

EX-ANTE EVALUATION OF HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLANS: PREREQUISITE FOR ACHIEVING SUSTAINABILITY

Daniela Angelina JELINČIĆ

Institute for Development and International Relations, Lj. Farkaša Vukotinovića 2, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
e-mail: daniela@irmo.hr

Sanja TIŠMA

Institute for Development and International Relations, Lj. Farkaša Vukotinovića 2, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
e-mail: sanja.tisma@irmo.hr

ABSTRACT

The article explains the meaning and the role of cultural heritage management plans. It points out to the importance of heritage management plans evaluation and different types of evaluation methods. The usual types of evaluation of plans/programmes involves ex-ante, mid-term and ex-post evaluation. The article examines the appropriateness of ex-ante evaluation on the case study of Integrated Built Heritage Revitalization Plan (IBHRP) of the old urban core of the City of Buzet, Croatia. Based on a theoretical approach to ex-ante evaluation, a set of conceptual evaluation questions has been designed which was then tested against challenges detected by the Plan. Ex-ante evaluation and all of the designed questions responding to the criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, sustainability, usefulness, consistency, complementarity, harmonization, acceptability and equal opportunities) have been found appropriate in the heritage management plans evaluation.

Keywords: cultural heritage, heritage management plans, ex-ante evaluation of a management plan, Buzet

VALUTAZIONE EX ANTE DEI PIANI DI GESTIONE DEL PATRIMONIO: PREREQUISITI DELLA SOSTENIBILITÀ

SINTESI

Questo articolo spiega il significato il ruolo dei piani di gestione del patrimonio culturale. Sottolinea l'importanza della valutazione dei piani di gestione del patrimonio e dei diversi tipi di metodi di valutazione. I soliti tipi di valutazione di piani / programmi prevedono una valutazione ex ante, intermedia ed ex post. Il documento esamina l'adeguatezza della valutazione ex ante sul caso di studio del Piano di rivitalizzazione del patrimonio integrato (IBHRP) del vecchio nucleo urbano della città di Buzet, Croazia. Sulla base di un approccio teorico alla valutazione ex ante, sono state progettate una serie di domande di valutazione concettuale che sono state poi testate rispetto alle sfide individuate dal Piano. La valutazione ex ante e tutte le domande progettate che rispondono ai criteri (pertinenza, efficacia, efficienza, coerenza, sostenibilità, utilità, coerenza, complementarità, armonizzazione, accettabilità e pari opportunità) sono state ritenute appropriate nella valutazione dei piani di gestione del patrimonio.

Parole chiave: patrimonio culturale, piani di gestione del patrimonio, valutazione ex-ante di piani di gestione, Pinguente

INTRODUCTION

Cultural heritage is expression of the identity of the inheritors, document of history, but also significant developmental resource. Contemporary way of life as well as high maintenance costs are often the cause of its decay. Therefore, careful planning and management of cultural heritage is of crucial importance in order to prevent its irretrievable disappearance but also to draw investments such as public-private partnership. Clear and concise cultural heritage management plans are fundamental for this purpose. They are also a prerequisite for preservation, protection and use of cultural heritage by the community, i.e. external visitors, thus contributing to the development in terms of employment, tourism, education and research. This implies clear vision, goals and activities. However, plans are rarely submitted to the procedure of external evaluation that could strengthen and additionally direct the planned activities. External evaluation is usually conducted in the phase of the plan preparation, at the halfway of implementation period and at the end. Every evaluation contributes to the quality of the plan and its practical feasibility.

CULTURAL HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLANS

Cultural heritage management plans imply appropriate analysis, goals, activities and implementation structures that manage and develop cultural heritage in an efficient and sustainable way. The purpose of such plans is to balance and coordinate cultural heritage needs with the needs of its users and responsible management bodies (UNESCO, 2013). Heritage management plan can be defined as a “*document that sets out what is significant in a site or monument as a basis for understanding its important qualities, in order to determine the action necessary to protect and manage it*” (Edinburgh World Heritage Site, 2005, 10).

UNESCO stipulates mandatory management plans for cultural heritage sites while cultural heritage categorized in a different way usually does not possess planning documents in practice. This is also due to the diversity of cultural heritage types, which makes it difficult to find one model as the example for all cultural heritage assets so the owners/

managers reluctantly decide to make plans. The existing plans differ noticeably in their structure, volume, and approach because they depend on the context, on the nature of the management plan, i.e. cultural heritage type. Thus, for instance, an urban management plan will considerably differ from the individual cultural heritage asset management plan. The difference between plans also depends on the character of the primary management system. However, to manage a site without planning can be detrimental, risking to lose authenticity, values, significance and integrity (Castellanos, cited in Abdel-Moneim, 2010).

