



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

# **Contents and Aims of Management Plans for World Heritage Sites: Managerial Analysis with a Special Focus on the Italian Scenario**

Badia, Francesco

2011

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/36686/>

MPRA Paper No. 36686, posted 21 Feb 2012 11:34 UTC

# **Contents and Aims of Management Plans for World Heritage Sites: A Managerial Analysis with a Special Focus on the Italian Scenario**

## **Abstract**

This paper aims to discuss the use of management tools for the UNESCO World Heritage sites. In particular, it focuses on the specific tool of the “management plan”. We have carried out a three dimension research project:

- 1) Analysis and development of a strong theoretical background, in order to consider the economic and managerial dimension of the management plans, even from the perspective of cultural tourism;
- 2) Deep study of Italian state of the art about use and application of management plans by the organizations managing World Heritage sites;
- 3) Comparison among some national and international case studies, in order to get empirical evidences which could be useful for theoretical considerations, regarding the general management system of the World Heritage sites.

These first phases of research highlight the necessity for further studies in the next years. Notwithstanding, we are able to evidence some elements that can lead the next steps of drafting and monitoring the management plans. The final goal of these processes should be the realization of effective management systems for cultural and natural heritage.

The most important points to be considered are:

- The awareness of the absence of a unique “model” for every kind of UNESCO site; as far as this aspect is concerned, the aim should be the study and application of general guidelines that could be applied to different situations;
- The necessity to realize a real sharing among all the stakeholders of the site with regard to vision, mission and strategies that should be implemented;
- the introduction of performance measurement systems, to get both support to the management and accountability to the community.

**Keywords:** UNESCO World Heritage, management plan, performance measurement.

## 1. The management plan for the World Heritage sites

The *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (UNESCO, 1972) has given birth to the World Heritage List (WHL) whose aim is “to participate in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value” (*ibidem*: p. 1). This list includes the heritage properties, called “sites”, that are worth of particular forms of preservation and development for their acknowledged and unquestionable value.

So far, the WHL has registered 911 heritage sites (704 cultural, 180 natural and 27 “mixed” sites) belonging to 151 different countries. Italy is the most represented country in the List, with 45 inscriptions. The constant increase of the list, as well as the necessity to implement real systems of monitoring on the management of the World Heritage sites, led UNESCO to adopt several new documents (UNESCO 1992, 1994, 2002), which make clear the aims of the 1972’s Convention. A very important document is represented by the *Operational Guidelines* of 2005 (UNESCO, 2005), where it is declared that “*Each nominated property should have an appropriate management plan or other documented management system which should specify how the outstanding universal value of a property should be preserved, preferably through participatory means*”, (UNESCO: p. 26, point 108). Thus, UNESCO makes statutory, for all the already inscribed sites, an existing requirement that was initially requested only to the new candidates from the early 2000’s onwards.

According to the 2005 document, the contents of the management plan, or, alternately, the key element of the management system of every inscribed property could be (p. 26, point 111):

- “a) a thorough shared understanding of the property by all stakeholders;*
- b) a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and feedback;*
- c) the involvement of partners and stakeholders;*
- d) the allocation of necessary resources;*
- e) capacity-building;*
- and f) an accountable, transparent description of how the management system functions”.*

In these six points, we find the majority of the characteristic features of the managerial theories, as they have been developed by the most important management scholars (Drucker, 1954), with particular reference to the typical elements of planning and control systems (Anthnoy, 1965). The debate on the role and the contents of management plan for World Heritage sites has deeply grown in the last years both in Italy (Micoli and Palombi, 2006) and abroad, with reference to the theoretical framework (Leask and Fyall, 2006) and to the proposal of practical guidelines for its implementation (Davey 1998; Thomas & Middleton, 2003; Ringbeck, 2008).

With reference to the research methodology (Ryan et al., 2002), in this paper we apply an approach which combines the deductive and the inductive dimensions. More specifically, on the one hand, the prevalently deductive part of the research has been characterised by a literature review of the main managerial topics, related to the management plans of World Heritage sites. In this review, the main role is held by the performance measurement theories (Eccles 1991; Kaplan and Norton 1992, 1993; Simons 1995, 2000). The aim of the analysis is to study, develop and explore the opportunities to apply systems and tool for supporting, monitoring and demonstrating the effective results of the UNESCO heritage policies. On the other hand, the part characterised by the inductive approach considers the Italian state of the art of the application of the management plan by the World Heritage sites (paragraph 2) and some integrated considerations resulting from the study of several case studies of UNESCO heritage sites in Italy and abroad (paragraph 3). The fourth and last paragraph includes the conclusions of this work that rise from the combination of the two research methods.

