4.4 The three results of a heritage management system

**Defining three elements:** The three elements (legal and institutional frameworks and resources; 4.2) come together and collectively facilitate the heritage processes (the actions of the management system; 4.3) that set out the objectives and translate them into actions and results. These results vary as much as the expectations of all those involved in the management process but can be broadly divided into three types: ‘outcomes’, ‘outputs’, and ‘improvements to the management system’. All results, but outcomes and outputs in particular, are a major focus of the planning stage (4.3). The terminology comes from the work culture of ‘management-by-objective’ used in industry and commerce; it is described in Appendix A in connection with developing a management plan.

1. **OUTCOMES (ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES)**
The management system aims to achieve certain objectives, known as outcomes. Outcomes reflect the changes to (or continuity in) the existing situation that have been sought in planning stages. The aim in focusing on outcomes is to check whether the management system is achieving its objectives.

2. **OUTPUTS (DELIVERABLE RESULTS)**
Processes deliver outputs which are those tangible products and services from a planned work programme that constitute direct support to heritage and to society at large. These outputs are necessary in order to achieve outcomes. Clarifying outputs is central to understanding heritage processes and their effectiveness.

3. **IMPROVEMENTS TO MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS**
Improvements to management systems are generated by corrective measures and feedback, either from external inputs or from within the management system, namely by monitoring processes and assessing outputs and outcomes. Continuous improvement is central to good management. It leads to changes in the management system that achieve greater effectiveness and efficiency.
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More on outputs and outcomes

Outputs are usually a good measure of productivity but a poor measure of the broader performance of a management system. Outputs represent the products or services produced by the management system.

For example, a site manager may judge his performance by the number of new itineraries (outputs) offered to visitors at a property. But the new visitor itineraries may:
- be delivered late and miss the peak tourist season (timeliness),
- be unsuited to visitor interests in terms of thematic content (customer satisfaction),
- provide imprecise information about the property (accuracy),
- be too long for site wardens to supervise and visitors to complete (quantity and scope),
- be incompatible with conservation needs, concentrating visitor wear and tear excessively (quality).

These aspects, together with the number of itineraries, can be quantified to define the effective success of the process (creating new itineraries) and its outputs (the new itineraries themselves), and are known as ‘indicators’. (see 4.3, Process 3: Monitoring).

But to establish the real effectiveness of an initiative, the site manager should take a step back and judge performance by:
- how the knowledge and attitudes of visitors have changed, thanks to the new visitor itineraries,
- whether this has led to the property’s heritage values being better recognized and attracting support for its care.

In other words, with the new visitor itineraries has the site manager delivered those outcomes that achieve the broader objectives of the management system? Outcomes are a better measure of achievement. They might be a direct result of a heritage process or a by-product of an output of the management system.

Monitoring and assessing outputs and outcomes delivers feedback, the knowledge of those corrective measures needed to improve the management system and reach all management objectives more efficiently.

Result 1: OUTCOMES (achieving objectives)

Overview
The management system as a whole works towards achieving certain objectives, known as ‘outcomes’. Outcomes are often intangible achievements that relate to heritage values or have repercussions for society (increasingly known as ‘heritage benefits’). They usually emerge through the effect of outputs, the specific actions accomplished and products and services delivered by heritage processes (Result 2, see p.104).

Diagram 15: Outcomes of a management system
People often look at outputs for judging performance since they are easier to control and monitor than are outcomes. But activities tend to be assessed on what they achieve (outcome) rather than what they produce (output). A school pupil will find it easy to answer the question ‘What did you learn today?’, but not to answer a question about its outcome: ‘How have you/How will you use what you learned today?’.

This is true of the heritage sector and the World Heritage system in particular: the ultimate outcomes for World Heritage properties are those of ensuring that OUV is protected (OG para 7 and paras 96-97) and that heritage is playing a role in the life of communities.

The aim of focusing on outcomes is to check whether the management system is achieving the objectives. Even a well-managed heritage property where all outputs are being achieved can sometimes continue to lose cultural values.

OUTCOMES IN GENERAL

Approaches and challenges vary extensively
Outcomes can relate directly to property management, for instance whether or not the property is maintaining its core values and, in the case of World Heritage, its OUV.