Usually, management plans provide a description of the cultural heritage with the information on its conservation state; management system description (legislative, regulatory and policy frames; management structure and implementation practice); horizontal themes (state of the plan comparing to other development plans); management strategy (vision and goals of the cultural heritage management with the action plan, which implies finances as well); description of the protection mechanisms and risk management strategy; reference to the preservation of the values of the cultural heritage, education and public awareness raising; vision of sustainable exploitation and plans for future (implementation plan and monitoring).

Elaboration of cultural heritage management plans in Croatia has recently been aggravated by a range of difficulties. *Strategy of Preservation, Protection and Sustainable Economic Use of Cultural Heritage for the Period 2011–2015* stresses the need for improvement and elaboration of plans and programs of the exploitation and management of cultural heritage (Ministarstvo kulture Republike Hrvatske, 2011). However, among the greatest problems in elaboration of plans are unresolved ownership rights and disorderly managed land registers,¹ aggravated identification of borders of cultural landscapes,² inexistence of clearly defined contact zones for cultural goods entered into UNESCO List of Cultural Heritage,³ along with a range of lesser procedural and other difficulties. Therefore, the number of management plans for Croatian sites is extraordinary low. Although UNESCO stipulates obligation to elaborate management plans for world heritage sites, not all of cultural goods thus categorized in Croatia possesses such documentation.⁴ There are sporadic

1 Particularly in case of archaeological sites where there is so called double registry merging both that what is above and what is below the soil surface so the ownership of the cadastral parcels expands to the underground ones making an integrative management of site impossible. It has been solved only recently with the new *Act on changes and amendments to the Act on the protection and preservation of cultural goods* (NN 90/2018) adopted in September 2018.

2 Which made impossible the entrance into the Cultural Goods Registry due to the need to make the inventory of an enormous number of cadastral parcels. However, this was also solved with the new Act from the previous note (NN 90/2018).

3 Which, before the changes by the mentioned new Act (NN 90/2018), practically meant that the conservator's agreement had to be issued for every intervention thus prolonging the process and actually aggravating the job.

4 6 sites possess such plan, 2 of them being natural heritage sites. At the establishment of the World cultural heritage list, the management plan was not a part of the obligatory documentation, while actual candidacy procedure envisages its elaboration and submission together with the candidacy. Thus, most recently entered heritage – Stari Grad plain, Stećci (Medieval Tombstone Graveyards), Beech forests and Venetian defence system (Zadar, Šibenik) possess management plans elaborated within the candidacy procedure. For serial transnational heritage, besides the elaborated joint management plan, individual plans should be elaborated for each particular heritage site and currently the elaboration of the management plan for the Fortress of St. Nicholas in Šibenik is under way. Also, the first management plan for the Old Town Dubrovnik is being elaborated. Subsequently, the management plan for Plitvice Lakes was elaborated, and is in force. The Split Diocletian Palace management plan although elaborated has not been adopted (Tomislav Petrinec and Mirna Sabljak, Ministry of Culture, personal communication, December 2018 and January 2019).

plans for other cultural goods, but there is no integrated system of their registering so no precise number can be quoted.⁵ Conservation studies are a prerequisite for elaboration of management plans, but most of Croatian cultural goods do not have that type of documentation.⁶ Correspondingly, scarce existing management plans have passed the external assessment procedure in their preparation phase while their implementation is not being either monitored or evaluated.

MANAGEMENT PLAN EVALUATION

Management plan evaluation is periodical assessment of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability in the context of achieving previously defined long-term goals. The goal of evaluation is to increase the effectiveness of management plan, which can subsequently also impact community development. It is conducted as an independent analysis of its preparation and implementation with the aim to reach conclusions and recommendations that are a signpost of change and foundation for future decisions. Also, the purpose of every evaluation is learning and acquiring experiences of all stakeholders involved in the process.

The plan/programme evaluation procedure is widely spread within the European Union and it ensures credibility and topicality of developmental breakthroughs (Maleković & Tišma, 2011). There are individual examples of heritage management plans and they have been scientifically researched (e.g. De Medici, De Toro & Nocca, 2019; Benali Aoudia & Chennaoui, 2019). Also, evaluation methods in this field have been developed and researched (e.g. Throsby, 2016; Mrak, 2014; Nared & Razpotnik Visković, 2014). However, evaluation of plans and programmes dealing with the development of heritage is not so common. Scarcity of cultural heritage evaluations should also be sought in the fact that cultural topics often make up only part of a widely set development documents dealing with local or regional development. There are also projects dealing with the development of cities, spatial planning, environmental protection whose dependable part is cultural heritage. Moreover, justification for performing evaluation even in such complex cases relies on the need to achieve consensus between different (public and private) interests while aiming at a holistic sustainable development and enabling easier decision-making (Lombardi, 1999).