In particular, the aim of the conclusions is to answer to two research questions, which are at the basis of this work: the former research question concerns the key elements to be applied and developed in the drafting process of a management plan; the latter one concerns the definition of the necessary conditions for a successful implementation of that process, especially in a perspective including performance measurement and performance evaluation systems in the management plan.

In the following section of this paragraph, we propose to define the theoretical framework where we can apply the main subjects of the management plans. This analysis has its starting point in the list of six requirements for the plans, provided by UNESCO Operation Guidelines (2005).

In particular, we will make explicit the possible relations between the disciplines of the management studies and the topics emerging from the requirements for the UNESCO management plans. We can identify the following specific points:

- Development of a public governance system (Bekke et al., 1995), in order to support the pursuit of public interest;
- Participation of the community, promotion of social cohesion and accountability (Gray et al., 1996; De Varine, 2002);
- Development of the cultural tourism in a long-term perspective (Harrison and Hitchcock, 2005; Di Giovine, 2009).

However, the b) and f) requirements seem to emphasise the development of a monitoring system within the management plans and the capacity to give a report on the obtained results to the community. In managerial terms, these considerations are expressed by the implementation of a system of measurement, evaluation and performance reporting. This implies introducing an appropriate set of indicators that should be coherent with the strategic aims and measurable for the subjects who are in charge of the management of the UNESCO heritage site.

The need for performance measurement has been one of the main topics of management sciences in the last years. Generally speaking, performance measurement seems to be necessary when the traditional economic-financial indicators (like earning, ROE, ROI ...) give an incomplete set of information about the state of the organisation. This is the traditional case of private corporations and this is the situation which initially permeated the birth of performance measurement systems. But this is not the only case of possible application of the performance management theories. Indeed, they are useful in each case where the economic and financial results are not measurable (or not expressible in a clear and irrefutable way). This is the typical case of not-for-profit organisations and, specifically, of public sector organisations, which are the most common subjects appointed for the management of cultural and natural heritage, in other words the greatest part of World Heritage sites.

Performance measurement can be also seen as a managerial process - additional to traditional strategic and management control - which has the goal of supporting the decision-making process, with reference to the pursuit of the prearranged results. According to the theory, the main points of a performance measurement system are:

- The use of a broad measurement system that considers quantitative and qualitative dimensions, and with reference to the former one, financial and not-financial aspects; this aspect allows us to consider not only economic and financial results, but also quality of products and services, innovation rate, quality of organisation processes and care of the relationships with the stakeholders;
- Coherently with the previous point, the "multi-dimensionality" of the system, i.e., the consideration of more basic variables to be controlled;
- The balance between managerial (short-term perspective) and strategic (long-term perspective) aspects;
- The balance with external and internal orientation of the measurement system, in order to consider the relationship of the organisation with its social context.

The frequent use of the term "balance" is remarkable: the implementation of a performance measurement system is indeed a challenging action of balancing apparently antithetical interests. Coherently with this consideration, the most well-known system of performance measurement is the "Balanced Scorecard" (Kaplan and Norton, 1992, 1993), initially introduced for corporations but subsequently applied to not-for-profit organisations (id., 2001).

The following empirical analysis aims at showing the level of presence of these theoretical points (and in particular of the performance measurement processes) in the concrete drafting and implementation of management plans in Italy and at the international level.

## 2. The current scenario in Italy

In this paragraph, we show the results of an empirical analysis applied to all the 44 Italian World Heritage sites. That was the number of inscribed sites at the time of realisation of the research, concluded in May 2010; now the Italian sites are 45. More specifically, we submitted a research questionnaire to one person in charge, at least, for each Italian World Heritage site. The research got the participation of 40 out of 44 sites, with an effective participation rate of 91%. This result represents an excellent outcome and gives us the opportunity of drawing conclusions of great significance about the Italian state of the art. At present, it seems to us that in this field there is not any other research with comparable results: this circumstance lets us enhance the final conclusion on this work on the analysis of the Italian scenario.

