

outcome of a large number of intersubjective evaluations. They are related to historical time and to collective memories. Therefore, the values of the heritage can be many, depending on who evaluates it, when it is evaluated and where.

The concept of significance embraces all known values of heritage within a period of time (Zancheti *et al.*, 2009) and, in this sense, it is impossible for one interpretation to capture the complete significance of the heritage in a specific society and period of historical time. The statement of significance is an instrument that selects a set of values of the significance with the intention of producing an instrument for managing conservation of the heritage. It is a set of values that was selected and validated by socially institutionalized procedures.

Integrity

The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention state that “integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the natural and/or cultural heritage and its attributes” (UNESCO, 2005, p. 23). This interpretation is firmly rooted in the materiality of heritage. Some other authors have presented a different view, founded on the idea of circumstances, since objects, in order to convey meanings, must be interpreted in historical and cultural contexts, such as the idea of conceptual integrity of Clavir (1994 and 1994a) and the social-functional; and the structural and the visual integrities of Jokilehto (2006).

In this paper, integrity will be defined as the level at which the attributes of the heritage embody heritage values in a complete, whole and secure way considering their past and present contexts.

Authenticity

Authenticity is related to the idea of truth or falsehood and, therefore, depends on value judgements. Value is conferred on sites through their past and present activities, memories, knowledge and sociocultural relationships which occur in space and time (Jamal and Hill, 2004). This is the same line of thought advanced by Lowenthal (1999) when he stresses that different generations see authenticity in different ways and this reflects their need for truth, standards and credos in the uses of their heritage.

The *Riga Charter on Authenticity and the Historical Reconstruction of Cultural Heritage* introduced a definition of authenticity, as an operational and measurable concept: “Authenticity is a measure of the degree to which the attributes of cultural heritage [...] credibly and accurately bear witness to their significance [...]” (Stovel, 2001, p. 244). However, the idea of measurement brings with it difficult problems when applied in practice. It is possible to say that an object is authentic, or partially authentic, but it is almost impossible to evaluate the amount of authenticity in an object, since this assessment is the outcome of a judgement about the truth of the authenticity.