There are three fundamental types of plans evaluation: ex-ante evaluation, mid-term evaluation and ex-post evaluation (Samset & Christensen, 2017). Ex-ante evaluation is a process that supports and monitors elaboration of plans and verifies if the quality goals are determined and realistic activities selected in the sense of available resources for their implementation. Mid-term evaluation of the plans' implementation enables measuring of progress and level

of success in the implementation of the planned activities and it is usually conducted at the mid-term of the envisaged implementation deadline. It provides opportunity to check if the set goals are still topical and if the plan implementation develops in the right direction. Ex-post evaluation is conducted at the end of the planned period and includes collective findings on the achievement of goals and sets the framework for future activities and planning (Samset & Christensen, 2017).

Majority of evaluation studies "assess the quality of plans – including their scope, the clarity and practicality of their aims, and their relevance to on-ground management" (Hockings et al., 2006, 20). Results of evaluations are further matched with management decisions and serve to increase quality, provide timely adjustments of the plan to the changes in the environment, transparency and trust of the public, political support, more efficient financial management, learning of all the participants in the elaboration process and plan implementation, innovations, motivation of employees expected to implement the plan or justification of their change and termination (Maleković & Tišma, 2011).

Regardless the evaluation type conducted, basic principles of the entire procedure are transparency, clear evaluation methodology, impartiality and independence, while key criteria are as follows (Samset & Christensen, 2017) and are presented in Table 1:

- Relevance, i.e. assessment of the consistency of the plan regarding the problem currently being solved as well as the context and environment in which the change is unfolded,
- Effectiveness as the level of achievement of the expected effects i.e. objectives set,
- Efficiency through ensuring ratio of cost and benefits, i.e. achieved results concerning reasonable implementation costs,
- Impact by which contribution to the general goal of the plan (intervention) is evaluated and its cumulative positive or negative contribution, and
- Sustainability as potential for long-term positive impact of the development planning document and capacities of various groups interested in further continuation of the proposed activities.

Depending on the object of evaluation, it is possible to include some other criteria as well. In case of cultural heritage management plans, it is recommendable to evaluate also coherence, usefulness and consistence, but some other criteria as well, i.e. complementarity, coordination, equality and acceptability.

Coherence or compatibility as evaluation criterion includes internal and external harmonization of the plan. External harmonization considers harmonization with goals and

⁵ For instance, the Euphrasian Basilica in Poreč management plan was elaborated within the framework of EX.PO AUS, IPA Adriatic Cross-border Cooperation Programme 2007–2013.

⁶ Mirna Sabljak, Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia, personal communication, December 2018.

Table 1: Evaluation criteria with corresponding questions.

Evaluation criteria	Evaluation questions
Relevance	To what extent are the programme goals justified as compared to the needs? Do they match local, national and European priorities?
Effectiveness	To what extent the goals have been achieved? Have the used interventions and instruments produced the expected results? Would more results have been achieved if different instruments had been used?
Efficiency	Are the goals achieved with the lowest costs? Is the obtained value proportional to the invested money? Are the changes in planning necessary in order to simplify and increase efficiency? If the answer is yes, what changes are needed?
Impact	What is the contribution to the general goals of the plan? What are the defined monitoring identifiers? What is the achieved planned/not planned or positive/negative contribution to the plan?
Sustainability	Will the results and impacts, including institutional changes last? Will the impact last even if the public financing ceases? What long-term (development) impacts are envisaged?

priorities of superimposed programmes, e.g. other public programmes connected with the planning document while internal harmonization implies existence of the hierarchy of goals where hierarchically lower goals logically contribute to the realization of those on the top. Usefulness in ex-ante evaluation observes the plan within a wider framework of relevant public policies in the context of the need for realization and provision of public good or service to the local community. It also observes to what extent the expected effects meet the needs of the direct and indirect users. Consistence as evaluation criterion explores clarity and observance of goals and priorities with regard to the vision set in the plan. Complementarity evaluates the degree in which the intervention supports other public policies. Coordination evaluates to what extent the measures of the intervention are organized in such a way that amplifies common effects. Equality as an ex-ante evaluation criterion measures to what extent the effects are equally distributed regarding stakeholders, regions, gender identity and acceptability. It evaluates positive or negative perception of the intervention from the point of view of stakeholders and general public