The research questionnaire was divided into ten questions, which aim at highlighting the following five points: - governance system of the World Heritage site; - current step in the drafting process of the management plan; - kind of competences, used for drafting of the plan; - presence of a performance measurement system and, within it, of a set of indicators, existing for the already approved management plans or pre-established for the not yet completed ones; - prevision of a periodical review process for the plans, after their final approval.

Before proceeding with the analysis of the results of the empirical research, we should consider that UNESCO has not implemented specific guidelines for the management plans' drafting process: this is a duty of every State party, coherently with the general principles of the World Heritage convention. Moreover, at present the absence of the management plan (or of the equivalent management system) does not imply any negative consequence, such as being taken off the list. In this scenario, so far only few countries – not only those which are facing critical situations as war or underdevelopment – have produced some document to implement management plan in their context. Italy represents a quite positive exception, because since 2004 the Ministry of Culture, has set up the process of drafting management plans and monitoring the management systems of Italian World Heritage sites, with the approval of national guidelines (MIBAC, 2004). Moreover, the Italian lawyer approved in 2006 a national law (law 77/2006), entitled “Special measures for preservation and fruition of the Italian sites of cultural, natural and landscape importance, inscribed on the ‘World Heritage list’, under the protection of the UNESCO”. This law expressly mentions the management plan as a typical element of World Heritage sites and gives priority of funding to the UNESCO heritage sites, which aim at managing their cultural services and tourism flows. This element is in accordance with the inspiring principles of the management plans.

With reference to the empirical analysis, the first result to be reported is the overall number of Italian sites which have completed the drafting process of the management plan before May 2010. This date considers not only the 40 World Heritage sites, which participated directly in this research, but all 44 Italian sites. The achievement of this complete result was made possible by the cooperation with the Italian Ministry of Culture and by the collection of some data from the internet. The final result of this first survey is that 20 out of 44 Italian Heritage sites have completed the management plan before May 2010. This 45% of the sample is not a good result, considered that 9 out of these 20 sites realized the plan during the inscription process, because the management plan has become compulsory for the candidature since 2002, and considered that the management plan has become compulsory for all the inscribed sites since 2005. This means that 24 out of 35 (69%) of the Italian sites, which have been inscribed before 2002, have not yet completed their plans.

We will now proceed with the analysis of the specific results of the empirical research carried out through the questionnaire. At first, we find that governance system of the site is exerted by more than one subject in 55% of the sample. That means that the cooperation among different institutions and organisations is necessary in most cases. This circumstance represents a significant critical state, even for the drafting process of the management plan. Another interesting result is that, in the 75% of the sample, site management is carried out by subjects, which are pre-existing to the inscription. They are normally local authorities or *soprintendenze* (Monuments and Fine Arts State Offices). Only in 3 cases (7,5%), an “*ad hoc*” new subject was created for the whole management of the site, after the inscription. In 7 cases (17,5%), *ad hoc* subjects share the management with pre-existing ones: in some of these cases, the situation is developing towards the possible complete assumption of the site management profiles by the *ad hoc* created subjects.

With regard to the kind of competencies used for the drafting process of the management plans, we find out that the architects are the most used figures, even though the management plan should normally request the presence of more and diversified professional figures. More specifically, architects participate or participated in the drafting process of 85% of the sample (34/40). Other important professional figures are economists (21 cases), art historians (21), landscape experts (19), archaeologists (18), engineers (18), curators (14) and jurists (11).

This data becomes even more relevant if we consider the statistics of the competences of the first person in charge for the drafting: he is an architect in 23 out of 40 cases. The second most common elements are, very distanced, archaeologists and art historians, each with 3 cases. Therefore, we should observe that in Italy the management plans are considered a prevalent competence of the architects. This is probably a result of the circumstances: architects are normally the subjects responsible for city, territory and landscape planning. In this sense, it seems to us that so far the new and innovative role of the management plan, with reference to the above mentioned requirements of it, has not been fully understood. In this way, we see a possible risk, where the management plan for World Heritage sites becomes only a further planning tool, losing its specific value.