But outcomes often relate to broader issues beyond the confines of the heritage property. Promoting compatible local development, for example, could be an important outcome, one that in turn contributes to the sustainability of the heritage (more local support) and so coincides with multiple management objectives. Similarly, ensuring that heritage promotes cultural diversity in communities is an outcome that, by creating greater social cohesion, can promote and protect heritage values and a greater identification with the heritage and sense of local ownership, possibly thereby generating new forms of support. It is through outcomes that the mutually beneficial relationship between heritage and broader society can be improved, a goal vital to the future sustainability of cultural heritage (see 2.3).

Outcomes can be the most important but also the most difficult things to measure accurately. There are many common objectives in the heritage sector but how they are achieved will depend on the nature of the site and its social, environmental and economic setting.

Examples of heritage outcomes
The following table highlights some examples of the most common outcomes sought from a heritage management system for a property. It also highlights the overlap with other outcomes. For example, visitor satisfaction can also lead to new forms of support for the property’s management. Effective engagement of the local community can ensure heritage values are promoted and protected. Similarly the effective protection of heritage values will increase visitor satisfaction and often contribute to local community well-being, as Table 10 shows. In order to achieve these outcomes, heritage processes (see Part 4.3) produce multiple outputs, often in a variety of timeframes.
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Table 10. Typical outcomes sought for World Heritage properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Other outcomes influenced</th>
<th>Outcome indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective: improved visitor satisfaction</td>
<td>Increasing visitor awareness and support Promoting and safeguarding OUV and other cultural values</td>
<td>Quantity (length and number of visits) Quality (visitor satisfaction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Other outcomes influenced</th>
<th>Outcome indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective: A thriving local community around the heritage property which benefits the heritage property</td>
<td>Promoting and safeguarding OUV and other cultural values</td>
<td>Employment levels and other trends in local economic data Trends in social / environmental statistics e.g. crime, truancy, vandalism New forms of support for the heritage Nights spent in local hospitality annually by visitors Regional tourism, return visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Other outcomes influenced</th>
<th>Outcome indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective: Safeguarding OUV and other cultural values</td>
<td>A thriving local community around the heritage property which benefits the heritage property Visitor satisfaction</td>
<td>[In some cases, the level to which an objective has been achieved can only be understood by assessing the processes and outputs contributing. See below]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 also highlights how some outcomes can be measured directly, the case of visitor satisfaction. Other outcomes, such as the well-being of the local community, can be measured directly but with indicators that that could be influenced by other factors – other visitor attractions could be increasing overnight visitor presence in the local area – and are thus unreliable (see Process 3, Monitoring). In some cases, an outcome is so broad that it is difficult to identify an indicator that measures it directly. This is the case of the most important outcome for World Heritage: safeguarding OUV and other cultural values.

**Choosing indicators for monitoring and assessing outcomes**

Indicators to monitor the outcomes should be selected during the planning process, following the advice already offered on indicators (Process 3; Monitoring, 4.3). Appendix A describes sample indicators that were adopted for assessing successful outcomes for Stonehenge (UK).

Heritage processes and outputs can contribute to more than one outcome (see also below): site improvements to manage visitors better can help to protect the OUV (multiple itineraries and rotational visits that reduce wear and tear) while also contributing to the wider outcome of a healthier local economy for surrounding communities (a greater number and variety of visitors to the locality). See under ‘Result 2, Outputs’ on p.104.
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Greater attention is given to outcome indicators under ‘Result 3, Improvements to management systems’, p.110.

**Key considerations for outcomes of the management system**
Outcomes may be less tangible and more difficult to measure than outputs. Usually they can be expressed as a trend on a graph that shows how performance has changed over time. Using trend graphs to show target performance levels and relevant comparisons allows information from monitoring outputs to be used to review and, if necessary, improve the management system.

Since they are less tangible, effective communication policies should promote positive outcomes as a catalyst for support from outside the primary management system. Support can deliver precious feedback to reinforce the management system and its actions (see Result 3 p.110). If quantified and documented outcomes can be communicated to others to illustrate the benefits of managing and conserving heritage. Greater public consensus for heritage actions will put pressure on governments to guarantee appropriate legal and institutional frameworks and to commit necessary resources for cultural heritage.