Generally, there is a number of evaluation models relating to different fields (e.g. environment, business) that can be adapted to heritage evaluation. However, numerous facets of heritage management make it an extremely complex and all-encompassing process, which in practice often prevents any evaluation to be made. Thus, heritage management may be evaluated from the environmental point of view where Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) (Eccleston, 2011), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) (Fischer, 2007) or matrix model (Leopold et al., 1971) may be appropriate; from the point of view of its impact on the local community, Community Impact Evaluation (CIE) will be used (Bottero,

2020). Further on, there are evaluation models adapted to specific type of heritage, e.g. for assessing archaeological impact (Campeol & Pizzinato, 2007) or landscape evaluations (National Park Service, s.a.). On the other hand, there are more generic evaluation models such as SWOT analysis, Spider model (Rienstra, 1998), Flag model (Vreeker & Nijkamp, 2006), Economic-business model (Ovans, 2015), etc. In order to make a comprehensive assessment, a multi-criterial evaluation model would be most appropriate drawing evaluations from different disciplines (Mrak, 2014). This, however may be a rather complex task. Specifically related to heritage evaluation, Kalman method (Kalman, 1979) is known. However, it is not necessarily appropriate for evaluating heritage management plans. In order to attract a private partner for heritage site management, management plans need to solve existing problems and respond to detected needs. Before the decision on public-private partnership is made, both public and private partners would benefit from heritage management plan evaluation in order to assess challenges and benefits of such a partnership. Nared and Razpotnik Visković claim that (2014, 107) *“managing cultural sites should include ex-ante evaluation in order to examine whether the management plan prepared suitably responds to the challenges of the area or site”*. This is why the research performed is based on the ex-ante evaluation method.

EX-ANTE EVALUATION OF THE HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLANS: CASE STUDY OF BUZET

Research and methodology

The research aimed to test the evaluation criteria prepared by the authors by performing the ex-ante evaluation



Image 1: Old urban core of Buzet (Integrated Built Heritage Revitalisation Plan (Buzet)).

of the Integrated Built Heritage Revitalization Plan (IBHRP) of the City of Buzet, Croatia. The research questions were the following: Is ex-ante evaluation appropriate method for integrated heritage management plan evaluation? Can all of the usual and additional (coherence, usefulness and consistency) criteria be successfully applied in ex-ante evaluation of integrated heritage management plans?

Methodology applied included desk research, focus group analysis, case study method and testing. Desk research served to set the context; focus groups determined the challenges of the area in question, which were then tested against the set evaluation criteria and corresponding questions on the case study of IBHRP of the City of Buzet. The testing has been done by using the basic criteria for the ex-ante evaluation. These were divided into two groups: the first group contains five basic criteria, while the second contains six additional criteria, which were assumed to have relevance in the field of cultural heritage. The criteria were set by the authors, based on Samset and Christensen's work (2017) as well as on the authors' conceptual questions designed on their experience in the field. The usual criterion of impact was not used in the evaluation testing since it was not defined as monitoring indicator during the IBHRP preparation. Thus, beside standard ex-ante evaluation criteria and questions posed in the evaluation of public policies, programmes and development plans, evaluation was expanded with additional evaluation criteria including assessment of interventions' adjustment concerning the need for preservation and sustainable use of cultural heritage. The research was performed during 2017–2018 period.

Such an approach to the evaluation of plans and projects is in many ways unique, which made its implementation quite difficult. First, it was the elaboration of an IBHRP for an area where local residents live and which is not adjusted to the contemporary way of life, which contains protected cultural heritage that demands urgent renewal and a new purpose. Therefore, during the elaboration of the plan as well as afterwards, during the ex-ante evaluation, a range of different needs and stakeholders' points of view about the development of the area were confronted. Second, ex-ante evaluation in this case was a powerful tool for testing justification and consistence of the proposed interventions in the Plan through the process of involvement of a number of actors in its elaboration. The sensitiveness of the topic, significant capital investments the Plan implies, public sources of funding and benefits the community will have and, especially, the possibility to involve private partners in the consideration of sustainability of the area covered by the Plan is one of the key reasons for defining additional evaluation criteria and questions of evolution adjusted to the subtle assessment of interventions in cultural heritage.