As already mentioned, one of the qualifying points of the empirical survey was the analysis of the presence of a performance measurement system, inside the management plan, with or without a set of indicators. We want to remind the readers that according to the managerial theory, a set of indicators is absolutely necessary for the implementation of a good performance measurement system. Starting from the consideration of the inclusion (implemented for the already realized management plans, foreseen for the other ones) of a set of indicators, only 20 out of 40 (50%) sites answer this request. This result is quite low, considered the importance of this requirement. This element is even more meaningful if we consider these two further conditions:

- 1) Only 11 out of the 20 sites, which use or want to use the indicators, are able to mention concrete examples of them;
- 2) Even 12 out of the 20 sites, which do not use the indicators (or not want to use them), do not foresee any other tool, neither simplified, of performance measurement.

These results lead us to a deep reflection about the future steps to implement in Italy, in order to introduce the theoretical elements useful for making the management plan a real managerial tool. Moreover, the mentioned results, with reference to the global scenario, are quite worrying, if we think that Italy is one of the countries with the most advanced practice in the management plans for World Heritage sites.

The last results of the empirical survey regard the prevision of a periodical review process for the management plans after their final approval. The review process is another necessary element for a managerial tool whose goals are to monitor and evaluate. The review is fundamental to adapt the plan to its real capacity of performing the institutional objectives. Also in this case, the collected data does not give encouraging feedback: only 24 out of 40 sites forecast the adoption of a periodical review process; we have to point out that the prevision of the review is not automatically equivalent to its implementation; so this result represents a very low score. Moreover, we have also to consider that 9 out of these 24 sites have not defined the deadline of the review yet, so it might be that they do not ever implement the review process.

Finally, another requirement of a management plan seems to be its capacity to be up-to-date with the evolution of the space-time context. This means not only that a periodical review process is necessary, but also that a complete new drafting process is very important on a longer temporal horizon. Unfortunately, also on this point, the final result of the survey is quite disappointing: only 11 sites thought of future deadlines for a new drafting process, 10 sites have not decided about it yet and 19 sites do not intend to proceed with it.

The whole picture of this survey shows us that there are still many steps to do in this topic and therefore the management research has the duty to give its support in going through a path that has not been clearly defined so far.

### 3. Comprehensive analysis of some national and international case studies

In this paragraph we extend the scope of our empirical analysis, and consider the emerging elements of other case studies of UNESCO World Heritage sites both in Italy and abroad. Some case studies address some not properly UNESCO sites, but consider institutions and organisations which manage cultural heritage among which there are also some UNESCO sites. We consider the following Italian sites: historic centre of Naples, historic centre of Modena, historic centre of Ferrara and its Po Delta, Venetian Villas, Su Nuraxi of Barumini in Sardinia, Orcia Valley, Sacri Monti of Piedmont and Lombardy, historic centre of Vicenza and Palladian Villas and Royal Palace of Caserta. At the international level we studied the cases of the Loire Valley in France, the historic centre and Alhambra of Granada in Spain, historical residences, gardens and lakes of Bavaria in Germany and the Statue of Liberty National Monument, N.Y., in the USA.

However, the following analysis does not aim at illustrating every case in details, as it is done more specifically in other writings that have already been published (Badia 2007, Donato and Badia 2008, 2010) or that are in course of publication. We try to explain some empirical evidence rising from these case studies in a whole, highlighting the emerging profiles of managerial analysis. We know that they are very different cases, for environmental, social and cultural contexts and also for the related topics of preservation and development of heritage. So, we would not like to realise a simple comparison among the cases, but a comprehensive analysis of the useful elements for a complete managerial analysis.

So, the fundamental dimensions of analysis, coherently with the management theories, will be:

- Elements of general strategy;
- Elements of governance and organisation structure;
- Elements of management (in a strict sense), i.e., distinctive elements of provided services, systems of pricing, promotion and communication, access to the services;
- Elements related to the information and accounting systems.