**OUTCOMES FOR HERITAGE IN GENERAL**

**GOOD TIPS**

- Monitoring and assessing outcomes needs careful planning to avoid unnecessary costs and time commitments and, where possible, it should draw on existing monitoring data.
- The assessment of outcomes often depends on analysing the status of several indicators in relation to agreed thresholds and past performance. Indicating graphically whether the status of the indicator is stable, improving or declining over time will illustrate trends.
- Understanding the wider repercussions of heritage actions often requires involving a broader selection of specialists than those typically involved in the heritage processes. Architects, conservators, geologists and engineers will need reinforcing with economists, sociologists, environmental scientists, tourism operators and perhaps others.

**USEFUL QUESTIONS TO ASK**

- It is a good idea continually to question current circumstances so as to check whether the management system has defined sufficiently broad objectives for a property and has given due attention to heritage benefits (see Part 2):
- Is there cooperation with neighbouring property-owners and users?
- Is there regular contact between managers and neighbouring property-owners and users?
- Do local communities resident in or near the property have input to management decisions?
- Are there programmed initiatives that consider local people’s welfare whilst conserving the property’s values?
- Is the impact of wider development being constantly monitored?

**OUTCOMES IN THE WORLD HERITAGE CONTEXT**

**Key considerations**
The principal outcome for World Heritage is conserving the property’s OUV. However, other outcomes can be particularly pertinent to World Heritage properties.

Management planning, a tool widely adopted for World Heritage, is described in Appendix A and focuses on the principal outcome of protecting OUV. However, the management
planning process also contributes to achieving some broader outcomes for cultural properties, some of which may require planning processes that are not solely property-based.

The following list of examples of other outcomes for World Heritage is by no means exhaustive:

- Helping to make the World Heritage Convention better known and creating a stronger interest in it amongst a variety of audiences,
- Promoting cooperation between States Parties and other organizations in the World Heritage system,
- Furthering one or more of the Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Committee (Credibility, Conservation, Capacity-building, Communication, Communities),
- Ensuring that lessons learned at specific World Heritage properties are shared with the World Heritage system as a whole and with non-World Heritage cultural heritage,
- Addressing needs identified through the Periodic Reporting process at the property and/or regional levels,
- Capacity-building through new learning environments and advocacy activities, by targeting appropriate audiences and reinforcing the capacities of practitioners, institutional frameworks and communities and networks, and creating links to a regional or subregional capacity-building programme,
- Assuring World Heritage properties play a role in sustainable development and securing heritage benefits for the property and its stakeholders.

With regard to the last point, the OGs place great emphasis on adopting a participatory approach for the management of World Heritage sites. A good measure of whether a participatory approach is being effective is whether those stakeholders not directly responsible for the day-to-day running of the site have benefited from it.

Some World Heritage properties collect data on the status and condition of some or all heritage values, but for many properties this is a recent development (as a response to new Periodic Reporting requirements). All World Heritage properties should aim to have or improve their system for monitoring outcomes, a process that takes time and resources. They must also ensure continuity since institutional and stakeholder commitment is vital, and have steady funding sources so that human and financial resources are less vulnerable to interruption.

**Result 2: OUTPUTS (deliverable results)**

**Overview**

The aim of heritage processes is to deliver results. Accomplished actions and delivered services in response to the outcomes established are known as outputs. They are tangible results that can be shared with the local community and other stakeholders, and often deliver direct support to the heritage, to communities and to stakeholders. They come together to contribute to the achievement of outcomes, the overall objectives of the management system.
OUTPUTS IN GENERAL

Approaches and challenges vary extensively
Outputs are the results of planned work programmes which identify activities that are important for reaching specific management and conservation targets and, in turn, for achieving the overall objectives set out by the management system (outcomes such as protection of cultural values, OUV in particular).

Different types of outputs can be expected from the planning, implementation and monitoring processes of the management cycle:
• the plans themselves (e.g. a completed management plan),
• the tangible results achieved on the ground (e.g. building repairs, information panels installed),
• the data that those results, and the process of achieving them, can deliver to inform future actions (e.g. visitors increased by one million over two years),
• services such as maintenance of fire-safety systems.

What outputs involve
Heritage processes will produce numerous outputs on a long- and short-term basis. Their combined impact ensures that broader objectives can be reached and guarantees those outcomes for the various stakeholders who represent the ultimate beneficiaries of the management system.