Context

Old urban core of Buzet has the status of the protected cultural heritage of the Republic of Croatia. The goal of the revitalization of the old urban core is functionality of some buildings, boosting of social life and economic development (entrepreneurship and tourism), and is based on preserved heritage (Ivandić et al., 2017). In order to exploit

Table 2: Key challenges and expected benefits detected by the IBHRP of the City of Buzet (Source: focus groups and Ivandić et al., 2017).

Key challenges	Expected benefits
lack of parking space both for residents and visitors of the old urban core	solved traffic and parking problems
old municipal infrastructure is not suitable for new development ideas, growth of the number of residents or tourists in the area	municipal infrastructure enhancement
flats are not suitable for contemporary living conditions of the residents (they do not have appropriate toilet facilities, old and worn out electrical installation and plumbing, damp on walls)	functionality of flats
old and poorly managed facades	enhancement of the external appearance of the buildings
lack of urban facilities such as consumer stores, kiosks, etc.; difficult supply of residents	quality of life of the residents
small number of tourist and catering facilities	enrichment of the tourist-catering supply
unsatisfactory cultural-entertainment offer	enhancement of cultural-entertainment offer
insufficient commercial and other services	enhancement of commercial and other services
insufficient success in ensuring economic self-sustainability of the revitalized building blocks	economic self-sustainability of the revitalized building blocks

that development potential, in 2017 the Integrated Built Heritage Revitalization Plan (IBHRP) of the old urban core of the town of Buzet was elaborated. Its goals were as follows:

- Detect possibilities of the old urban core as attractive living, working and visiting space,
- Revitalize historic core socially and economically,
- Decorate the space and restore buildings in the old urban core in public and private ownership,
- Increase interest of tourists and consumption, and
- Contribute to the competitiveness of the town of Buzet as a whole.

Results

In order to detect challenges against which ex-ante evaluation of the IBHRP has been performed, focus group workshops have been organized with relevant stakeholders. The detected priorities were: solving traffic and parking problems, municipal infrastructure enhancement, functionality of flats, enhancement of the external appearance of the buildings, quality of life of the residents, enrichment of the tourist-catering supply, cultural-entertainment offer, commercial and other services, and economic self-sustainability of the revitalized building blocks. Based on these key challenges (summarized in Table 2), the IBHRP of the City of Buzet was made.

The challenges were then tested against the set evaluation criteria and corresponding questions. Findings of the evaluation are presented in Table 3.

Discussion

Strategic context of urban development within the IBHRP was prepared and vision, goals and priorities defined within the framework of the Plan were assessed by the ex-ante evaluators as fully relevant. The key benefits of the IBHRP are clearly formulated in relationship with the priority activities, which contributes to the positive assessment of the effectiveness of the document. The proposed activities and resources planned for their realization are assessed according to the real needs in accordance with good governance postulates. The document itself is coherent, follows the internal planning logic and is in harmony with higher rank documents. It meets environmental, social and economic standards of sustainability.

All goals fulfil the criteria of relevance, consistence, coherence and additional criteria of harmonization and sustainability. Priority activities of the IBHRP are relevant and coherent. The additional criterion of harmonization with groups of activities defined by the Action plan is also fulfilled.

The Plan in general was assessed as sustainable because it fulfils the wishes and endeavours of all stakeholders thus making strong prerequisites and devotion for its efficient implementation. It mainly meets both mandatory as well as additional assessment criteria. Mandatory (standard) ex-ante evaluation criteria have proved to be adequate for heritage plans evaluation since they provide indispensable information for further

Table 3: Findings of the evaluation.

