise carried out in 2004 did not consider that the presentation and general awareness about the protection and conservation of World Heritage sites in the UK was adequate.

7.24   In their study PwC found that use of WHS status in marketing and branding was mixed with some sites appearing to use it more extensively than others. As their case studies show, some sites have adopted an imaginative approach to marketing which could provide a model for other sites to follow. Sites which are relatively less well known seem more likely to use the status in their marketing activities and experience a more significant rise in brand value. For other sites, failure to promote their World Heritage Site status can be a deliberate choice rather than an oversight. For these sites WHS status and 'heritage' more broadly are not always seen as a good fit with the image they wish to portray.

7.25   For some sites there have been difficulties in interpreting UNESCO guidance on the use of the World Heritage logo and it is perceived that opportunities are being missed because of concerns over rule breaking. Both DCMS and a number of individual sites have produced branding guides spelling out rules for the use of the logo and suggesting where it might be used. The issue of guidance of this nature on a shared website might help other sites to make more effective use of the logo in publications and marketing activities.

7.26   It is sometimes suggested that other countries are more effective than the UK at promoting their World Heritage Sites and that a joined-up promotional strategy is needed to promote sites within the UK more effectively. Our evidence suggests that the impact WHS appears to have on the motivations of visitors is very marginal and if the objective is to increase visitor numbers there are likely to be more cost effective ways of achieving this goal. On the broader issue of awareness-raising however there does seem to be scope for sites to work more effectively both independently and together to raise awareness of World Heritage both in the UK and more widely. In particular the evidence suggests that an understanding of these sites' cultural significance can increase people's sense of pride, identity and belonging, particularly in areas where sites are less obviously 'famous'.

7.27 Possible steps include:

- Sites to share best practice in promotion and interpretation
- More accessible websites on World Heritage with easier navigation between them
- Improved guidance on the use of the World Heritage logo

- Greater coordination between sites where opportunities arise for joint promotion, for example in relation to the 2008-12 Cultural Olympiad.

7.28 Matters could be taken forward through the strengthened network for World Heritage stakeholders proposed earlier in this chapter.

Civic pride and social capital

7.29 PWC found no direct causal relationship in the 6 sites chosen suggesting that civic pride automatically increases directly as a result of World Heritage status, but it does appear to create some seal of quality for a location and its cultural significance. Blaenavon is an outstanding example of how such enhancement of civic pride can be achieved.

7.30 Across the six case study sites they investigated all of those consulted felt that the achievement of WHS status was a significant accolade that would generate some sense of local pride, but the extent of this differed between sites. The quality approval appears to be more important for those sites which are less well known.

7.31 Pride also appeared to be higher among individuals of white ethnic origin (81%) than those of ethnic minorities collectively (75%) and lowest among Asian or Asian British ethnic groups (57%). It was generally higher among Christians (81%) than all other denominations (77%).

7.32 The nature of the site also determines whether it is a source of local pride. PWC suggest that the Castles of Edward I in Wales are sometimes viewed negatively by locals as a symbol of foreign occupancy and oppression.

7.33 Where sites such as Studley Royal Park including Fountains Abbey had already had an important role in the local community the civic benefit deriving purely from WHS status was seen to be much more limited.

7.34 There is evidence that for some groups in particular WHS status can help build social capital through promoting social interaction in communities and creating a sense of community identity. For example the proportion agreeing that WHS provides an important common bond with the local community and more opportunities to meet other local people was highest among those over 70 and those with a long term disability.

7.35 Individual sites may find it valuable to:

- evaluate their impact on local communities to investigate their effectiveness in raising awareness, civic pride and social cohesion;

- share best practice with other sites; and

- consider whether there are further measures they might take to increase the potential benefits.

Education

7.36   The 2004 Periodic Reporting exercise suggested that we increase awareness of World Heritage education and promulgate best practice.

7.37   Examples of such good practice are provided in the PwC case studies. PwC found however that while all six case study sites had well developed programmes of educational activity, often including activities for both school children and vocational programmes, in all cases these activities pre-dated their inscription as World Heritage Sites. At one site (Studley Royal Park) an education strategy had been developed as part of the management plan and at another (Dorset and East Devon coast) its establishment as a WHS had led to the appointment of a dedicated educational officer. However of the six case studies only one site (Blaenavon) was either running or had plans to run an educational programme which linked specifically to World Heritage.