An output may not directly satisfy a need, but forms the impulse for another process. For instance, as part of visitor management strategies, the first output is perhaps the visitor management plan, arising out of the planning process. New signage on the property will be one of several principal outputs during the implementation stage. The reactions of visitors, recorded as they leave the property, are an output arising from monitoring that may become an impulse for another process, namely corrective measures to make the signage better serve visitor needs and thus achieve the outcome of visitor satisfaction.

Key considerations
Supplemented by external advice and information on the achievement of outcomes (see the following sections), it is the analysis of outputs, and the processes that created them, that make general management more effective (see Result 3, Improvements to management systems, p.110).

Outputs help us to gauge the productivity of a management system. Documenting outputs and monitoring the processes that create them (see 4.4, Process 3, Monitoring) are inextricably linked and fundamental to understanding heritage processes and, in turn, management effectiveness. Furthermore, the collected data provide important base material for reporting on what has happened – they should be a central part of annual reporting requirements, along with outcomes (see next section) – and, once evaluated, provide feedback to improve the future management cycle (see 4.5, Result 3, Improvements to management systems).

The results of planning and monitoring can themselves be outputs but should not be viewed as an ‘end product’, rather as a means to another process and another output which work together towards making the management system operational and effective.

Plans are an example of outputs that are often shared widely but not communicated further down the management line (after their implementation). Outputs must be documented so that stakeholders can see the tangible results of their contribution and contribute further in the event of a gap between targets and results.
Understanding outputs versus outcomes (many-to-one relationship)
The relationship between processes, outputs and outcomes can be difficult to understand. There will often be a ‘many-to-one’ relationship between processes and a particular outcome; in other words, several outputs will correspond to one outcome.

The following table illustrates the difference between outputs and outcomes in a heritage process by analysing in greater detail the three example of outcomes identified in the previous section. The first example explores the visitor itineraries already mentioned in the introduction to 4.4, and how they contribute to visitor satisfaction, amongst other things. The last example, safeguarding heritage values, highlights a process, environmental monitoring, with an output which does not directly satisfy a need, but may form the input for another process and output.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome indicators</th>
<th>Output(s)</th>
<th>Process / Output indicators</th>
<th>Heritage process(es)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitor satisfaction</td>
<td>Establish if the objective has been achieved</td>
<td>New visitor itineraries</td>
<td>Establish the effectiveness of the process, the quality of the output and role in achieving wider objectives</td>
<td>Quantity (length and number of visits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other outcomes influenced:</td>
<td>Increasing visitor awareness and support</td>
<td>Quality (customer satisfaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality (visitor satisfaction, accuracy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting and safeguarding OUV and other cultural values</td>
<td>Quantity (length and number of visits)</td>
<td>Timeliness (in time for the peak season)</td>
<td>Compatibility (reducing visitor wear and tear)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>Outcome indicators</td>
<td>Output(s)</td>
<td>Process / Output indicators</td>
<td>Heritage process(es)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A thriving local community around the heritage property which benefits the heritage property</td>
<td>Employment levels and other trends in local economic data</td>
<td>A series of heritage-friendly business opportunities</td>
<td>Quantity (e.g. funds raised or number of partners / recruits / jobs created) and frequency (e.g. return visitors)</td>
<td>Identifying market opportunities related to the heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other outcomes influenced:</td>
<td>Trends in social / environmental statistics e.g. crime, truancy, vandalism</td>
<td>New partnerships, new sponsors</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Attracting partners and investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting and safeguarding OUV and other cultural values</td>
<td>New forms of support for the heritage</td>
<td>Recruiting new talent to boost the local economy</td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Start-up funds for new business initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nights spent in local hospitality annually by visitors</td>
<td>Improved urban environment</td>
<td>Local community satisfaction</td>
<td>Inclusiveness</td>
<td>Master planning urban regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional tourism, return visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compatibility with heritage needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scope and timeframe of commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local community satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 11 shows, in order to achieve a single or several outcomes, heritage processes (see Part 4.3) produce multiple outputs, often in a variety of timeframes. When successful, the combined impact of output identification and delivery ensures that the management system reaches the objectives of interest to all stakeholders.