Evaluation criteria	Evaluation questions	Findings
Relevance	To what extent are the IBHRP goals justified as compared to the needs? Do they match local, national and European priorities?	The goals set in the Plan are harmonized with the identified needs and are connected with the Development Strategy of the town of Buzet.
Effectiveness	To what extent are the goals to be achieved? Can the used interventions and instruments produce the expected results? Would more results have been achieved if different instruments had been used?	The key benefits of the IBHRP are clearly formulated in the relationship with the priority activities.
Efficiency	Are the goals to be achieved with the lowest costs? Is the obtained value proportional to the invested money? Are the changes in planning necessary in order to simplify and increase efficiency? If the answer is yes, what changes are needed?	Costs quoted in the Action Plan are based on the preliminary studies, tested and approved as efficient and realistic in a wide consultative process with all relevant stakeholders.
Coherence	Is internal and external coherence of the IBHRP achieved? Do the defined measures contribute to the achievement of the set goals and priorities? Does the plan implementation contribute to the achievement of the goals of the higher ranked documents?	IBHRP is a coherent document, internal harmonization is achieved. The strategic municipal development goals are underlying the scope of the IBHRP of Buzet Historic Town Centre, thus ensuring external coherence.
Sustainability	Will the results and impacts last? Will the impact last even if the public financing ceases? What long-term (development) impacts are envisaged?	The implementation of the IBHRP will largely improve local welfare with quality of innovative and authentic content and services, equally provided by private as well as public sector partners.
Additional criteria		
Usefulness	Do the expected effects meet the needs of the direct and indirect users and to what extent?	The Plan is clearly formulated in the way that it is visible what benefits are planned for the local population. The very plan elaboration process enabled consultations, discussions and consensus on key development issues of that area.
Consistence	Are the goals in the IBHRP clearly set? Do the goals overlap or supplement each other? Do the goals contribute to realization of the vision?	The main goals of the Historic Town Centre revitalization are derived from the defined vision and are harmonized with the IBHRP of the Buzet Historic Town Centre key goals thereby satisfying the consistency evaluation criteria
Complementarity	What is the ratio in which the proposed interventions support relevant local strategic documents or other higher rank public policies?	The interventions proposed in the IBHRP are in harmony with the Development Strategy of the town of Buzet (three goals) and contribute to the achievement of the goals concerning the preservation of cultural heritage and Istrian identity within the framework of the County development strategy of the Istrian County (one goal)
Harmonization	To what extent are the measures of the IBHRP organized in such a way that amplifies common effects? Do the consolidated measures contribute to the realization of the set vision?	All measures envisaged by the plan mutually supplement each other into a coherent whole thus contributing to the achievement of the set goals.
Acceptability	Were all relevant stakeholders involved during the planning process? Did the proposed goals, priorities and measures achieve positive or negative perception from the point of view of the relevant stakeholders?	All stakeholders were involved during the planning process both through focus groups as well as through individual interviews and conversations.
Equal opportunities	Do the measures proposed within the IBHRP ensure equal opportunities for all stakeholders regardless their age, region, religion and gender identity?	The realization of the plan will bring significant improvements in the local environment regarding the accessibility of the facilities and better quality of life for all.

management of the town. This also provides a solid basis for potential (private) investments. Additional ex-ante evaluation criteria proved to be important since they point to what extent the expected effects meet the needs of the direct and indirect users. Also, they contribute to the verification of consistence and clarity of goals and priorities concerning the vision as well as harmonization with other strategic documents important for the development of the town. One of the key recommendations of the ex-ante evaluation testing on this case study is to introduce the criterion of impact, which is a standard evaluation criterion. It may provide additional information on the contribution of the plan to the general development goals and ensure regular monitoring of the planned activities.

CONCLUSION

Evaluation of the investment in renewal and sustainable use of cultural heritage is the challenge for future generations. Extraordinary high costs of restoration, maintenance and use point to the necessity to elaborate management plans as key sustainability tools. Elaboration of those documents is a rare practice in Croatia while the practice of evaluation of their elaboration and implementation monitoring is practically non-existent. The evaluation implies collection, analysis and use of information on the progress in elaboration i.e. implementation of the plan and results achieved thus contributing to taking over responsibility for exploitation of resources and achievement of results. Evaluations, ex-ante in particular, are a precious tool for testing if strategic management decisions have been correct and are especially significant for the assessment of public investments that demand meeting different economic, social, environmental and cultural needs from always limited sources of funding. Involvement of private partners in the implementation of such plans are rare, which makes these evaluations even more important as a proof of their justification.

Due to a range of methods and tools for the assessment of justification of both development goals as well as implementation of concrete measures, it is difficult to unambiguously assess their usability and applicability for evaluation of the complex, integrated plans such as IBHRP. Therefore, the very ex-ante evaluation method seems as wide enough to encompass all relevant aspects of the plan even through key evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and sustainability). Additional criteria suggested by the authors following the UNESCO methodologies for assessment of the heritage management plans contributed to a tailor

made approach relevant for deliberation and planning of the areas that are rich in cultural heritage. As previously assessed, ex-ante evaluation as a tool has several key advantages due to which its application is proposed. The experience of the town of Buzet has shown that it is a relatively undemanding method with respect to limited time planned for the implementation, it is based on the knowledge on the evaluation area, on the analysis of the available documentation and insistence on participatory planning method by involving all relevant stakeholders in the process. Also, ex-ante evaluation provides additional value to the IBHRP because it monitors the planners of the plan during the whole planning process and enables changes in case of need.

