

- ▶ Some management approaches interpret 'outputs' and 'outcomes' in a slightly different way and this should be checked. For example, some schools of thought divide 'output' into two levels: a series of 'results' (e.g. laying drainage networks, mending roofing and gutters) which come together for a specific 'purpose', which is nevertheless a tangible result (e.g. improving rainwater collection and disposal).⁷⁷
- ▶ The natural heritage sector has made good progress in assessing heritage processes and outputs with their 'Framework for Assessing Management Effectiveness' (see Appendix B), and, in particular, 'Tool 10: Work/Site Output Indicators' proposed in the *Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit* is of interest.⁷⁸

OUTPUTS IN THE WORLD HERITAGE CONTEXT

Key considerations

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.

77. European Commission. 2004. *Aid Delivery Methods. Volume 1. Project Cycle Management Guidelines*. Brussels, European Commission. p.82. https://www.aswat.com/files/europeaid_adm_pcm_guidelines_2004_en.pdf

78. Hockings, M., James, R., Stolton, S., Dudley, N., Mathur, V., Makombo, J., Courrau, J. and Parrish, J. 2008. *Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit. Assessing management effectiveness of Natural World Heritage sites*. Paris, UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (World Heritage Papers 23) pp.58-59. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/series/23/>