These groups attach meanings to, and are the keepers of them, in the areas where they live, work or perform their rituals. Finally, other important stakeholders are the visitors that seek out places that can provide new meanings and authentic experiences for their lives (Jamal and Hill, 2004).

Stakeholders tend to play an increasing role in the management of heritage conservation, since decisions in this field must be reached by agreements between the people affected. As to the contemporary approach, conservation interpretations and decisions are based on negotiation, discussion and consensus (Avrami *et al.*, 2000; Staniforth, 2000; Cameron *et al.*, 2001).

The Indicator of the State of Conservation (Isc)

As set out by Zancheti and Hidaka (2011), the Indicator of the State of Conservation (Isc) can be used to express the level of sustainable conservation of urban heritage sites. According to contemporary conservation theory, it is determined by three key performance indicators (KPI): significance – I*sig*; integrity – I*int;* and authenticity – I*aut*.

For a defined period of monitoring, the evaluation of the 'scores' of the KPIs comes from the answers to the following basic questions:

Q1. Has the significance of the site been maintained?
Q2. Has the integrity of the site been maintained?
Q3. Has the authenticity of the site been maintained?

The logical responses to these questions are taken as:

Q1: (i) the significance has not changed; (ii) there have been changes but the significance is still recognizable; (iii) the significance has been lost.
Q2: (i) the integrity of the attributes has not changed; (ii) the integrity of the attributes has changed but their meanings have not; (iii) the integrity of the attributes has changed and there have been important changes in their meanings; (iv) the integrity has been lost.
Q3: (i) the attributes are authentic; (ii) the attributes are partially authentic; (iii) the attributes are not authentic.

When the three sets of answers are combined, there are thirty-six logical possibilities for the vector (I_{sig}, I_{int}, I_{aut}). In real evaluations, made with people, this number will be higher than the logical possibilities, because people tend to perceive and express the changes in a more detailed way than the logical possibilities. In spite of the large numbers of answers, there are few extreme cases where conservation can be considered excellent or a complete failure. Table 1 shows these cases. If one of the KPIs reaches nil, the values of the other KPIs will be of no importance for evaluating the state of conservation (lines 2, 3 and 4).