Since ex-ante evaluation is one of the rapid assessment tools, it monitors more the process of the elaboration of development plan, relevance of the topic and the ways of mitigating the identified challenges. As differentiated from ex-post evaluation, it usually does not go into depth and does not collect and assess all relevant impacts of the proposed measures. Therefore, although the researchers sometimes recommend it, the coherence of the expected effects of the IBHRP was not evaluated. So far, process although relevant for development policies is not fully defined in the ex-ante evaluations for heritage management plans. Definition of clear indicators as a basis for future coherence evaluation process as a part of a holistic impact assessment model remains a research challenge for the future.

Finally, ex-ante evaluation method is an appropriate method for integrated heritage management plan evaluation since it provides a fast insight into justification of interventions while through additional criteria introduced into analysis assesses justification of planning breakthroughs regarding the sustainable use of cultural heritage, which is in the focus of interest of integrated management plans. Accordingly, the case study of the ex-ante evaluation of the IBHRP of the town of Buzet, presented in this article fully confirms the theory of Samset and Christensen (2017) and the theory of Nared and Razpotnik Visković (2014), which claim that management of cultural goods can use ex-ante evaluation aiming at harmonization of the plan with the challenges of the locality/area. Thus, evaluation has proved to be a valuable tool in the hands of the owner of cultural heritage, which ensures positive changes and foundation for future planning. Introducing the mandatory elaboration of heritage management plans and their evaluation into public policies (cultural policy in particular) would ensure a strong foundation for the development of the entire community inheriting those cultural goods.

EX-ANTE VREDNOTENJE NAČRTOV UPRAVLJANJA DEDIŠČINE: PREDPOGOJ ZA DOSEGANJE TRAJNOSTI

*Daniela Angelina JELINČIĆ*Inštitut za razvoj in mednarodne odnose, Lj. Farkaša Vukotinovića 2, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvaška
e-mail: daniela@irmo.hr*Sanja TIŠMA*Inštitut za razvoj in mednarodne odnose, Lj. Farkaša Vukotinovića 2, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvaška
e-mail: sanja.tisma@irmo.hr

POVZETEK

Članek razloži pomen in vlogo načrtov za upravljanje kulturne dediščine. Opozarja na pomembnost vrednotenja načrtov upravljanja dediščine, ki ni vedno pogost. Različne metode ocenjevanja ustrezajo različnim potrebam po vrednotenju. Običajne vrste vrednotenja načrtov / programov vključujejo predhodno, vmesno in naknadno vrednotenje. V prispevku je preučena ustreznost predhodnega vrednotenja študije primera načrta oživitve integrirane grajene dediščine (IBHRP) starega mestnega jedra mesta Buzet na Hrvaškem. Na podlagi teoretičnega pristopa k predhodnemu vrednotenju je bil zasnovan sklop idejnih ocenjevalnih vprašanj, ki so bila nato preizkušena glede na izzive, odkrite v načrtu. V vrednotenju načrtov upravljanja dediščine je bilo za predhodno vrednotenje in vsa zasnovana vprašanja, ki ustrezajo merilom (ustreznost, uspešnost, uspešnost, skladnost, trajnost, uporabnost, doslednost, komplementarnost, usklajenost, sprejemljivost in enake možnosti) primerno. Zato se je vrednotenje izkazalo kot dragoceno orodje v rokah lastnikov kulturne dediščine, saj zagotavlja pozitivne spremembe in podlago za prihodnje načrtovanje. Uvedba obveznega razvoja načrtov za upravljanje dediščine in njihovo vrednotenje v javnih politikah (zlasti kulturni politiki) bi postala trdna podlaga za razvoj celotne skupnosti, ki bi podedovala ta kulturna bogastva.

Ključne besede: kulturna dediščina, integrirani načrti za upravljanje dediščine, predhodna ocena načrta upravljanja, Buzet