7.38   PwC note that as part of management plans sites are encouraged to establish a research strategy to support research to improve understanding and interpretation. They found this activity to be patchy across these sites and while some had also gone on to include an interpretation strategy and learning and education strategies and linked these to specific outcomes and objectives; others had just provided simple plans. This suggests that if more comprehensive approaches were taken in this area, it would ensure that the learning and education benefits associated with these sites were maximised and put World Heritage more at the centre of this activity.

7.39   World Heritage Sites might also raise their profile in schools through *Engaging Places,* a joint DCMS/DCFS initiative to help schools unlock the educational potential of local buildings, places and spaces in the built environment. To make schools more aware of what can be achieved by engaging with buildings and places, *Engaging Places* brings together a wide range of built environment learning providers so that schools can find out why buildings and places matter and what services and resources are locally available.

Chapter 8: Equalities impact assessment

8.1 Any Government department, when considering the formulation of new policies, is required to assess those policies against a number of 'specific impact tests' as part of an 'impact assessment'. The results of the assessment can be an important part of how the Government decides between different policy options. The impact assessment that relates to the policy options presented in this consultation document can be viewed at
www.culture.gov.uk/Reference_library/Consultations/2008_current_consultations/cons_worldheritagepolicy.htm

8.2 In relation to specific duties under equalities legislation, we would welcome comments on the extent to which the way in which we identify, protect, manage and promote World Heritage Sites might contribute to equality of opportunity in the areas of:

- Disability
- Race
- Gender

8.3 We are also specifically inviting comment from UK bodies with interests in equality and human rights.

8.4 In addition, in relation to the potential impact of the policy options on rural areas, we are specifically consulting on whether adjustments to proposed policies might be needed to meet specific rural needs and circumstances, and are inviting comment from a range of relevant bodies.

Chapter 9: Next steps and how to respond

Next Steps

In addition to setting out our proposals for the future identification, protection and management of World Heritage Sites, this consultation paper also asks for views in response to the following questions:

Question 1: Given the factors we have set out in this document, which of the following options should we adopt in relation to the future nomination of sites for World Heritage Status?

- Continue to nominate annually from our existing Tentative List;

- Suspend new nominations for a period;

- Draw up a shorter and more focused Tentative List, spacing out our nominations so that we are not necessarily proposing a new site each year and introducing a two-stage application process to filter out early those sites unlikely to be successful (our preferred option); and/or

- Consider alternative designations such as a National Heritage List or the European Heritage label.

Question 2: What further measures should be considered to improve the management and promotion of our World Heritage Sites?

How to respond

Responses should be sent to: Caity Marsh at whreview@culture.gsi.gov.uk

Or to

Culture Team (World Heritage),
Department for Culture, Media and Sport,
2-4 Cockspur Street, London SW1Y 5DH

To arrive by 24 February 2009.

This document can also be accessed at the DCMS website via which responses can also be sent: www.culture.gov.uk

You will also find a web forum (http://dcms-sp2007:8003/) on the DCMS website where you can give your views on some wider aspects of UK World heritage Site policy.

Unless a respondent requests otherwise, all responses will be available for public scrutiny.

A summary of consultation responses will be published on the DCMS website.

Annex A: Code of Practice on Consultations

This consultation is being carried out in accordance with the Government's Code of Practice for written consultation, published in April 2004.

The Codes and criteria are available on the website of the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform at http://bre.berr.gov.uk/regulation/consultation/code/index.asp

The six criteria applicable to this exercise are as follows:

1. Consult widely throughout the process, allowing a minimum of 12 weeks for written consultation at least once during the development of the policy.

2. Be clear about what your proposals are, who may be affected, what questions are being asked and the timescale for responses.

3. Ensure that your consultation is clear, concise and widely accessible.

4. Give feedback regarding the responses received and how the consultation process influenced the policy.

5. Monitor your department's effectiveness at consultation, including through the use of a designated consultation co-ordinator.

6. Ensure your consultation follows better regulation best practice, including carrying out a Regulatory Impact Assessment if appropriate.