Monitoring and assessing outputs
The examples in the Table 11 illustrate the variety of outcomes that might be sought and the diverse outputs that may contribute to them (also sequentially where a series of consecutive outputs lead to the outcome). The table also identifies some of the possible output indicators (using general advice already offered on indicators in Process 3, Monitoring, Part 4.3). Have outcomes that are difficult to measure been achieved by measuring the extent to which outputs have been delivered? See Appendix A for sample indicators adopted for Stonehenge (UK).

Choosing output indicators
The outputs to be monitored should be decided in advance, preferably when the annual work plan or the overall management plan is being developed (see Part 4.3 Planning, and Appendix A on management planning).

For assessing outputs, it is important to compare progress against the targets set in work programmes for a property. The more tangible nature of outputs, compared with other results of the management system, makes it fairly easy to identify impartial indicators that measure this annual ‘productivity’. (By ‘impartial indicators’ we mean that the same information would be collected, irrespective of the collector, and therefore would not be subject to personal bias).
The changes, products or services that make up outputs can themselves be ‘measurable’ results (i.e. indicators), for example, extensions to the buffer zone area, expressed in square metres. But a series of indicators (rather than one only) is usually more effective for quantifying and qualifying an output.

a. Where possible, output indicators will be quantified in terms of:
- Physical outputs (e.g. number of security cameras installed, number of brochures produced or distributed and number, total area and value of roofing repairs completed),
- The volume of work (e.g. number of meetings held with local communities or the number and value of external partnerships activated),
- Users (e.g. the annual number of visitors or rentals, audio guides used or answers given to enquiries).

b. Output indicators may sometimes qualify the impact of an output by offering data that show statistical trends relating to:
- The effectiveness of physical outputs, e.g. the relative lifespan of roofing repairs,
- The quality of work done, e.g. the national diversity of partners, or the opinions of external target groups,
- The profile of users, e.g. the distances travelled by visitors to the property.

c. Output indicators will sometimes assess work in financial terms – actual versus planned expenditure – in order to provide financial information for the purpose of accountability to management authorities, donors and others.

GOOD TIPS

In industry and commerce, outputs are only produced (or should only be produced) because there is a ‘customer’ of the process who specifically wants them. Although not directly applicable to the heritage sector, this way of thinking helps to differentiate between achieving concrete results (outputs) and broader objectives (outcomes), and recalls the importance of ensuring that annual work programmes do target genuine needs.

Indicators chosen to assess outputs should be the fewest necessary to determine success, measurable in a consistent way and, above all, ‘SMART’ (a popular mnemonic used to set management objectives):
- Specific to the product or service they are supposed to measure
- Measurable (either quantitatively or qualitatively)
- Attainable in terms of cost and consensus (buy-in from stakeholders)
- Relevant to the information needs of managers
- Time-bound – so we know when we can expect the output to be achieved

Indicators will assess specific outputs but the choice of indicators for each output will be influenced by the broader outcome (or outcomes) to which the output is contributing.

National or international control standards might offer objective criteria for qualitative indicators (management quality, environmental). Moreover, the development of internal monitoring protocols can help to standardize approaches and maintain quality and credibility.

76. The ISO 9000 family of standards published by the International Organization for Standardization (www.iso.org), and available through national standards bodies.
In the World Heritage context, outputs should come together to contribute to the protection of OUV as a primary outcome, but also to other outcomes such as benefits to society. Whether they are steps taken to protect attributes, authenticity and integrity, or services delivering benefits to the local community, outputs are chosen as part of the planning process (or within management planning, see Appendix A). They will be based on, amongst other things, an assessment of factors affecting the property and its stakeholders.

The additional challenges created by inscription can lead to new outputs being required, such as multiple plans (Part 4.3) or elaborate institutional frameworks (Part 4.2) linked to World Heritage properties. Other World Heritage processes, such as Reactive Monitoring and Periodic Reporting, may affect the intended outputs and the systems should be ready to cope with such situations.

In the case of specific projects aimed at changes to properties or their management to comply with World Heritage requirements, an inclusive approach to monitoring and assessing heritage processes and their outputs (as well as planning them) is particularly important. Projects need to be ‘owned’ by local stakeholders and local implementing partners and their information needs are of primary importance. Indicators should not reflect only what the ‘donor’ would like to know, but what local managers, the local community and other stakeholders need. It is therefore important to understand how local information systems work, and to ensure that local stakeholders take a lead role in defining relevant indicators.

---