#### *Elements of general strategy*

With reference to the first point of interest, the general strategy of the organisations that could be considered as representative of the case studies, we were able to find out the following points:

- Development of systems, coherent with the public governance paradigm; this means that there often is a public institution that is able to have a steering role on a network system composed by private and public subjects, whose aim is to achieve common and shared goals; the most representative case of this situation, is the management system of the Loire Valley, where the public governance's institution is the *Mission Val de Lore*. It is an agency founded by the Regions Centre and Pays de la Loire for the management of their World Heritage inscription (The Loire Valley between Sully-sur-Loire and Chalonnes); a similar case is present in Italy, on a less vast territory, in the Orcia Valley in Tuscany;
- Effective collaboration between public sector organisations and private subjects, i.e., capacity to promote horizontal subsidiarity, in order to realise a matching between the public interest and the need of the private subjects; we find good examples of this situation in Bavaria and in the management system of the Statue of Liberty; a good path of development is present also in the management system of the Sacri Monti of Piedmont and Lombardy, where a collaboration with public sector and ecclesiastic institutions is necessary;
- A clear and shared definition of the "vocation" of the territory, particularly in link with the promotion of destination management initiatives, with the participation of several actors; this is the case of the Venetian territory (both the cases of the historic centre of Vicenza and the Venetian Villas), where some difficulties emerge however, due to the high heritage "dispersion" on the territory;

#### *Elements of governance and organisation structure*

The elements linked to the organisation and the governance in the studied sites seem to be particularly interesting in the following situations:

- Governance of the territory by "above-regulated" management (often called "meta-management"), possibly through the development of smart structures of direction; this

element is concretely realised, coherently with the previous considerations, in the Loire Valley;

- Study of juridical forms of management useful for reaching the pre-established aims: a positive example is, in this sense, the creation of a foundation, as found out in the case of Barumini, for the management of the Su Nuraxi UNESCO site;
- Development of networking and partnership initiatives, particularly when the development of the sites requires the activation of fundraising policies; for example, this is the case of Naples, which activated some fundraising initiatives to the European Union, in cooperation with other partners; moreover, networking and partnerships are useful to create an integrated system of knowledge with other subjects which share either the same management “challenges” (this is the case of the networking realised by the Mission Val de Loire), or some specific goals (this is the case of the destination management initiative “Transromanica”, which sees the participation of the Modena municipality).

#### *Elements of management, in a strict sense*

These elements regard not the general management systems, but specific choices of management related to the provided services. In particular, we can consider:

- Individuation of the distinctive characters of the provided services, with definite attention to the quality of the cultural proposal; this element is present in several situations, but we find a well developed case in Granada for the management of the Alhambra palace; this element comprises also the development of a brand or a label that is associated with the cultural heritage (for the World Heritage sites, it is often associated with the symbol of UNESCO);
- Use of pricing policies, in order to attract more visitors and maximise the revenues, however considering the limits coming from the consideration of heritage fruition as a public good; in this sense an interesting case is the management system of Bavarian heritage;
- Consideration of the possibilities of accessing to services, with particular reference to integrated packages or to the use of ICT, either for internal aims (integrated ticket systems) or for the external promotion (web sites); in this field, there are several interesting cases and situations; among them, we would like to mention the system of admission to Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island and some promotional initiatives (such as the “Campania Card”, recently promoted by the Campania region and involving the cases of Naples and Caserta), in order to facilitate the realisation of tourism routes in its territory.

#### *Elements related to the information and accounting systems*

For the consideration of these elements, we have to outline three levels of analysis:

- The first level regards the simple attention to the number of visitors; this profile is present in all the analysed cases, with more or less accurate measurement systems; but in some cases, e.g. the historic centres which may not emit tickets, the realisation of these systems is not possible and alternative solutions are necessary; the visitors measurement system can consider the visitors’ age profiles, their geographical origin and lastly their level of satisfaction, which is not easy to measure;
- The second level considers the whole analysis of the economic balance; this is much less present in the analysed cases; many organisations neither monitor nor control their economic balances and this is a great problem of the organisations in this field, not only in Italy; however, we found some exceptions, e.g. the *Bayerische Schloesserverwaltung* (Bavaria), which gives attention to this profile, observing the different kinds of revenues and expenses;
- The third level looks at the creation of an integrated system of economic and financial information with the other data, linked to, e.g., quality of services, innovation rate, quality of organisation processes and quality of the relationships with the stakeholders ; as explained in the previous paragraphs, this should be the general aim of documents such as the management plan; this element is not so frequent in the analysed cultural organisations; however, there are some institutions that understood the importance of this aspect and that are now engaged in the realisation of a complete performance measurement system; this is the case of the UNESCO heritage sites of Ferrara and Modena.