ANNEX B: Tentative List Submission Format

STATE PARTY: **DATE OF SUBMISSION:**

Submission prepared by:

Name: E-mail:

Address: Fax:

Institution: Telephone:

Name of Property:

State, Province or Region:

Latitude and Longitude, or UTM coordinates:

DESCRIPTION:

Justification of Outstanding Universal Value:

(Preliminary identification of the values of the property which merit inscription on the World Heritage List)

Criteria considered to be met [see Paragraph 77 of the *Operational Guidelines*]**:**

(Please tick the box corresponding to the proposed criteria and justify the use of each below)

(i) ☐ (ii) ☐ (iii) ☐ (iv) ☐ (v) ☐ (vi) ☐ (vii) ☐ (viii) ☐ (ix) ☐ (x) ☐

Statement of authenticity and/or integrity [see Paragraphs 78-95 of the *Operational Guidelines*]**:**

Comparison with other similar properties:

(The comparison should outline similarities with other properties on the World Heritage List or not, and the reasons that make the property stand out)

ANNEX C: Guidance for aspiring sites (extract from PwC report)

Figure 2:Summary guidance

1. Why do we want to become a World Heritage site?

- Aspiring sites should consider what it is that they hope to gain from WHS status and in particular whether these aspirations link clearly with the World Heritage Convention. If these objectives relate to conservation, education, understanding or social objectives then they may represent a good fit. If these objectives relate to regeneration, economic or tourism objectives then these are not strongly related to World Heritage and indeed there may be more attractive ways of achieving these benefits.

2. Is it achievable?

- Early discussions with DCMS and/or relevant heritage agencies as well as reference to World Heritage Committee, ICOMOS and IUCN should give sites a good understanding of the likelihood of success, particularly in relation to the Outstanding Universal Value criteria and the extent to which sites might fill gaps on the World Heritage List. The aesthetic quality of the nomination document is not a consideration.

3. What will it cost for us to bid?

- **The time commitments**- Following the current UK nomination system bids will first need to gain a place on the UK Tentative list and then reach the UNESCO committee for approval. Currently the average length of time taken for a bid to be approved is around 5 years.

- **The complexity of the site and the nomination document**- Our research suggests that the larger and more complex the ownership of the site the larger the partnership that would be required to develop the bid. The average number of partners involved is 13 but for large sites or sites with multiple ownership or jurisdiction the number of partners involved can be as many as 70. The participation in the bid can be expected to cost on average £200k in staff time during the bid process. Smaller sites with just one or a few owners are likely to incur less cost in the bidding process. There may be further cost if additional conservation, tourism or other studies are required and these can be for between £20- £80k per study.

- **The management plan**- New nominations are required to develop a management plan for the site. This will provide a more comprehensive assessment of the site for conservation and management purposes which is a significant benefit in itself regardless of the outcome of bidding, however it can be expected to cost between £200-£250k in staff time and resources.

- **The overall cost**- From our research the overall cost of producing a bid which reaches the UNESCO committee for approval is estimated at between £420 and £570k.

- **Who pays**?- There is no central government funding available from DCMS and whilst English Heritage, Historic Scotland, Cadw, the Heritage Lottery Fund, Defra, Natural England and others have historically provided some support to specific sites depending on circumstance locally driven bids should anticipate having to find funding from local or regional sources. These sources are usually the Local Authority or in more recent cases the Regional Development Agency. In Scotland and Wales a greater role is usually taken by Historic Scotland or Cadw where bids are genuine.

4. What will it cost for us to manage the site?

- **The ownership and complexity of the site and the governance structure adopted**- Larger more complex sites which are in multiple ownership can be expected to require more resources to manage and will therefore be more expensive. Through our research we have identified four different governance structures which each have a different corresponding management cost. The largest group of current UK World Heritage Sites fall within the 'co-ordinator' or the 'no co-ordinator' governance models and these sites cost between £100- £215k per annum to manage. For smaller, largely self contained sites with special ownership arrangements, for example where the owner(s) are the Church or the Crown, the sites are likely to be relatively well managed already and in these instances the management costs are likely to be between £13- £26k per annum. For large sites with very complex ownership like Edinburgh Old and New Towns or the Dorset and East Devon coast management is a much bigger task and a large staff is likely to be necessary for it to be undertaken effectively. In these locations, the annual management costs can be as much as £190- £615k.

