Table 2. Geographical distribution of the experts participating in the first round of the DP (after Zancheti and Haidaka, 2012, p. 6).

	Distribution of WHUS*		Distribution of the experts on the DP	
Regions/Continents	Number	%	Number	%
Africa	23	22%	1	3%
Arab States	14	6%	1	3%
Asia and the Pacific	22	10%	4	12%
Europe and North America	123	57%	21	62%
Latin America and Caribbean	35	16%	7	20%
Total	217	100%	34	100%

**Source:* UNESCO – ICOMOS, 2008.

Table 3. Weights of the stakeholders' opinion to determine the KPIs of significance, integrity and authenticity (after Zancheti and Haidaka, 2012, p. 12).

KPIs	Local experts	Outside experts	Long-standing residents	New residents	Reference group	Visitors	Sum
Significance	0.200	0.183	0.194	0.127	0.176	0.121	1
Integrity	0.206	0.196	0.192	0.122	0.164	0.119	1
Authenticity	0.206	0.199	0.190	0.115	0.178	0.111	1

the sample by their geographical location is stressed. See Zancheti and Hidaka (2012).

The results of the Delphi Panel enabled the weights of the opinions of the stakeholders to be calculated using the means of the responses. Table 3 shows the weights necessary to write the equations of the three KPIs already adjusted so as to sum up to 1 (one).

With these weights equations 2, 3 and 4 of the KPIs can be written as following:

$$I_{sig} = 0.200I_{sig}^{Lesp} + 0.183I_{sig}^{Xesp} + 0.194I_{sig}^{Lres} + 0.127I_{sig}^{Nres} + 0.176I_{sig}^{Rgru} + 0.121I_{sig}^{Vis} \quad (6)$$

$$I_{int} = 0.206I_{int}^{Lesp} + 0.196I_{int}^{Xesp} + 0.192I_{int}^{Lres} + 0.122I_{int}^{Nres} + 0.164I_{int}^{Rgru} + 0.119I_{int}^{Vis} \quad (7)$$

$$I_{aut} = 0.206I_{aut}^{Lesp} + 0.199I_{aut}^{Xesp} + 0.190I_{aut}^{Lres} + 0.115I_{aut}^{Nres} + 0.178I_{aut}^{Rgru} + 0.111I_{aut}^{Vis} \quad (8)$$

The set of equations (6), (7) and (8) represents the most complex case for evaluating the state of conservation of an urban heritage site, since it is implied that the opinion of all types of stakeholders is important. However, this is not necessarily the case for all sites, since, for example, the significance of many of them, when taken on their own, does not depend on the presence of any others, such as the cultural reference groups. Among the large number of WHS on the WHL, there is a small subset for which the values of the site are related to cultural groups, for example in the case of some religious sites.