The whole analysis of these four managerial aspects shows a poor presence of positive elements; more specifically, the main problem of application of the management principles and tools seems to regard the last point (information and accounting systems) and, particularly, its third element, i.e., the necessity of a performance measurement system that could merge quantitative and qualitative dimensions. Finally, we would like to highlight the most common critical points:

- Presence on the territory of different subjects which have power of decision but are not connected; this element leads to the realisation of several initiatives for visitors, tourists and community, but they often are reciprocally interfering; we find out this kind of difficulty in Modena and Caserta;
- Difficulties of collaboration between different public sector organisations or between the public and private sectors, especially in those cases of shared management of the territory; these difficulties often create apparently insuperable impediments to the development of shared preservation and enhancement policies; this element was found in the cases of Granada, Ferrara and the Orcia Valley (for the relationships between public sector organisations), of Naples and the Venetian Villas (for the private-public relations);
- The stiffness of some typical public sector administration models, which paralyse the management and make it less capable of catching the environmental changes. These critical points are present in the cases of the cultural heritage of Bavaria, that is managed by a big organisation, and of Vicenza;
- The dispersal of the development initiatives, which especially emerges when the supply is not really linked to the reference target or when the institutions in charge of the management of territorial heritage are working in complicated contexts; this is quite common especially in absence of partnership promotion initiatives; these critical aspects are present, for example, in the case of Barumini, Sardinia;
- Last but not least, the difficulty of applying management tools to measure the economic and financial balances and the levels of performance; as already said, this element is present in almost all the analysed cases; moreover, there are some cases, where the incompleteness of these tools is not perceived as a critical aspect (in particular, this is the case of the Loire Valley, which is for many of the other aspects a best practice); finally, we should consider that the use of these management tools should not be excessive or overwhelming in relation with the actual needs of the organisations; an interesting case of a planning and control system inappropriate for the organisation is the Statue of Liberty, where the requested fulfilments are executed only to respect formal procedures and not to give a real support to the decision-making processes.

#### **4. Concluding remarks**

In the previous paragraphs we analysed the theoretical framework and some empirical evidences related to the management of World Heritage sites and the use of the management plans. In this paragraph, we will try to give an answer to the two research questions we highlighted in the first paragraph:

- What are or should be the key elements to apply and develop in the drafting process of a management plan are or should be;
- How we can define the necessary conditions for a successful implementation of that process, especially in a perspective of inclusion of performance measurement and performance evaluation systems in a management plan.

With reference to the first research question, we think that the following initiatives would be necessary or important:

- Creation of a proper body for the management of the World Heritage site, with “*meta-management*” duties; if quite a few organisations have the responsibility for the site management, they have to collaborate in the constitution of this body;
- Concrete identification of the mission for the World Heritage site, promoting growth and territorial development, social cohesion and identification in its own heritage by the community;

- Adjustment of the strategic lines into coherent management objectives; they should be examined, as already said, with a multidimensional perspective;
- Adaptation of the multidimensional perspective through the concomitant considerations of different perspectives (preservation, development, consciousness, communication, social responsibility, tourism, ...);
- Concrete capacity of measuring the chosen perspectives and monitoring the results in order to give support to the decision-making process; the measurement should be founded with a set of indicators;
- Realisation of reporting documents, which consider the implemented indicators and the social dimension according to a perspective of management accountability.

The second research question claims that it is necessary to revise the traditional processes of planning in the fields of preservation and development of cultural and natural heritage. We have to go from the traditional planning process to a complete implementation of *planning and control* systems, coherently with the managerial vision. The management plan for the World Heritage sites should catch this need, with the integration of the performance measurement perspective within itself. This does not mean to consider the management plan as a further, formal, planning tool, but to elaborate it as a real managerial tool. This means that the management plan should integrate the other planning documents of the territory and to assume the role of reference document for the heritage preservation and development.

Moreover, we should consider that in such a various scenario, to identify a sole reference model is very difficult and, maybe, dangerous. So we, as researchers, should try to define some very general guidelines for the management plans, without penetrating the shaping of all the details of every single case. However, in the drafting process of a management plan, a process of targets sharing among the actors is necessary, with the involvement of all the relevant internal and external stakeholders. This would be a very important part in the process of the realisation of the monitoring system, with particular reference to the set of indicators of the performance measurement. In this system, the perspective of the economic development has to be considered in the management plan according to a sustainability point of view, like a propulsive element for the territory. These considerations permit to enhance the management plan as a reference tool for the application of the preservation and development policies to the natural and cultural heritage of the UNESCO sites. Actually, in this perspective, the management plan can be used also for other situations, where cultural and natural heritage have an important role, but where admission to the World Heritage list have not been reached (yet).