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdel-Moneim, N. M. (2010):** Management Plan and Culture Heritage Local Development. *Pakistan Heritage*, 2, 69–78.
- Benali Aoudia, L. & Y. Chennaoui (2019):** The Archaeological Site of Tipasa, Algeria: What Kind of Management Plan? *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 19, 3, 173–196.
- Bottero, M., Bragaglia, F., Caruso, N., Datola, G. & F. Dell'Anna (2020):** Experimenting Community Impact Evaluation (CIE) for Assessing Urban Regeneration Programmes: The Case Study of the Area 22@ Barcelona. *Cities*, 99, 102464.
- Campeol, G. & C. Pizzinato (2007):** Metodologia per la valutazione dell'impatto archeologico. *Archeologia e Calcolatori*, 18, 273–292.
- De Medici, S., De Toro, P. & F. Nocca (2019):** Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Development: Impact Assessment of Two Adaptive Reuse Projects in Siracusa, Sicily. *Sustainability*, 12, 1, 311.
- Eccleston, C. H. (2011):** Environmental Impact Assessment: A Guide to Best Professional Practices. Abingdon, Routledge.
- Edinburgh World Heritage (2005):** The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site, Management Plan. Edinburgh, UNESCO.
- Fischer, T. B. (2007):** Theory and Practice of Strategic Environmental Assessment. London, Earthscan.
- Hockings, M., Stolton, S., Leverington, F., Dudley, N. & J. Courrau (2006):** Evaluating Effectiveness A Framework for Assessing Management Effectiveness Of Protected Areas. Gland, IUCN.
- Integrated Built Heritage Revitalisation Plan (Buzet).** Available at: [https://www.interreg-central.eu/Content.Node/IBHRP-in-Buzet-Summary-\(EN.ver.\).pdf](https://www.interreg-central.eu/Content.Node/IBHRP-in-Buzet-Summary-(EN.ver.).pdf) (last access: 3. 6. 2020).
- Ivandić, N., Kos, G., Kunst, I. & N. Telišman-Košuta (2017):** Integrirani plan revitalizacije starogradske jezgre grada Buzeta. Zagreb, Institut za turizam.
- Kalman, H. (1979):** The Evaluation of Historic Buildings. Ottawa, Parks Canada.
- Leopold, L. B., Clarke, F. E., Hanshaw, B. B., & J. R. Balsley (1971):** A Procedure for Evaluating Environmental Impact. Washington, United States Department of the Interior. Geological Survey 1971, Circular n. 645. Available at: <http://eps.berkeley.edu/people/lunaleopold/%28118%29%20A%20Procedure%20for%20Evaluating%20Environmental%20Impact.pdf> (last access: 3. 6. 2020).
- Lombardi, P. L. (1999):** Understanding Sustainability in the Built Environment. A Framework for Evaluation in Urban Planning And Design. Doctoral thesis. Manchester, University of Salford.
- Maleković, S. & S. Tišma (2011):** Evaluating Pre Accession Assistance – Rethinking its Effectiveness in Promoting Developmental Change. In: Faculty of Economics in Split (ed.): *Challenges of Europe: Growth and Competitiveness – Reversing the Trends*. Split, Faculty of Economics, 90–100.
- Ministarstvo kulture Republike Hrvatske (2011):** Strategija zaštite, očuvanja i gospodarskog korištenja kulturne baštine Republike Hrvatske za razdoblje 2011.–2015. Available at: https://www.min-kulture.hr/userdocsimages/bastina/STRATEGIJA_BASTINE_VRH.pdf (last access: 10. 10. 2018).
- Mrak, I. (2014):** Evaluation Model for Cultural Heritage in Spatial Planning. *International Journal of Global Environmental Issues*, 13, 2-4, 206–234.
- Nared, J. & N. Razpotnik Visković (2014):** Managing Cultural Heritage Sites in Southeastern Europe. Ljubljana, Založba ZRC.
- National Park Service:** Park Planning. U.S. Department of the Interior. Available at: <https://www.nps.gov/grko/getinvolved/planning.htm> (last access: 3. 6. 2020).
- NN 90/2018:** Zakon o izmjenama i dopunama Zakona o zaštiti i očuvanju kulturnih dobara. Available at: https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2018_10_90_1756.html (last access: 30. 6. 2020).
- Ovans, A. (2015):** What is a Business Model? *Harvard Business Review*. Available at: https://hbr.org/2015/01/what-is-a-business-model_ (last access: 3. 6. 2020).
- Rienstra, S. A. (1998):** Options and Barriers to Sustainable Transport Policies. Doctoral Thesis. Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit.
- Samset, K. & T. Christensen (2017):** Ex-ante Project Evaluation and Complexity of Early Decision Making. *Public Organisation Review*, 17, 1, 1–17.
- Throsby, D. (2016):** Investment in Urban Heritage Conservation in Developing Countries: Concepts, Methods and Data. *City, Culture and Society*, 7, 81–86.
- UNESCO (2013):** Managing Cultural World Heritage: World Heritage Resource Manual. Available at: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/827/> (last access: 10. 10. 2018).
- Vreeker, R. & P. Nijkamp (2006):** Methods for Evaluating Development Scenarios: An Application to Thailand. In: Alexander, E. R. (ed.): *Evaluation in Planning: Evolution and Prospects*. Oxon, Routledge, 174–203.