

4 Defining, assessing and improving heritage management systems

- ▶ It is important to identify which of the above parameters (and perhaps others) can be altered (and in what order) if circumstances change (e.g. programming or resourcing difficulties) for a specific action, and understanding where compromises need to be made. This will often be dictated by policy (e.g. rigid quality standards) or limitations (e.g. inflexible deadlines) within the institutional framework. It is important to obtain consensus on any such replanning in the implementation stage.
- ▶ During implementation, it is harder to check whether the overall objectives (see 4.4 Outcomes) to which specific actions are contributing are being achieved; however this is important for informing any replanning.
- ▶ Things to look out for: common oversights in the planning stage which have negative repercussions during implementation:
 - inadequate resources (particularly human and intellectual),
 - taking for granted that equipment and facilities are adequately maintained and accessible,
 - insufficient checks of infrastructure (e.g. roads, access, services supplies, offices, fire towers),
 - inability to host the additional strain created by new activity (e.g. conservation site works, disruption of a community water supply, conflict between stakeholders) that might result from the action being implemented.
- ▶ Approaches to outsourcing (the process of defining and letting contracts for services and works outside the management system) vary enormously even within the European Community where a common legal framework unites Member States. There are countries with consolidated and articulated approaches to the distribution of actions and related risk in cultural heritage practice and those that have only begun to broach such issues in recent years. This is a particularly important knowledge area for those properties whose management needs outsourcing of expertise, services or works (whether by public authorities or private owners).
- ▶ Some property managers will have most actions for the property carried out by others (private owners, or multiple organizations that constitute the institutional framework). Their principal activity will not be delivering results with in-house teams or outsourcing activities but negotiating. The challenge is to persuade others to do things, to do them well and in a coordinated way, i.e. responsibility but without power, a characteristic of many primary heritage management systems.

USEFUL QUESTIONS TO ASK

- ▶ Are all or some of the following tactical approaches put into practice as part of the implementation process?
- ▶ Are other parties from within and outside the management system involved and if so at what stage?
- ▶ Are there periodic adjustments in the allocation and deployment of human and financial resources, equipment and facilities, etc. during implementation?
- ▶ Are measures adopted and maintained to assess, prepare for and respond to the types of disruptive events posed by external threats or shortcomings in the management system, i.e. diverse forms of risk management?
- ▶ Are mechanisms in place to ensure that information and documents produced in the implementation stage remain current, relevant and secure, and are used to inform future actions?
- ▶ Are there mechanisms to guarantee that all necessary resources are in place or that there will be a steady flow of them once operations have started?
- ▶ Are there mechanisms in place to ensure that all appropriate authorizations and approvals are in place and all relevant parties are informed?
- ▶ Are responsibilities for actions properly assigned to individuals, suppliers or contractors, together with sufficient power to implement the actions?
- ▶ If conflicts between the cultural property and stakeholders arise during implementation, are mechanisms in place to help find solutions?