## References

- ANTHONY R.N., (1965), *Planning and control systems: a framework for analysis*, Boston: Harvard University.
- BADIA F., (2007), L'esigenza di elementi manageriali nei piani di gestione UNESCO. I risultati di uno studio condotto su due siti patrimonio mondiale dell'umanità in Italia e Spagna, Ferrara: *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Economia Istituzioni Territorio*, n. 29.
- BADIA F., DONATO F., (2010), Strategie, criteri e strumenti per la valorizzazione economica del patrimonio culturale ferrarese, in VV. AA., *Competenze e strumenti per il patrimonio culturale. Il caso del territorio ferrarese*, Ferrara: Corbo, pp. 221-250.
- BEKKE H.A., KICKERT W.J., KOOIMAN J., (1995), Public Management and Governance, in KICKERT W.J., VAN VUGHT F., *Public Policy and Administration Sciences in The Netherlands*, London: Prentice Hall, pp. 201-218.
- DAVEY A.G., (1998), *National system planning for protected areas*, World Commission on Protected Areas, Best practice protected areas series, n°1.
- DE VARINE H., (2002), *Les racines du futur. Le patrimoine au service du développement local*, Chalon sur Saone : ASDIC.
- DI GIOVINE M.A., (2009), *The Heritage-Scape. UNESCO, World Heritage and Tourism*, Plymouth: Lexington Books.
- DONATO F., BADIA F., (2008), *La valorizzazione dei siti culturali e del paesaggio. Una prospettiva economico aziendale*, Firenze: Olschki.
- DRUCKER P., (1954), *The practice of management*, New York: Harper & Brothers.
- ECCLES R.G., (1991), The Performance Measurement Manifesto, *Harvard Business Review*, January - February, pp. 131-137.
- GRAY R., OWEN D., ADAMS C., (1996), *Accounting and Accountability. Changes and Challenges in Corporate Social and Environmental Reporting*, London: Prentice Hall.
- HARRISON D., HITCHCOCK M., (2005), *The Politics of World Heritage. Negotiating Tourism and Conservation*, Clevedon: Channel View.
- KAPLAN R.S., NORTON D.P., (1992), The Balanced Scorecard. Measures That Drive Performance, *Harvard Business Review*, January - February, pp. 71-79.
- KAPLAN R.S., NORTON D.P., (1993), Putting the Balanced Scorecard to Work, *Harvard Business Review*, September - October, pp.134-142.
- KAPLAN R.S., NORTON D.P., (2001), *The Strategy Focused Organization. How Balanced Scorecard Companies Thrive in the New Business Environment*, Harvard Business School Press: Boston.
- LEASK A., FYALL A., (2006), *Managing World Heritage Sites*, Oxford: Elsevier.
- MIBAC [ITALIAN MINISTRY FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES], (2004), *Il modello del piano di gestione dei beni culturali iscritti alla lista patrimonio dell'umanità. Linee guida*, Paestum, May, 25th-26th.
- MICOLI P., PALOMBI M.R., (edited by), (2006), *I siti italiani iscritti nella Lista del Patrimonio Mondiale dell'UNESCO: la strategia per la gestione. Atti della terza Conferenza nazionale*, Villanova Monferrato: Diffusioni Grafiche.
- RINGBECK B., (2008), *Management Plans for World Heritage Sites. A practical guide*, Bonn: German Commission for UNESCO.
- RYAN B., SCAPENS R.W., THEOBALD M., (2002), *Research Method & Methodology in Finance & Accounting*, 2nd Edition, London: Thomson.
- THOMAS L., MIDDLETON J., (2003), *Guidelines for management planning of protected areas*, World Commission on Protected Areas, Best practice protected areas series, n°10.
- UNESCO, (1972), *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, Adopted by the General Conference at its seventeenth session, Paris, 16 November.
- UNESCO, (1992), *Strategic Orientations, Annex II*, WHC -92/CONF.002/12.
- UNESCO, (1994), *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, WHC/2/Revised, Paris, World Heritage Centre.
- UNESCO, (2002), *Budapest Declaration on World Heritage*, World Heritage Committee.