- **The fame of the site**- If the site is already well known then it may already be attracting a significant number of tourists and there may be an opportunity to fund the management costs in part or in whole from the visitor incomes it generates. This may often require a complimentary investment up front to for example develop a visitor centre or improve access and parking to encourage more visitors. Our research shows that the impact WHS status makes on visitor motivations is usually very marginal and there is little evidence that becoming a WHS automatically generates additional visitors. Aspiring sites should be wary of this.

- **The nature of the heritage asset and its relevance to wider stakeholders**- The extent of local cost is predominantly determined by the ability of the site to leverage funding from other sources to support the management of the site. Partnership activity plays an important role in securing any additional funding.

- **Who pays**?- As with bidding costs, management costs are predominantly borne by Local Authorities in England with some input from the other organisations previously listed. In Scotland and Wales investment from HS and Cadw is often more significant.

5. What benefits would we get from bidding?

- Even if bids are not successful in gaining World Heritage Status the journey itself can be expected to provide some benefits, primarily in terms of partnership, conservation through the management plan and potentially through additional funding. The bidding process requires partnership, which in turn can provide access to a more diverse range of potential funding providers. Furthermore the creation of a management plan, often for the first time provides a comprehensive overview of how the site should be managed. Importantly the achievement of these benefits will depend on the current activities. If sites already have strong local, public and private partnerships then the bidding process may not significantly affect these or generate additional funding opportunities and if the site is in single or special ownership then a comprehensive plan for its management and conservation may already be in place.

6. What benefits would we get from the WHS designation?

- **Partnership**- WHS status is said to increase the level of partnership activity through the consultation required to create and fulfil the requirements of the management plan. This will naturally depend on the extent of the partnership activity before the site gained WHS status. If strong partnerships existed before WHS status then one can expect limited benefits.

- **Additional funding**- As a result of gaining WHS status, and through the diverse range of partners involved, the site is likely to be viewed more favourably, particularly by conservation, heritage and community based funding sources and, subject to a variety of other considerations, these sources appear to often invest additional public funds in the site. Again this will depend on the extent of current investment but this is one of the more significant areas of benefit from WHS status but only at a local or regional level.

- **Conservation**- The additional funding generated by WHS status can improve conservation levels in those sites which are not already well designated by existing listing arrangements but where locations are already heavily protected more limited value can expect to be gained. Currently WHS status has no statutory effect on the planning system and whilst the increased publicity sometimes provides greater scrutiny in planning applications influencing the scale and quality of local development WHS status is seen as having a marginal impact on the planning system overall. Follow up to the Heritage Protection Review should strengthen the position of World Heritage Sites within the planning system in the future.

- **Tourism**- WHS status is suggested to provide a promotional advantage and a 'branding effect' which can encourage additional visitors. However, the evidence indicates that this is likely to have a very marginal effect (c.0-3%) and this will be stronger for less 'famous' sites. Furthermore if sites do not have adequate infrastructure already, are not marketed effectively and are not currently well linked with the common UK tourism routes then they are unlikely to gain many additional visitors. On its own it is unreasonable to expect WHS status to generate additional visitors.

- **Regeneration**- WHS status is assumed to be a catalyst for regeneration, predominantly through stimulating new investment, inward migration and increased tourism. Only one example exists where this has occurred across our case studies and even in this location there were other factors were involved in this change and a significant level of public investment.

- **Civic Pride**- There is strong evidence that WHS status provides a mechanism for building local confidence and civic pride and this appears to be a significant area of benefit. However this will depend on the diversity of the local population and the nature of the asset itself and what it represents to that population. For example the Castles of Edward I in Wales are a World Heritage Site but they are viewed by some locals as a symbol of English oppression.

- **Social Capital**- WHS status is also recognised as a mechanism for increased social unity and cohesion through increasing opportunities for interaction and engagement within the local community and again these benefits can be significant. However these benefits may be more significant within the ethnic and religious majority of the area rather than for minority groups.

- **Education and learning**- WHS status is considered to be a tool for learning engagement and there appears to be a degree of learning and cognitive growth taking place in the sites which have WHS status. However, most UK sites were important educational assets long before they gained WHS status and the extent of the benefit in this area will depend on the extent to which the site can integrate the WHS status into learning activities and reach a wide variety of groups.